

寫作前導活動對中學生寫作焦慮和寫作表現之影響：
列舉法和提問法的運用

**The Effects of Prewriting Activities on Junior High School EFL Students'
English Writing Anxiety and English Writing Performance:
Listing and Asking WH-Questions**

By

沈凭義 Ping-Shi Carrie Shen

THESIS

**Presented to the Faculty of the
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature of
Tunghai University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS in
Teaching English As A Foreign Language**

TUNGHAI UNIVERSITY

July 2015

中華民國一零四年七月

東海大學碩士學位論文考試審定書

外國語文學系 碩士班

研究生 沈筑戴 所撰之論文：

The Effects of Prewriting Activities on Junior High School EFL Students' English Writing Anxiety and English Writing Performance: Listing and Asking WH-Questions

寫作前導活動對中學生寫作焦慮和寫作表現之影響：

列舉法和提問法的運用

經本委員會審查，符合碩士學位論文標準。

學位考試委員會

指導教授

Kai-hsi Wu

考試委員

Kai-hsi Wu

Chia-li Luo

Jung-Jung Chen

系主任

Szu-yi Chen

中華民國 2015 年 7 月 14 日

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ABSTRACT (English).....	ii
ABSTRACT (Chinese)	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problems.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Research Questions.....	3
Definition of Terms.....	3
Significance of the Study.....	5
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	6
Prewriting Activities.....	6
Prewriting Strategies.....	7
Effects of Prewriting.....	9
Decreasing Writing Anxiety.....	10
Improving Writing Performance.....	10
Promoting Positive Attitude.....	13
Creating Cooperative Learning.....	14

Problems of Prewriting Activities.....	15
English Writing Anxiety.....	16
Measurements of English Writing Anxiety.....	17
Negative Impacts of English Writing Anxiety on Writing Performance...	18
Solutions of English Writing Anxiety.....	19
CHAPTER 3 METHOD.....	21
Participants.....	21
Measurements and Variables.....	22
Instruments.....	22
Treatment.....	24
Data Collection Procedures.....	26
Data Analysis Procedures.....	27
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	28
Summary of the Participants' Background Information.....	28
Participants' Self-rated Degrees of English Writing Anxiety before	
Prewriting Activities.....	29
The Differences of Participants' English Writing Anxiety before	
and after Prewriting Activities.....	34

Participants' English Writing Performance before and after Prewriting Activities.....	40
Participants' Self-rated Degrees of Attitudes toward Prewriting Activities.....	44
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION.....	50
Summary of the Major Findings.....	50
Pedagogical Implications.....	53
Limitations of the Study.....	54
Suggestions for Future Research.....	55
REFERENCES.....	57
APPENDICES.....	63
APPENDIX A Second Language Writing Anxiety Questionnaire (English Version)...	63
Second Language Writing Anxiety Questionnaire (Chinese Version)...	66
APPENDIX B GEPT Holistic Scoring Guidelines	69
APPENDIX C Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire (English Version).....	70
Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire (Chinese Version).....	71
APPENDIX D Consent Form (Chinese Version).....	72
APPENDIX E Pre-test.....	73
APPENDIX F Post-test.....	74

APPENDIX G Semi-structured Interview Questions.....	76
APPENDIX H Lesson Plan for the First Instruction Session-Listing.....	77
Lesson Plan for the Second Instruction Session-Asking wh-questions.....	79
APPENDIX I GEPT Grading Samples.....	81
APPENDIX J Students Grades and Word Count before and after Prewriting Activities.....	83
APPENDIX K Examples of Students' Pre-test, Post-test Writing, and Prewriting Sheet.....	84

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The three-year research is finished in July, 2015. I got a lot of support and encouragement from many professors, the teaching assistant in my Department, all my graduate school classmates and friends, and my dearest family. I would like to take this chance to express my gratitude to all of them.

First, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Kai-Lin Wu for being supportive and patient in guiding me to the completion of my thesis. She had faith in me and gave me immediate help when I had questions about my research. She also sets a good example for me being a supportive and enlightening teacher. I would also like to thank my committee member, Dr. Jung-Han Chen at the Tunghai English Language Center for his helpful comments and instruction in these academic years. I also want to thank my committee member, Dr. Chun-Lin Luo in the Department of English Language Literature and Linguistics of Providence University for her detailed comments on my proposal and final defense. Moreover, I would like to thank Dr. Daniel C. Teng in the Center of Teacher Education of Tunghai University for his support and instruction in statistics. I would like to thank my participants in the study to give me the chance to experiment prewriting activities in after-school English classes. Last, I would like to thank my family for their support. Without their love and care, I would not have been able to finish my M.A. degree.

Finally, the time spent on my M.A. study at Tunghai University was an intensive and fabulous journey in my life. I am glad to know that I have confidence in my teaching style and attitude after all the hard work. In conclusion, I would like to thank God for guiding me to enter Tunghai University where I learned to be independent and met inspiring professors during these academic years.

Ping Shi Carrie Shen
Tunghai University
2015 July

**The Effects of Prewriting Activities on Junior High School EFL Students’
English Writing Anxiety and English Writing Performance:
Listing and Asking WH-Questions**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of prewriting activities on junior high school EFL students’ English writing anxiety and English writing performance. In addition, students’ attitudes toward prewriting activities were investigated. The study examined: 1) junior high school (JHS) EFL students’ self-rated degrees of English writing anxiety, 2) JHS EFL students’ English writing anxiety before and after they engaged in the prewriting activities, 3) JHS EFL students’ English writing performance before and after they engaged in the prewriting activities, 4) JHS EFL students’ attitude toward prewriting activities.

This study recruited twenty-two seventh-graders in a private secondary school in central Taiwan. Students received one-hour prewriting instruction after school for ten weeks. They were trained by the teacher-researcher to do listing and asking wh-questions before writing a picture story. The quantitative and qualitative data included a pre-test, a Second Language Writing Anxiety Questionnaire, a post-test with a prewriting sheet, a prewriting attitude questionnaire, and a semi-structured interview. This study was expected to decrease students’ English writing anxiety and to improve their English writing performance through prewriting activities.

The results of the study showed that the seventh graders’ self-rated degrees of English writing anxiety were moderate before participating in the prewriting activities. Secondly, there was no significant difference in their English writing anxiety before and after prewriting activities. Thirdly, the students made significant improvement on their writing performance and writing length. Fourth, the students had positive

attitude toward prewriting activities. Moreover, the sentence and vocabulary production, organization skills, and time limitation were found most challenging to the students during prewriting activities.

Keywords: prewriting activities, English writing anxiety, English writing performance, junior high school EFL students

寫作前導活動對中學生寫作焦慮和寫作表現之影響： 列舉法和提問法的運用

摘要

本研究目的在探討寫作前導活動對台灣中學生的英語寫作焦慮和英語寫作表現之影響，以及學生對寫作前導活動的態度調查研究。本研究的內容包括：(1)中學生的自我評量其寫作焦慮之程度，(2)中學生在寫作前導活動的前後，對英語寫作焦慮之不同，(3)中學生在寫作前導活動的前後寫作表現，(4)中學生對寫作前導活動自我評量之態度。

本實驗的研究對象為台灣中部某所私立中學二十二名的國一學生。他們接受為期十週的課後寫作前導活動課程—列舉法和提問法的圖片寫作課，研究者為他們的授課老師。本研究包含量化和質化的分析，其內容為前測、第二語言寫作焦慮量表、後測、寫作前導活動態度問卷與半結構化訪談；本研究期許寫作前導活動能降低他們的英文寫作焦慮，以及能幫助學生的英文寫作表現。

本研究結果顯示，國一學生在寫作前導活動前有適度的英文寫作焦慮；在寫作前導活動教學前後，其寫作焦慮並無顯著差異；在寫作前導活動教學後，其寫作表現和作文長度有相當的進步；在寫作前導活動的自我評量中，學生對寫作前導活動也持有正向的態度；因此，寫作前導活動並未能顯著降低國中學生的寫作焦慮，但卻能提升學生的寫作表現，並對其學生產生正面的影響。此外，本研究發現，句子、單字、寫作架構的表達和時間限制對國一學生是最具挑戰性的困難之處。

關鍵字：寫作前導活動，英文寫作焦慮，英文寫作表現，國中學生

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Course Schedule of the Prewriting Instruction.....	25
Table 3.2	Data Collection Procedures.....	27
Table 4.1	Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviation of the SLWAI before Prewriting Activities.....	29
Table 4.2	Means, Standard Deviation, and Average Means of the Three Subscales of the SLWAI before Prewriting Activities.....	31
Table 4.3	Ranking, Descriptions, Means, and Standard Deviation of the Top Three Items and Bottom Three Items of SLWAI before Prewriting Activities.....	32
Table 4.4	Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviation of the SLWAI after Prewriting Activities.....	34
Table 4.5	Means, Standard Deviation, and Average Means of the Three Subscales of the SLWAI after Prewriting Activities.....	36
Table 4.6	Ranking, Descriptions, Means, and Standard Deviation of the Top Three Items and Bottom Three items of SLWAI after the prewriting activities.....	37
Table 4.7	Paired-samples T-test of the Pretest, Posttest, and Three Subscales before and after Prewriting Activities.....	38
Table 4.8	Means and Standard Deviation of the Participants' Performance before and after Prewriting Activities.....	41
Table 4.9	Paired-samples T-test of the Participants' English Writing Grades before and after the Prewriting Activities.....	41
Table 4.10	Participants' Word Count, Means, and Standard Deviation before and after Prewriting Activities.....	43
Table 4.11	Paired-samples T-test of the Participants' English Writing Word Count before and after Prewriting Activities.....	43
Table 4.12	Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviation of Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire.....	45
Table 4.13	Means and Standard Deviation on the Three Subscales of Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire.....	45
Table 4.14	Ranking, Descriptions, Means, and Standard Deviation of the Top Three Items and Bottom Three items of Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire.....	46

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

To second or foreign English (ESL/ EFL) learners, writing seems to be one of the most challenging language skills. In the writing process, ESL/EFL learners have to generate ideas and translate the ideas into readable paragraphs (Hashempour, , Rostampour., & Behjat, 2015). For them, writing is an ability that contains both higher-level skills such as planning and organizing and lower-level skills like punctuations, spelling, and word choice.

Writing in English, without doubt, is difficult for junior high school students in Taiwan. Most of them do not have any systematic English writing instruction at school. Many students are required or encouraged to take the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT). To pass the elementary level of the test, students have to do Chinese-English translation and picture writing in fifty minutes. Most students are afraid of English writing since they cannot formulate ideas fast enough. Some of them panic and feel stressful. Therefore, prewriting can be a beneficial activity to young EFL learners.

Prewriting, also known as “planning”, is the first stage of the writing process. It is an essential component of process-oriented writing instruction. Prewriting is the phase for writers to “talk on paper to themselves, explore thoughts, discover new insights, and make connections” (Wyrick, 2011, p. 4). After students generate some ideas, they write the first draft based on the idea. Then, with the help of teachers and peers, they revise and edit their first drafts. In other words, they participate in the different stages of the writing process: prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing.

Prewriting helped students to come up with new thoughts more easily (Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Voon, 2010; Wei, 2010). Thus, prewriting activities have the

advantages of helping students have better writing performance (Famhim & Rahimi, 2011; Fowler, 2001; Hashempour et al., 2015; Ibnian, 2011; Lee, 2013; Lorenz et al., 2009; Maghsoudi & Haririan, 2013; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Moheniasl, 2014; Schuyler, 2006; Voon, 2010), have positive attitudes toward English writing (Rao, 2007; Schuyler, 2006; Wei, 2010), create collaborative learning (Famhim & Rahimatii, 2011; Lee, 2013; Schweiker-Marra & Marra, 2000; Smith, 1999), and decrease students' writing anxiety (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Mohesenasl, 2014; Schweiker-Marra & Marra 2000).

Statement of the Problems

Previous studies showed that prewriting skills were beneficial to second language writing (Lally, 2000; Voon, 2010). Additionally, a considerable number of studies were based on the effects of different kinds of prewriting activities on students' performance at different levels (Famhim & Rahimi, 2011; Fowler, 2001; Hashempour et al., 2015; Ibnian, 2011; Lee, 2013; Lorenz et.al, 2009; Maghsoudi & Haririan, 2013; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Moheniasl, 2014; Schuyler, 2006; Voon, 2010). However, the effect of implementing prewriting instruction on reducing L2 students' writing anxiety was seldom explored (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Mohesenasl, 2014; Schweiker-Marra & Marra 2000). Therefore, the researcher of the present study intended to explore the effects of prewriting activities on English writing performances and writing anxiety. The researcher was motivated to conduct the study by implementing prewriting activities in junior high school for two reasons. First, most junior high school students had limited knowledge and practices of English writing, but they had the need to pass the GEPT elementary-level writing test. Second, few of the previous studies involved young

EFL writers. More empirical evidences of the implication of prewriting activities in the junior high classrooms would help English teachers design effective writing activities for young EFL writers in Taiwan.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of prewriting activities on junior high school EFL students' English writing performance and English writing anxiety. In addition, students' attitudes toward prewriting activities were investigated. This study also explored the challenges and difficulties of English writing that Taiwanese EFL junior high school students might encounter.

Research Questions

The present study was designed to answer the following four research questions:

1. What are junior high school (JHS) EFL students' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety?
2. Are there any significant differences in the JHS EFL students' writing anxiety before and after they engage in the prewriting activities?
3. Are there any significant differences in JHS EFL students' writing performance before and after they engage in the prewriting activities?
4. What are participants' attitudes toward prewriting activities?

Definition of Terms

1. Prewriting activities: Prewriting, an essential element of process-oriented writing, is the first stage of the writing process. It is the idea-generation stage, which may take place in or between other writing stages. In this stage, warm-up writing

exercises are given by writing teachers to help writers generate and then organize their raw ideas before composing (Smith, 1999). In the current study, prewriting activities refer to the two specific strategies: listing and asking wh-questions.

2. English writing anxiety: English writing anxiety, also known as English writing apprehension, is an affective factor and has a negative influence on language learners' writing competency (Daly, 1997) and on EFL learners' writing performance (Hassan, 2001). Learners who have writing anxiety may have negative feelings toward writing. In this study, writing anxiety is measured by a modified Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), which is originally designed by Cheng (2004) to measure ESL/EFL students' writing anxiety (see Appendix A).
3. English writing performance: According to Abu Shawish and Atea Avdelraheem (2010), writing is not an easy work for students. It is the combination of students' ability of "content, organization, grammar, syntax, mechanics, word choice, the targeted audience and the writers' progress." Therefore, every student's writing performance varies depending on their writing training. In this study, English writing performance is measured by the 5-point scale of the GEPT holistic scoring guide for elementary picture writing (see Appendix B).
4. Attitudes toward prewriting activities: According to Ismail et al. (2010), the attitudes toward prewriting activities are predispositions to reflect an individual's situation and value toward prewriting activities. Individuals always come up with some positive or negative feelings and emotions of writing experiences and

prewriting judgments. Students who are anxious of their writing performance normally have negative attitudes toward writing classes. Therefore, the researcher in this study hopes to investigate junior high school students' positive or negative attitudes after implementing prewriting activities. In this study, junior high school students' attitudes toward prewriting activities are measured by a prewriting attitude questionnaire (see Appendix C).

Significance of the Study

It was hoped that the findings of the study would provide a better understanding of the effects of prewriting activities on EFL junior high school students' English writing anxiety and English writing performance. Moreover, by implementing listing and asking wh-questions as prewriting activities and investigating the participants' attitude toward prewriting training, the researcher sought possible ways of incorporating English writing activities in the junior high school EFL English class.

For junior high school EFL teachers, they can use prewriting activities to teach English writing to young writers. For JHS EFL students, they can use the easy but useful methods, prewriting activities, which not only help them decrease their writing anxiety but improve their English writing performance. For future studies, many relevant issues of implementing different prewriting activities into different levels of English writing classes can be explored in the future.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews previous studies relevant to prewriting activities and their effects on English writing performances and writing anxiety. It includes the following major sections: prewriting activities, prewriting strategies, effects of prewriting, English writing anxiety, measurements of English writing anxiety, negative impacts of English writing anxiety, solutions of English writing anxiety.

Prewriting Activities

The writing process consists of four basic stages: prewriting, drafting, revising and editing. Prewriting is the “thinking and planning” stage of the writing process (Lorenz et al., 2009). During this stage, the writer uses prewriting strategies to find ideas. Then, he/she writes the first draft based on the prewriting notes. This is the second stage: drafting. After complementing the first draft, the writer proceeds to revising and checking content and organization of writing and editing (Hashempour, et al., 2015).

Prewriting activities are designed to help students generate ideas, increase the writing awareness, raise the writing motivation and reduce anxiety (Wei, 2010). It is like the sketches before starting painting (Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012). It has a great effect on helping students facing writing from a blank page to gathering ideas. To learners, prewriting is supposed to be a nonthreatening technique which does not need any preparation. It is the technique that needs no preparations; thus, it can be used in every level of writing (Hashempour, et al., 2015).

Several prewriting activities can be implemented to help students find ideas, which are listing, brainstorming, clustering, concept mapping, and asking wh-

questions. The following section describes prewriting strategies frequently used in English composition classes.

Prewriting Strategies

The prewriting strategies listed and described below, which are listing, asking wh-questions, free-writing, brainstorming, concept mapping, and graphic organizer.

Listing

Listing is the simplest way of prewriting activities. When students see a topic, they try to jot down all ideas they see or think. This activity is free-association. In L2 writing, listing is creating a list of topic-related words or phrases (Lally, 2000; Hashempour et al., 2015). Students need at least three to five minutes to write down their immediate thoughts on the paper. After they finish the list, learners need to find out the connections between the listed words or larger ideas hidden in the several small ideas (Wyrick, 2011). Learners may use listed items or words and sum up the ideas into a paragraph (Mogahed, 2013).

Asking wh-questions

According to Mogahed (2013), asking wh-questions is one of the most common ways of raising topics. It is a useful way to form the foundation of writing by responding to questions (Hashempour et al., 2015). When students face a writing topic, they can use six wh- words to ask themselves some questions about the topic. The six wh- words are “who”, “what”, “when”, “where”, “how”, and “why”. Students can find out the connections while they answer the questions. For example, “Who is in the picture? Where is the place in the picture? When is the picture set? Why are they in the

picture? How do they do so?” It is an influential strategy to expand an abstract topic quickly (Hashempour et al., 2015).

Free-writing

According to Wyrick (2011), free-writing is the start for writers to find a focus. Students need some blank paper and at least five minutes to write about the picture or topic. They can begin writing whatever thoughts they have. Students do not need to care about punctuation, spelling and complete sentences while they do the free-writing. Students do not need to correct or delete their writing on the paper either. Learners will come up with ideas which contain imaginative new directions.

Brainstorming

The founder of brainstorming, Osborn, had developed four original rules of brainstorming, including “don’t allow criticism, encourage wild ideas, go for quantity, combine and improve other ideas (Hashempour et al., 2015, p. 88)”. Furthermore, brainstorming can make learners transfer their thoughts “from the brain to tongue” (Hashempour et.al, 2015). Therefore, it is a method of getting a large number of people’s ideas in a short time.

Concept mapping

Concept mapping was first developed by Ausubel's meaningful learning theory. It is also called “clustering, semantic mapping, and cognitive mapping” (Brown, 2007, p. 91). Students make a relationship between the concepts and compositions and specify the main idea of topics (Fahim & Rahimi, 2011). Students can “place the picture or the topic in a circle in the middle of a blank sheet of paper” (Wyrick, 2011, p. 13). It

consists of “nodes and labeled connective lines” to broaden concepts (Lee, 2013, p. 254). Then, students can draw lines and circles to connect the main topic circle. If students brainstorm many ideas, the lines are abundant and connected. The line of concepts can be arranged from the most general to the most specific (Fahim & Rahimi, 2011). With a clear representation of key words, students can organize the main issues in a meaningful way (Mahnam, 2012).

Graphic organizer

According to Mogahed (2013) and Lorenz et al. (2009), graphic organizers are mostly used to do visual thinking. Thinking visually can make students understand the great deal of information easily. It is also called mind mapping, visual organizer, and structural overview. Graphic organizers can be implemented in different kinds of special worksheet forms, including charts, tables, diagrams, and flow charts. They help students arrange their ideas in order.

Effects of Prewriting

Researchers have conducted studies on prewriting activities and their effects on ESL/EFL learners. Prewriting, according to previous studies, has effects on students’ writing anxiety (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Mohesenasl, 2014; Schweiker-Marra & Marra 2000), writing performance (Famhim & Rahimi, 2011; Fowler, 2001; Hashempour et al., 2015; Ibnian, 2011; Lee, 2013; Lorenz et al., 2009; Maghsoudi & Haririan, 2013; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Moheniasl, 2014; Schuyler, 2006; Voon, 2010), students’ attitude (Rao, 2007; Schuyler, 2006; Wei, 2010), and cooperative learning (Famhim & Rahimatii, 2011; Lee, 2013; Schweiker-Marra & Marra, 2000; Smith, 1999).

Decreasing Writing Anxiety

Previous studies have found positive effects of prewriting on decreasing students' writing anxiety (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Mohesenasl, 2014; Schweiker-Marra & Marra 2000). According to Schwiker-Marra and Marra (2000), the experimental group students had less writing anxiety after implementing prewriting according to the data of the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) questionnaire. Similarly, Mohesenasl (2014) pointed out that there was a statistically significant decrease of writing anxiety according to the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) questionnaire investigation. Students mitigated writing anxiety after prewriting. Moreover, Abu Shawish and Atea Avdelraheem (2010) suggested that prewriting activities would decrease students' emotional fear since prewriting activities were relatively simpler than writing itself and less anxiety-provoking.

Improving Writing Performance

Previous studies have found that concept mapping has positive effects on students' writing performance (Fowler, 2001; Famhim & Rahimi, 2011; Hashempour et al., 2015; Ibnian, 2011; Lee, 2013; Lorenz et al., 2009; Maghsoudi & Haririan, 2013; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Moheniasl, 2014; Schuyler, 2006; Voon, 2010). Mahnam and Nejadansari (2012) investigated concept mapping affected the L2 students' compositions. Forty EFL adult students in an English composition class were divided into the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group students received concept mapping for twelve weeks. The result of the study showed that the experimental group students wrote better argumentative essays after prewriting training. Similarly, Lee (2013) found that concept mapping had a great effect on Korean college students. One hundred and thirty two English-speaking university students in Korea participated in the study. They were divided into the

experimental group and the control group in each level. The result showed that students of the experimental group elaborated more ideas by generating more comprehensive concept maps. Moreover, the students had higher scores on content, organization, vocabulary and language use. In addition, Famhim and Rahimi (2011) examined the effect of concept mapping on Iran's EFL university students listening performance. Fifty-five EFL university students enrolled in the English department participated in the study. Students were randomly assigned to the experimental group and the control group. The result showed that students of the experimental group outperformed the students of the control group. There was a significant difference on the experimental group students' scores.

Voon (2010) examined the effects of brainstorming and role playing on the content of students' writing assignments. Thirty-three EFL high school students from different countries participated in the study. Through a four-week brainstorming training, students showed a great effect on the post-test. They could write more contents and their arguments were more convincing than in their pre-test. Through interviewing, all students agreed that prewriting helped them generate ideas and supporting points more easily. Similarly, Ibnian (2011) examined the effect of brainstorming on tenth grade students' essay writing skills. Eighty-four students were classified into four classes; two classes served as the experimental groups and two classes were the control groups. After one session of prewriting, the result showed that brainstorming had a great effect on the experimental group students' post-test scores.

Maghsoudi and Haririan (2013) examined the effect of brainstorming on EFL learners' writing performance. Eighty-four students in an Iranian university in different departments participated in the study. They were divided randomly into four

groups; two were experimental groups and the others were control groups. The experimental groups' students received prewriting instruction for twelve weeks. The result showed that students of experimental groups had a great improvement on their post-test mean scores. They had better writing performance by comparing with their pre-test scores.

Moheniasl (2014) explored the effect of writing strategy instructions on reducing writing apprehension and promoting writing performance. Forty-two intermediate EFL Iran students participated in the study. They were divided into four groups; two were experimental groups and the others were control groups. The experimental group students received brainstorming, concept mapping and free writing training for twelve sessions. The result showed that the experimental group students had a significant improvement on their post-test scores. They had better writing achievement than control groups' students.

Schuyler (2006) investigated the effects of prewriting instruction on students' timed writing performance. Thirty-six seventh grades students in various levels participated in the study. They received two-week intensive prewriting instruction including brainstorming and graphic organizer. The result showed that students improved on their post-tests. Similarly, Hashempour et al. (2015) examined the effect of using five prewriting strategies, including brainstorming, listing, wh-questions, answering, and outlining on Iranian EFL advanced learners' writing performance. Sixty Iranian EFL advanced learners participated in a sixteen-session writing class. They were divided into the experimental group and the control group randomly. The result showed that these prewriting strategies had a positive effect on the experimental group students' post-test scores. Teaching learners several prewriting techniques was beneficial to students in that they could choose the most suitable prewriting strategy

in their writing.

Fowler (2001) explored the effects of clustering, drawing, free writing, and thinking on fifth graders' production of writing. One hundred students from varied socioeconomic backgrounds participated in this study for six sessions. The result showed that free writing and clustering could make students write more than drawing and thinking. That is, younger writers wrote better on task-focused tangible products than abstract thinking. Similarly, Lorenz et al. (2009) examined multimedia graphic organizer software on primary school students' writing performance. Twenty-four second graders participated in the study. They received three-week computer-based graphic organizer classes. The results found that students' written output and logical organization were better after teaching the computer-based graphic organizer strategy. According to teachers' observation, students were willing to work harder and longer. Students became more enthusiastic and focused more on the computer-based writing class.

Promoting Positive Attitude

Previous studies have found positive effects of prewriting on students' writing attitude (Rao, 2007; Schuyler, 2006; Wei, 2010). Rao (2007) investigated brainstorming on EFL learners' writing performance and writing perceptions. One hundred and eighty sophomore college students in the university in China participated in this study. They were divided into two experimental groups and one control group. The result showed that brainstorming had a measurable effect on experimental group students' writing performance. The attitude survey result indicated that students felt positive about prewriting. Similarly, Wei (2010) examined the effects of prewriting activities, listing and drawing, on elementary school EFL students' compositions.

Fifth grade elementary school students of two classes in Taiwan's public elementary school participated in this study. They were divided into an experimental group and a control group. Students in the experimental group received prewriting training for two months. The post-writing questionnaire results showed that students had positive attitudes on prewriting activities. The interview results indicated that students liked prewriting activities since they could learn writing more efficiently and compiled thoughts quickly through group discussion. In Schuyler's (2006) study, the researcher used an attitude survey to examine the students' understanding of prewriting and their attitudes. The result showed that prewriting raised students' overall understanding of writing and their learning motivation.

Creating Cooperative Learning

Previous studies have found positive effects of prewriting on cooperative learning in writing classes (Famhim & Rahimatii, 2011; Lee, 2013; Schweiker-Marra & Marra, 2000; Smith, 1999). Schweiker-Marra and Marra (2000) examined the effects of prewriting activities on at-risk fifth grade students' writing performance. Twenty-nine students participated in a six-month session. They were separated into an experimental group and a control group. They received collaborative prewriting for six sessions. The teacher-student conference of the students' perceptions showed that the experimental group students commented positively on peers' prewriting editing. Peers editing helped the students to observe others' writing styles. Similarly, Lee (2013) stated that collaborative prewriting made students feel less concerned about making mistakes. Students could provide their ideas, words, concepts and statements with different levels' learners.

Famhim and Rahimatii (2011) pointed out that students in collaborative writing classes could perform better and foster students' ideas on concept mapping. Similarly, Smith (1999) examined collaborative prewriting activities on junior college students writing performance. Four classes of EFL university students were taught to use prewriting, brainstorming, and wh-questions generation in group work for six sessions. Students did peer editing and replied to three relevant questions related to their writing. The result showed that collaborative prewriting could improve individual's writing shortages and contents. They could synthesize information by gathering from peers' experiences.

Problems of Prewriting Activities

Although most of the previous studies have proved the advantages of prewriting, researchers mentioned some problems teachers and students may encounter in the prewriting. To implement prewriting activities effectively in the classroom, some researchers suggested teachers should carefully consider their students' level and age, choice of prewriting strategies, the training time, and problems of group work.

Fowler (2001) suggested writing teachers should consider students' level and age while choosing strategies. The result of the study showed that drawing and thinking were the least productive strategies for students to implement in writing. Students tended to wander in thinking time and lost focus. Furthermore, students took too much time on drawing. Sometimes, they felt distracted or puzzled when the topics were too complex to draw. Due to these factors, the researcher stated that students must be taught how to expand notes; moreover, to write more in the following-up papers based on their notes. Teachers should provide enough time for students to learn how to transform ideas into a paragraph by ordering when using thinking strategies. Teachers should be

concerned about the students' grade level, suitable topics, and contents when using drawing, in case the topics are too abstract to draw. Similarly, Lorenz et al. (2009) found that the primary school students focused more on getting pictures in the computer-based graphic organizers writing class. Choosing suitable pictures according to topics were time-consuming. Therefore, the researchers suggested teachers should monitor students' prewriting progress carefully.

Famhim and Rahimi (2011) suggested that teachers should set up the length of the training time for students of different ages and levels. Without enough practice time, students could not familiarize themselves with prewriting activities taught by teachers. Some prewriting activities, like concept mapping and graphic organizers, were much harder for students. For older writers, teachers could give examples of prewriting and handouts with explicit explanation for students to get clear ideas. For younger writers, collaborative group writing would be a good way to motivate students' prewriting activities.

In addition, teachers should monitor group writing work carefully and ask students to use target language frequently in collaborative writing classes (Smith, 1999). Students might rely on the most advanced students in the group and stop brainstorming on their own. Prewriting in the target language would be also required in collaborative writing classrooms and could make students concentrate more on the writing tasks instead of chatting.

English Writing Anxiety

Writing anxiety also known as writing apprehension, is “the construct that attempts to differentiate people who find writing enjoyable and those who experience high level of anxiety when writing is required” (Daly, 1997, p. 566). For students,

writing anxiety is the stress and block of individual's feeling when they are writing (Mohesenasl, 2014). Both L1 and L2 students have anxious feelings in expressing their ideas clearly (Karakaya & Ulper, 2011). Students with writing anxiety have troubles from writing simple words to complex compound sentences. While students have writing anxiety, they will have several syndromes like "procrastination, apprehension, tension, low-self-esteem, and lack of motivation" (Schwekker-Marra & Marra, 2000, p. 99). Moreover, students may suffer from "the possibility of failure, flawed performance, fear of evaluation, and negative attitudes" (Mohesenasl, 2014, p. 811) while they start writing. Therefore, their writing styles are mostly "lifeless, mechanical, full of grammatical errors, repeated concepts and word choice, and unsupported organization (Mohesenasl, 2014, p. 811)." Writing anxiety has a bad effect on writers' writing performance (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010).

Measurements of English Writing Anxiety

"Writing anxiety" was first introduced by Daly and Miller in 1975. To measure first language learners' writing anxiety, they designed the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT). WAT includes twenty-six items in three domains: "the tendencies to avoid writing, attitudes towards written communication and feelings experienced during writing" (Lao, 2013, p. 8). The importance of WAT had given rise to studies of writing anxiety (Cheng, 2002). Moheniasl (2014) and Ismail et al. (2010) used WAT in their studies to explore students' writing anxiety.

Cheng (1999) developed Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) to measure L2 Taiwanese students writing anxiety. It contained twenty-seven 5-point Likert-scale items in three categories, which were somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior subscales (Cheng, 2004). Somatic anxiety, also called

physiological anxiety, includes some syndromes, such as upset stomach, pounding heart and excessive sweating. Cognitive anxiety leads learners to worries, preoccupation, and negative expectations. Behavioral anxiety causes procrastination, withdrawal and avoidance behaviors.

The present study used Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) to measure EFL junior high school (JHS) students' English writing anxiety. Because most of the Taiwanese EFL JHS students are second language learners, Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) is more suitable than Writing Apprehension Test (WAT), which is used to measure first language learners.

Negative Impacts of Writing Anxiety on Writing Performance

Previous studies have found negative impacts of writing anxiety on students' writing performance (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Ismail et al., 2010). Abu Shawish and Atea Abedraheem (2010) examined Palestinian EFL students' writing anxiety. Two hundred and sixty-five university students in Palestine participated in the study. Two questionnaires, "causes of apprehension" and "minimizing writing apprehension" (Abu Shawish & Atea Abedraheem, 2010, p. 12), were used to examine students' writing apprehension cause and remedies. The result showed that the lack of vocabulary, grammar patterns, organization, and coherence were the main problem causing their writing anxiety. Students who had writing anxiety failed to correct and revise their writings since they lacked faith in writing well. Consequently, students made the same mistakes several times and did not reflect on their writing process. Similarly, Ismail et al. (2010) explored ESL tertiary university students' apprehension and attitude toward academic writing. Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) and open-ended interview were used in the study. The

results showed that participants were fearful of writing because they lacked writing knowledge. They faced difficulties in the writing process which affected their writing performance. According to the teachers' interview, the researchers found that students disliked writing in English. They wrote just for the examination purpose; however, they handed low-quality work and had procrastination and plagiarism problems.

Solutions of English Writing Anxiety

Previous studies have found writing anxiety can be solved by teachers' motivation and guidance (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Cheng, 2002; Ismail et al., 2010;). Cheng (2002) suggested language teachers should know their students' writing perceptions well. Moreover, teachers should use more time to change students' inappropriate judgments of their failed writing experiences. Teachers' encouragement and positive feedback would build up students' perceptions. Teachers could give credit on students' abundant ideas and give fewer judgments on their linguistic errors. Similarly, Abu Shawish and Atea Avdelraheem (2010) suggested writing teachers should vary teaching writing strategies, give credit to good performers in writing, and provide positive feedback to low-level writers to lower their writing anxiety. Ismail et al. (2010) suggested that teachers should focus more on writing process rather than students' products only. Writing process could help students improve writing fluency rather than accuracy. Teachers could give students more comments on organization and idea developments.

In view of the aforementioned studies, writing anxiety has been an important issue affecting students' writing performance and attitude toward English writing. Several studies suggested that prewriting training could be helpful to ease students' writing anxiety. This study was designed to apply two prewriting activities'—listing

and asking wh-questions to help JHS EFL students' English writing performance and decrease their English writing anxiety. The reason for choosing these two prewriting activities was that listing was the simplest method for students to learn prewriting when they began to write paragraph writings; asking wh-questions was the most common method related to their school's English class' contents.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter presents the research method of this study. It consists of the following four parts, including participants, measurement and variables, instruments, treatment, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures.

Participants

The participants in the study were twenty-two seventh graders (Males: 11; Females: 11) at a private junior high school in central Taiwan. They have been learning English for more than five years. They had seven 50-minute English classes per week, including normal English classes and foreign teachers' reading and speaking classes; however, they had unfamiliar knowledge in English writing since school's textbooks contain mainly English reading and conversation. Moreover, they were required to pass the GEPT elementary level test, which is the four-skill English proficiency test in Taiwan.

All participants signed up (see Appendix D) to take the ten-week after-school English writing classes once a week. They had limited knowledge of paragraph writing and just wrote what teachers ask them to. Students were quite familiar with each other since they had been one-year in school with their peers. Therefore, their peers would not cause students' writing anxiety.

Measurement and Variables

In this study, the junior high school (JHS) EFL students' writing performance, writing anxiety and their attitudes toward prewriting activities were measured. Therefore, the independent variable, also the treatment, was the instruction of prewriting activities. The dependent variables were English writing anxiety, English writing performance, and attitudes toward prewriting activities.

Instruments

The following instruments were used in this study for data collection: pre-test (see Appendix E), the modified Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) (see Appendix A), post-test and a prewriting sheet (see Appendix F), an prewriting attitude questionnaire (see Appendix C), and semi-structured interview questions (see Appendix G). The details of the instruments are presented in the following paragraphs.

Pre-test

In the pre-test, all participants were required to write an official elementary level GEPT picture writing about a trip to Kaohsiung (see Appendix E) in forty minutes. The limited time was consistent with the standard GEPT elementary writing test. All participants were expected to write a paragraph of forty to eighty words in length.

SLWAI (Chinese version)

The Chinese version of the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory was distributed to students after the pre-test and the post-test. Cheng's SLWAI (2004) was adapted in this study to explore the participants' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety

before and after the prewriting training.

SLWAI was a modified five-point Likert-scale with five responses of “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neutral,” “agree,” and “strongly agree” (see Appendix A). It consists of twenty-seven statements and is divided into three subscales, which were somatic anxiety subscale, avoidance behavior subscale and cognitive anxiety subscale to explore students’ writing anxiety level. There were eight items (Items 2, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, and 23) in somatic anxiety subscale, seven items (Items 4, 6, 12, 14, 19, 22, and 27) in avoidance behavior subscale and twelve items (Items 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, and 26) in cognitive anxiety subscale.

Post-test

In the post-test, participants were required to write the same elementary GEPT picture writing as pre-test in fifty to eighty words within forty minutes. In order to examine the effects of prewriting, a blank prewriting sheet includes a listing form and a wh-questions’ form (see Appendix F), was attached to the post-test. Students could choose a prewriting strategy they prefer and take prewriting notes in the space provided for them.

Prewriting attitude questionnaire (Chinese version)

The prewriting attitude questionnaire (see Appendix C) consisted of nine five-point Likert-scale items in three subcategories: students’ attitudes toward prewriting activities (Items 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8), students’ writing performance (Items 1, 4, and 6), and students’ writing anxiety (Item 9). In addition, three open-ended questions were included to explore the difficulties of doing prewriting (Item 10), the suggestions of ten-week after-school writing class (Item 11) and prewriting activities

students' prefer (Item 12). This questionnaire was designed by the researcher and was distributed to the participants in the last week of the writing instruction.

Interview questions

A semi-structured interview (see Appendix G), consisting of six questions, was conducted to collect more detailed information about participants' attitude after the implementation of prewriting activities. Question 1 investigated the type of prewriting activities the participants use. Question 2 examined students' perceptions of prewriting. Question 3 and 5 explored students' perceptions of writing anxiety. Question 4 investigated how participants feel toward the pre- and post-test and their anxiety in the ten-week writing classes. Question 6 asked students for any other relevant suggestions or thoughts. The interview questions were designed by the researcher.

Treatment

Two prewriting activities were implemented in order to improve junior high school students' EFL writing performance and reduce their writing anxiety. The teacher-researcher offered a ten-week English writing class in which prewriting activities are implemented. "Listing" and "asking wh- questions" were the two major prewriting strategies instructed and practiced in class (See Appendix H). The class was offered once a week and each time 60 minutes after school at the participants' junior high school. There were two instruction periods for ten weeks. Week 2 to week 5 was listing instruction period. Week 6 to week 9 was asking wh- questions instruction period. Table 3.1 shows the time and contents of the 10-week English writing classes.

Participants were guided by the teacher-researcher to participate in prewriting activities before they started writing picture stories in class. The teacher-researcher chose different topics of picture story tasks in a GEPT elementary-level writing practice book, which was considered to suit students' levels, interests and background knowledge. After the instruction of prewriting activities, all participants did timed writing. After that, their writings were corrected by the teacher-researcher and returned to them the next week with teacher's feedback on linguistic errors and the organization. The purpose of correcting students' papers was to give them the chance to avoid the same mistakes in their following writing tasks and to improve their writing performance.

Table 3.1 Course Schedule of the Prewriting Instruction

Week	Event
2	Prewriting strategy—listing instruction Writing topic: “A train station”
3	Prewriting strategy—listing instruction Writing topic: “Two boys’ leisure time”
4	Prewriting strategy—listing instruction Writing topic: “A bad day”
5	Prewriting strategy—listing practice (Teacher will not help) Writing topic: “Mother’s Day”
6	Prewriting strategy— asking wh- questions instruction Writing topic: “Breakfast time” Prewriting strategy— asking wh- questions instruction
7	Writing topic: “In a souvenir shop” Prewriting strategy— asking wh- questions instruction
8	Writing topic: “A summer camp” Prewriting strategy—asking wh- questions practice (Teacher will not help)
9	Writing topic: “Children’s hobby”

Data Collection Procedures

This study was conducted in the after-school English composition class offered by the teacher-researcher for ten weeks. The quantitative and qualitative data collected for the study included the pre-test on picture story writing with SLWAI questionnaire, the post-test of the same picture story topic with SLWAI questionnaire, a prewriting attitude questionnaire and interview questions data.

In the first week of the study, the pre-test with SLWAI and background information questionnaire was distributed before the implementation of prewriting activities. All participants were asked to take the pre-test on a GEPT elementary-level picture story topic “A trip to Kaohsiung” on a piece of lined A4-size paper in forty minutes. They were not allowed to refer to their textbooks and they cannot discuss with the teacher and classmates. After the test, the participants completed the SLWAI that assessed their degrees of writing anxiety and background information questionnaire. In week two, all participants signed the consent forms (see Appendix D) of the study. All participants knew that data during prewriting training would be copied and collected. From week two to week nine, the teacher-researcher led the prewriting activities instruction. In week ten, the post-test with one prewriting sheet including a listing form and a wh-questions form, SLWAI, and a prewriting attitude questionnaire in Chinese version were distributed to all participants. The semi-structured group interview was scheduled in week ten as well. The teacher-researcher interviewed four groups of participants to explore more about participants’ changes of writing performance, writing anxiety, and attitudes during their writing process. The complete data collection procedure is listed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Data Collection Procedures

Week	Event
1	Do pre-test GEPT writing in 40 minutes. Have participants fill out the SLWAI questionnaire & background information questionnaire.
2	Have participants fill out the consent form (Chinese version).
10	Do post-test GEPT writing in 40 minutes. Have participants fill out the SLWAI questionnaire & the prewriting attitude questionnaire (Chinese version) Do the semi-structured group interview

Data Analysis Procedure

The software package SPSS 21 for windows was used to analyze the quantitative data of the study. To answer research question one, frequencies and descriptive analysis were performed on the data of SLWAI questionnaire to examine the participants' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety. To answer research question two, a paired-samples t-test was used to analyze the pre-test and the post-test data from SLWAI to see whether there is a significant difference in the participants' writing anxiety before and after implementing prewriting activities. To answer research question three, the pre-test and the post-test were graded by the researcher using the GEPT holistic scoring guidelines for GEPT elementary-level writing test. In addition, a paired-samples t-test was performed on the pre- and post-test data to see whether there was a significant difference in the participants' writing performance before and after implementing prewriting activities. To answer research question four, the data collected from the prewriting attitude questionnaire and semi-structured group interview were analyzed based on descriptive statistics and using qualitative data analysis.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents and discusses the results of the study. It includes the following five sections: (1) summary of participants' background information; (2) participants' self-rated degrees of English writing anxiety before prewriting activities; (3) the differences of participants' English writing anxiety before and after prewriting activities; (4) participants' English writing performance before and after the prewriting activities; (5) participants' self-rated degrees of attitudes toward prewriting activities.

Summary of the Participants' Background Information

The first part of the SLWAI questionnaire shows the participants' background information (see Appendix A). The participants in the seventh grade were eleven females and eleven males (n=22). Twelve students (59%) had not learned English before they entered elementary schools; ten students (41%) had learned English before they entered elementary schools.

Regarding their self-rated degrees of English difficulty, four participants (18%) thought learning English was difficult; fourteen participants (63%) thought learning English was neither easy nor difficult for them; four participants (18%) thought English was not difficult to learn. In addition, eight participants (36%) thought English writing was difficult; eleven participants (50%) thought English writing was neither easy nor difficult for them. Only three participants (13%) thought English writing was not difficult. With regard to their English writing instruction, only four participants (18%) had taken English writing classes. Eighteen students (82%) had not

taken any English writing classes before. This explained why more participants thought English writing was more difficult than English itself. Students had limited knowledge of English writing because few of them had taken English writing classes before.

Finally, ten students (45%) had taken reading and listening of GEPT elementary level; twelve students (55%) did not take the GEPT. What is noteworthy is that four of them took the GEPT elementary level in the fifth grade; six of them in the seventh grade. To sum up, more than half of the students did not take the GEPT, which was required by their school.

Participants' Self-rated Degrees of English Writing Anxiety before Prewriting Activities

Table 4.1 presents the results of participants' self-rated degrees of English writing anxiety before prewriting activities, including frequencies of the participants' five-Likert scale responses, means (M) and standard deviation (SD) on the 27 items of the SLWAI.

Table 4.1
Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviation of the SLWAI before Prewriting Activities

Somatic Anxiety Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
2. I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time pressure.	0	5	4	10	3	3.50	.99
7. My mind goes blank when I start to work on an English composition.	3	7	8	4	0	2.59	.94
9. I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	6	11	3	0	2	2.14	1.10
10. If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a poor grade.	2	5	6	8	1	3.05	1.07

13. My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraint.	1	7	5	8	1	3.05	1.02
15. I feel panic when I write English compositions under time constraint.	0	6	8	6	2	3.18	.94
18. I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.	1	8	5	6	2	3.00	1.09
23. I feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	5	8	6	2	1	2.36	1.07
Avoidance behavior subscale	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
4. I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.	1	10	6	3	2	2.77	1.04
6. I try to avoid writing English compositions.	3	9	6	4	0	2.50	.94
12. I try to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.	5	8	6	1	2	2.41	1.15
14. Unless I have to write in English, I would not use English to write compositions.	2	8	9	2	1	2.64	.93
19. I would try to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	4	12	4	1	1	2.23	.95
22. I seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.	5	5	7	4	1	2.59	1.15
27. I seek every opportunity to use English to write compositions.	3	5	8	6	0	2.77	1.00
Cognitive anxiety Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
1. While writing in English, I'm not nervous.	1	8	8	4	1	2.82	.96
3. While writing English compositions, I feel worries and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	3	2	8	7	2	3.14	1.17
5. While writing in English, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.	0	5	2	12	3	3.59	1.01
8. I don't worry that my English compositions are worse than others'.	1	6	8	5	2	3.05	1.05
11. When I write in English, my ideas and words flow smoothly.	1	10	5	6	0	2.73	.94
16. While writing in English, I worry that the ways I express and organize my ideas do not conform to the norm of English writing.	1	6	4	8	3	3.27	1.17
17. I'm afraid that the other students would deride my English composition if they read it.	4	6	9	3	0	2.50	.96
20. When I write in English, my mind is clear.	1	7	10	4	0	2.77	.81
21. I don't worry about what other	3	10	3	3	3	2.68	1.29

people would think of my English compositions.								
24. I'm afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	2	6	7	6	1	2.91	1.07	
25. I feel comfortable and at ease when writing in English.	0	4	10	4	4	3.36	1.01	
26. I'm not afraid that my English compositions would be rated as very poor.	2	5	6	8	1	3.05	1.09	
Average Mean						2.80		

Note: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5=strongly agree
Item 1, 4, 8, 11, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 27 are reverse coded.

As shown in Table 4.1, the result of the pre-test shows that the mean of the SLWAI was 2.80. It indicated that the participants had a moderate degree of writing anxiety, which was not above the middle point 3 on the five-point scale before the implementation of prewriting.

Table 4.2 presents the results of the somatic anxiety, avoidance behavior, and cognitive anxiety subscales of the SLWAI before the implementation of prewriting activities, including means (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.2
Means, Standard Deviation, and Average Means of the Three Subscales of the SLWAI before Prewriting Activities

Subscales of the SLWAI	M	SD
Somatic Anxiety Subscale	2.86	1.03
Avoidance Behavior Subscale	2.56	1.01
Cognitive Anxiety Subscale	2.99	1.02
Average M	2.80	

As presented in Table 4.2, the mean was 2.86 in the somatic anxiety subscale, 2.56 in the avoidance behavior subscale and 2.99 in the cognitive anxiety subscale. All average mean were not above the middle points (3.0). This result revealed that students felt less anxious before prewriting implementation.

In particular, the mean score was higher in the cognitive anxiety subscale (2.99), which was higher than the total mean (2.80) and two other subscales (somatic anxiety=2.86, avoidance behavior anxiety=2.56). In sum, the participants' writing anxiety was more strongly associated with their cognitive anxiety, which was related to the contents of writing and worries of grading on their English writing.

Table 4.3 presents the results of the top-three items and bottom-three items of SLWAI before prewriting implementation, including means (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.3
Ranking, Descriptions, Means, and Standard Deviation of the Top Three Items and Bottom Three items of SLWAI before Prewriting Activities

Top Three Items			
Ranking	Items descriptions	M	SD
1	5. While writing in English, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.	3.59	.98
2	2. I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time pressure.	3.50	.99
3	25. I feel comfortable and at ease when writing in English.	3.36	1.01
Bottom Three Items			
Ranking	Item descriptions	M	SD
1	9. I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	2.14	1.10
2	19. I would try to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	2.23	.95
3	23. I feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	2.36	1.07

As shown in Table 4.3, the participants' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety was higher on Item 5 (M=3.59), Item 2 (M=3.50), and Item 25 (M=3.36). The results of SLWAI showed that participants tended to worry that they would use improper expressions and sentence patterns (Item 5). They would feel heart pounding while writing English compositions in limited time (Item 2) and they would not feel

comfortable when writing in English (Item 25). To sum up, the participants felt anxious on one item (Item 2) in the somatic anxiety subscale, and two items (Item 5 & 25) in the cognitive anxiety subscale.

Also shown in Table 4.3, the participants' self-rated writing anxiety was lower on Item 9 (M=2.14), Item 19 (M=2.23), and Item 23 (M=2.36). The SLWAI showed that students disagreed that they would tremble when writing English paragraph writings in limited time (Item 9). They also disagreed that they try to excuse themselves if they were asked to writing in English (Item 19), and their body would not be rigid and tense when writing English compositions (Item 23). In general, the participants felt least anxious on two items (Item 9 & 23) in the somatic anxiety subscale, and one item (Item 19) in the avoidance behavior subscale.

The finding was in line with previous studies (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Mohseniasl, 2014). Abu Shawish and Ata Avedlraheem used the apprehension questionnaire to investigate EFL university students' writing anxiety. The results showed that there was no significant difference on affective, cognitive, linguistic and student behaviors subscale ($p>.05$). The findings indicated that students felt less anxious when students did not take writing classes. Similarly, Mohseniasl (2014) found that intermediate EFL learners had lower writing anxiety before the prewriting strategies instruction. Moreover, there is no statistically significant difference on the writing anxiety questionnaire ($p>.05$). The findings indicated that the EFL learners felt less anxious before the prewriting instruction.

According to the semi-structured interview, students reported they had writing anxiety before prewriting implementation. There are three reasons why they had writing anxiety. Firstly, more than ten students said that they did not know how to generate ideas by seeing three pictures. Secondly, five students mentioned that they

did not know how to use subordinated conjunctions to connect each thought. Thirdly, seven students mentioned that the time limitation caused writing anxiety since they did not know how to write. In sum, students faced writing anxiety before the prewriting activities.

The Differences of Participants' English Writing Anxiety before and after the Prewriting Activities

Table 4.4 presents the results of the participants' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety after the implementation of prewriting on the 27 items of the SLWAI, including frequencies of the participants' five-point Likert scale responses, mean (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.4
Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviation of the SLWAI after Prewriting Activities

Somatic Anxiety Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
2. I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time pressure.	0	10	1	7	4	3.23	1.20
7. My mind goes blank when I start to work on an English composition.	6	11	2	2	1	2.14	1.06
9. I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	7	10	1	4	0	2.09	1.04
10. If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a poor grade.	3	7	3	7	2	2.91	1.24
13. My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraint.	4	7	2	6	3	2.86	1.36
15. I feel panic when I write English compositions under time constraint.	3	9	2	5	3	2.82	1.30
18. I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.	4	8	3	3	4	2.77	1.38
23. I feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	4	13	0	3	2	2.36	1.19
Avoidance behavior subscale	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
4. I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.	5	9	2	4	2	2.50	1.30
6. I try to avoid writing English	3	10	2	3	4	2.77	1.38

compositions.							
12. I try to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.	3	11	2	5	1	2.55	1.14
14. Unless I have to write in English, I would not use English to write compositions.	3	8	4	4	3	2.82	1.14
19. I would try to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	6	11	0	2	3	2.32	1.36
22. I seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.	4	10	4	3	1	2.41	1.14
27. I seek every opportunity to use English to write compositions.	2	11	3	6	0	2.59	1.01
Cognitive anxiety Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
1. While writing in English, I'm not nervous.	5	13	0	4	0	2.14	.99
3. While writing English compositions, I feel worries and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	4	8	3	4	3	2.73	1.35
5. While writing in English, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.	0	4	0	15	3	3.77	.92
8. I don't worry that my English compositions are worse than others'.	5	10	1	6	0	2.36	1.14
11. When I write in English, my ideas and words flow smoothly.	2	12	3	2	3	2.64	1.22
16. While writing in English, I worry that the ways I express and organize my ideas do not conform to the norm of English writing.	0	6	1	12	3	3.55	1.06
17. I'm afraid that the other students would deride my English composition if they read it.	7	7	4	2	2	2.32	1.29
20. When I write in English, my mind is clear.	1	12	2	5	2	2.77	1.15
21. I don't worry about what other people would think of my English compositions.	2	8	4	5	3	2.95	1.25
24. I'm afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	3	7	5	4	3	2.86	1.28
25. I feel comfortable and at ease when writing in English.	2	9	3	6	2	2.86	1.21
26. I'm not afraid that my English compositions would be rated as very poor.	6	8	1	5	2	2.50	1.37
Average Mean						2.67	

Note: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5=strongly agree

Item 1, 4, 8, 11, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 27 are reverse coded.

As shown in Table 4.4, the mean of the SLWAI was 2.67. It indicated that the mean of participants' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety was slightly lower after the prewriting implementation.

Table 4.5 presents the results of the somatic anxiety, avoidance behavior, and cognitive anxiety subscales of the SLWAI after the prewriting activities, including means (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.5
Means, Standard Deviation, and Average of the Three Subscales of the SLWAI after Prewriting Activities

Subscales of the SLWAI	M	SD
Somatic Anxiety Subscale	2.65	1.22
Avoidance Behavior Subscale	2.56	1.23
Cognitive Anxiety Subscale	2.79	1.19
Average M	2.67	

As shown in Table 4.5, the mean was 2.65 in the somatic anxiety subscale, 2.56 in the avoidance behavior subscale and 2.79 in the cognitive anxiety subscale. Three subscales' mean were not above the middle points (3.0). These results revealed that students felt less anxious on three subscales after prewriting implementation.

Table 4.6 presents the results of the top-three items and bottom-three items of SLWAI after prewriting implementation, including means (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.6
Ranking, Descriptions, Means, and Standard Deviation of the Top Three Items and Bottom Three items of SLWAI after Prewriting Activities

Top Three Items			
Ranking	Items descriptions	M	SD
1	5. While writing in English, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.	3.77	.92
2	16. While writing in English, I worry that the ways I express and organize my ideas do not conform to the norm of English writing.	3.55	1.06
3	2. I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time pressure.	3.23	1.20
Bottom Three Items			
Ranking	Item descriptions	M	SD
1	9. I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	2.09	1.04
2	7. My mind goes blank when I start to work on an English composition.	2.14	1.06
	1. While writing in English, I'm not nervous.	2.14	.99
3	17. I'm afraid that the other students would deride my English composition if they read it.	2.32	1.29
	19. I would try to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	2.32	1.36

As shown in Table 4.6, the participants' self-rated writing anxiety was higher on Item 5 (M=3.77), Item 16 (M=3.55), and Item 2 (M=3.23). The results of SLWAI showed that participants would be worried to use incorrect expression and sentence patterns (Item 5), be worried to use wrong expressions and organization skills (Item 16), and feel heart pounding when writing English compositions (Item 2). To sum up, the participants felt anxious on two items (Item 5 & 16) in the cognitive anxiety subscale and one item (Item 2) in the somatic subscale. Item 5 and Item 2 were the highest items which were the same as pre-test highest items of SLWAI. That is to say, the participants felt anxious about using the wrong expressions. Moreover, they felt anxious and have the reaction of heart pounding.

On the other hand, the participants' self-rated writing anxiety was lower on Item 9 (M= 2.09), Item 7 (M=2.14), Item 1 (M= 2.14), Item 17 (M= 2.32) and Item 19 (M=

2.32). The SLWAI showed that students agreed least that they would tremble when writing English compositions in limited time (Item 9), which was same bottom one item in the pre-test. They would not worry so much about blanking out when they started to do English writing (Item 7), and they would not be so nervous while doing English writing (Item 1). They would not be so afraid that other students saw their English writing (Item 17). They would not worry to excuse themselves if they asked to write English compositions (Item 19). In sum, the participants felt the least anxious on two items (Item 7 & 9) in the somatic anxiety subscale, two items (Item 1 & 17) in the cognitive anxiety subscale, and one item (Item 19) in the avoidance behavior subscale.

Table 4.7 shows the results of the paired-samples t-test of participants' writing anxiety and three subscales before and after prewriting implementation; including mean difference (MD), standard deviation (SD) and t-test value (T). The significant decision level is set at $p < .05$, the t-test value is .49.

Table 4.7
Paired-samples T-test of the Pretest, Posttest, and Three Subscales before and after Prewriting Activities

SLWAI	MD	SD	T	<i>p</i>
Pair 1 (pretest-posttest)	.11	.77	.69	.49
Pair-2 (Somatic Anxiety Subscale)	.210	1.01	.97	.34
Pair-3 (Avoidance Behavior Subscale)	-.71	.92	-.36	.72
Pair-4 (Cognitive Anxiety Subscale)	.200	.76	1.22	.23

Note; N=22
MD: mean difference

As shown in Table 4.7, the results showed that there was no statistically significant difference before and after prewriting implementation. However, the mean difference showed that students slightly lowered their writing anxiety after prewriting implementation.

Moreover, the results showed that there was no significant difference on three subscales. The mean difference of somatic anxiety and cognitive anxiety subscale indicated that the prewriting activities might slightly reduce participants' somatic and cognitive anxiety.

The quantitative finding was different from previous studies (Abu Shawish & Atea Avdelraheem, 2010; Cheng, 2002; Ismail et.al, 2010; Moheseniasl, 2014). Ismail et.al (2010) found that ESL tertiary students had high writing anxiety in the writing process. Most of the participants had writing difficulties and they were fearful of English writing. Likewise, Moheseniasl (2014) found that intermediate EFL learners statistically had lower writing anxiety after prewriting instruction. Similarly, Cheng (2002) found that English-major university students had higher writing anxiety. Abu Shawish and Atea Avdelraheem (2010) found that higher achievers of EFL university students were more apprehensive than lower achievers.

Three possible reasons why the participants in present study had moderate writing anxiety before and after prewriting activities are as follows. First, anxiety is a personal trait. Students' writing anxiety could not be changed in the limited ten-week writing classes. Second, students studied in a private junior high school, which had foreign and Chinese teachers for their English classes. They were not anxious about learning English. Last, they volunteered to participate in the after-school English writing classes. They already knew they would learn writing in the following weeks. Therefore, they were not fearful before and after prewriting activities.

Even though students had moderate anxiety on SLWAI, prewriting attitude questionnaire and semi-structured interview showed positive results of decreasing students' writing anxiety. According to the prewriting attitude questionnaire item 9, there was a statistically significant decrease in their writing anxiety. By analyzing the

semi-structured interview, students reported their writing anxiety decreased after the prewriting implementation. Three reasons participants mentioned are included as follows. First, more than ten students thought they lowered their writing anxiety when listing words and making wh-questions of the pictures. When they listed words and made wh-questions, they felt ease and wrote their compositions more smoothly. Second, seven students mentioned that their anxiety decreased by knowing how to write the introduction and conclusion part since they did not learn these terms and usages before. Third, ten students said they decreased writing anxiety because they became well familiar with two prewriting activities by both in-class practice and homework for sixteen times.

Similarly, the qualitative finding was consistent with previous studies (Lin & Ho, 2009; Scheweiker-Marra & Marra, 2000) Lin and Ho (2009) examined English writing anxiety from EFL university students' perspectives. They found that sixteen participants had writing anxiety of somatic and cognitive anxiety, such as grading and time limitation after two-month EFL writing classes. Similarly, Scheweiker-Marra and Marra (2000) examined the effects of prewriting activities on at-risk fifth grade students' writing anxiety. They found that participants released their inner writing fearfulness after the prewriting treatment.

Participants' English Writing Performance before and after the Prewriting Activities

GEPT official holistic scoring scale and GEPT official elementary writing samples were used as grading criteria. The grading explanation and comments were adapted from the GEPT official elementary writing samples (see Appendix I). Moreover, the five-point scores and comments given by the researcher on the four

paragraphs were validated by the expert from the GEPT official grading program. After the teacher-researcher graded the participants' pre-test and post-test, the second researcher confirmed the grader consistency. Therefore, the scores were validated and reliable.

Table 4.8 presents the results of the participants' writing performance, including participants' grades, means (M), and standard deviation (SD) before and after prewriting activities.

Table 4.8
Participants' Grades, Means, and Standard Deviation before and after Prewriting Activities

Performance	2	3	4	5	M	SD
Pre-test	10	9	3	0	2.68	0.70
Post-test	1	9	11	1	3.55	0.66

Note=22

5= the well-done writing; students barely make mistake

4= the good writing; students sometimes make mistake

3= the readable writing; students make mistake frequently

2= the writing is full of mistakes

As shown in the Table 4.8, the mean of participants' pre-test score was 2.68. The mean of participants' post-test score was 3.55. The result showed that prewriting activities had a great effect on participants' writing performance after prewriting activities (see Appendix J).

Table 4.9 presents the result of the participants' English writing performance before and after the prewriting activities, including means (M), standard deviation (SD) and t-test value (T).

Table 4.9
Paired-samples T-test of the Participants' English Writing Grades before and after Prewriting Activities

Performance	MD	SD	T	p
Pair 1 (pre-test-post-test)	-.864	.468	-8.664*	.00

Note; N=22

*significant at $p < .05$

As shown in the Table 4.9, there was a significant improvement in the participants' writing performance after the prewriting activities ($p < .05$). It showed that prewriting activities could help students improve their writing performance.

The positive finding of the participants' writing performance was also consistent with previous studies (Famhim & Rahimi, 2011; Fowler, 2001; Ibnain, 2011; Lee, 2013; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012). According to Mahnam and Nejadansari (2012), the result showed that prewriting strategies would enhance L2 advanced learners' writing achievement after twelve-session explicit prewriting instruction. Similarly, Fowler (2001) discovered that EFL fifth graders produced better compositions after receiving training on task-focused prewriting strategies training such as clustering and free writing. Famhim and Rahimi (2011) found that EFL university students had better grades after utilizing prewriting activities. Likewise, Lee (2013) found that concept mapping helped EFL university students to generate more ideas and contents. In addition, the participants' organization skills presented in the post-test are better than pre-test. Moreover, Ibnian (2011) found that brainstorming helped tenth grade students wrote better essays.

The word count is essential in the GEPT elementary writing test. The standard word count is fifty words per writing. Some of the participants did not pass the standard word count in their pre-test (see Appendix J). Table 4.11 presents the results of the participants English writing word count before and after the prewriting activities, including the range of participants' word count, means (M), and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.10
Participants' Word Count, Means, and Standard Deviation before and after Prewriting Activities

Word Count	Lower than 50 words	50-150 words	M	SD
Students in pre-test	3	19	65.45	15.08
Students in post-test	1	21	78.27	22.55

As shown in Table 4.10, three students could not reach the minimum number of the standard word count in the pre-test. After eight-week prewriting instruction, only one student could not reach the minimum number of the standard word count in the post-test. The result showed that most students wrote more contents after prewriting implementation.

Table 4.11 presents the result of the participants' English writing word count before and after the prewriting activities; including the means (M), standard deviation (SD) and t-test value (T).

Table 4.11
Paired-samples T-test of the Participants' English Writing Word Count before and after Prewriting Activities

SLWAI	MD	SD	T	p
Pair 1 (pre-test-post-test)	-.12.81	19.17	-3.13*	.005

Note; N=22
 MD: mean difference
 *significant at $p < .05$

As shown in Table 4.11, there was a significant growth of the participants' writing word count after the implementation of prewriting activities ($p < .05$). Most participants could write more after learning prewriting activities.

The finding on the writing length was consistent with the findings of previous studies (Mogahed, 2013; Voon, 2010; Wei, 2010). Mogahed (2013) found that prewriting activities encouraged students to write more. Voon (2010) discovered that brainstorming and role-playing had a great effect on EFL high school students' word

production. Students could generate a pool of ideas during the role-play interaction and wrote more developed arguments in their argumentative essays. Similarly, Wei (2010) found that elementary school students generated longer and better paragraph writings after the implementation of listing and drawing. The researcher found that students word productivity increased by generating more ideas.

According to the prewriting attitude questionnaire, Item 6 (see Table 4.13) showed that sixteen students (72%) agreed they wrote longer passages after prewriting activities. According to the semi-structured interview, most students reported that prewriting activities could help them write better. Two participants said that they could write down some key words and know the main idea of picture writing. Two other participants mentioned that they could organize their thoughts by jotting down the ideas. Three participants said prewriting could help them write faster and have time checking grammar and sentence structures of their writings.

In sum, the prewriting instruction on listing and wh-questions was associated with Taiwanese junior high school EFL students' English writing performance. The participants produced better picture writings with better holistic scores and increased the length of writings.

Participants' Self-rated Degrees of Attitudes toward Prewriting Activities

Table 4.12 shows the results of the participants' attitude toward prewriting activities. It includes frequencies of the participants' five-point Likert scale responses, means (M) and standard deviation (SD). The attitude questionnaire contains three subscales, which are attitude toward prewriting activities, improvements of writing performance and decreasing writing anxiety.

Table 4.12***Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviation of Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire***

Attitude toward Prewriting activities	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
2. Get more ideas to write.	1	0	1	17	3	3.95	.77
3. Sketch the thoughts into words by using listing and asking wh-questions.	3	1	2	13	3	3.55	1.20
5. Think of more thoughts into words by using listing and asking wh-questions.	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	.47
7. Like all prewriting activities we practiced in this semester.	0	8	1	9	4	3.41	1.15
8. Like English writing more.	1	6	2	9	4	3.41	1.19
Improvements of writing performance	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
1. Clarify my raw thoughts.	1	2	1	14	4	3.82	.98
4. Use correct grammar to write a composition.	1	0	1	14	6	4.09	.85
6. Write longer passages.	1	5	0	11	5	3.64	1.19
Decreasing writing anxiety	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
9. Feel less nervous when seeing English picture writing.	1	1	0	14	6	4.05	.93
Mean						3.80	

As shown in Table 4.12, the mean of the attitude questionnaire was 3.80. It indicated that the participants' attitude toward prewriting was positive ($M > 3$).

Table 4.13 shows the results of the participants' attitude toward the three subscales, including "attitude toward prewriting activities," "improvements of writing performance," and "decreasing writing anxiety" subscales. It includes means (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.13***Means and Standard Deviation on the Three Subscales of Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire***

Attitude Questionnaire	M	SD
Attitude toward Prewriting activities	3.73	.96
Improvements of writing performance	3.85	1.01
Decreasing writing anxiety	4.05	.93

As shown in Table 4.13, in the first subscale, “Attitude toward Prewriting activities”, the participants responded to five items, and the mean was 3.73. In the second subscale, “Improvements of writing performance,” the participants responded to three items, and the mean was 3.85. In the third subscale, “Decreasing writing anxiety,” the participants responded to one item, and the mean was 4.05. In general, most participants agreed that prewriting could help them have positive attitudes toward writing, improve their writing performance and decrease their writing anxiety. In particular, the participants showed more positive attitudes toward “decreasing writing anxiety,” than “improvement of writing performance” and “attitude toward prewriting activities.”

Table 4.14 presents the results of the top-three items and bottom-three items of the attitude questionnaire after prewriting implementation, including means (M) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 4.14
Ranking, Descriptions, Means, and Standard Deviation of the Top Three Items and Bottom Three items of Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire

Top Three Items			
Ranking	Items descriptions	M	SD
1	5. Think of more contents to write when seeing the picture.	4.32	.47
2	4. Use correct grammar to write a composition.	4.09	.85
3	9. Feel less nervous when seeing English picture writing.	4.05	.93
Bottom Three Items			
Ranking	Item descriptions	M	SD
1	7. Like all prewriting activities we practiced in this semester.	3.41	1.15
	8. Like English writing more.	3.41	1.19
2	3. Sketch the thoughts into words by using listing and asking wh-questions.	3.55	1.20
3	6. Write longer passages	3.64	1.19

As shown in Table 4.14, the participants' self-rated attitudes toward prewriting were higher on Item 5 (M=4.32), Item 4 (M=4.09), and Item 9 (M=4.05). The results of the attitude questionnaire showed that participants would think of more content to write when they saw English picture writings (Item 5), use correct grammar to write a composition (Item 4), and to be less worried when seeing English picture writings (Item 9). To sum up, the participants had more positive attitudes on the attitude subscale (Item 5), writing performance subscale (Item 4), and writing anxiety subscale (Item 9).

On the other hand, the participants' self-rated attitudes toward prewriting were lower on Item 7 (M= 3.41), Item 8 (M=3.41), Item 3 (M=3.55), and Item 6 (M= 3.64). The attitude questionnaire showed that students agreed least that they liked all prewriting strategies mentioned in the class (Item 7), liked English writing more (Item 8), sketched the thoughts into words by using two prewriting strategies (Item 3), and wrote longer English writing passages (Item 6). Surprisingly, all bottom three items were higher than the average mean (3.00), which indicated that half of the participants had positive attitudes toward these items. In Item 7 and Item 8, thirteen students (59%) agreed they liked two prewriting activities which they practiced in the semester and they liked English writing more. In Item 3, sixteen students (72%) agreed that they would sketch their thoughts into words by two prewriting activities. In Item 6, sixteen students (72%) agreed that they wrote longer passages.

Items 10 and 12 in the prewriting attitude questionnaire were open-ended questions designed to elicit the difficulties the participants had; moreover, the prewriting strategies students would use were investigated.

Item 10 asked the participants if they had any difficulties during prewriting. Four difficulties that students mentioned by students. First, three students mentioned they had difficulties with sentence production. This problem could be linked together with lacking knowledge of sentence structures. Some students asked for the teacher-researcher's help composing the sentences during class practice. The majority of participants wrote easy words in the listing part because they had difficulties writing down the exact phrases and sentences to express the pictures due to their limited knowledge of sentence production. Second, two students had difficulties of the lack of vocabulary. The listed words in prewriting sheet were not enough for them to finish the plots of picture writing. Teacher-researcher had to give them enough linguistic help for the topics. Students should gain vocabulary knowledge by teacher's guidance. Third, two students had difficulties of the lack of organization skills. Teacher-researcher had to teach them the organization phrases explicitly during the writing class. Fourth, five students had difficulties due to the limited time. The limited time for participants to write picture writings was 35 minutes. Therefore, some participants wrote rough conclusions because of the limited time.

Item 12 asked the participants' preferable prewriting activities before they wrote picture writings. Eight students (36%) reported that they preferred using listing. There were three reasons why listing was chosen. Firstly, two students mentioned they could write fewer words but get the ideas in the fastest way. Second, five students mentioned listing was easier than asking wh-questions. Third, two students mentioned listing could help them not only generate ideas but also organize thoughts. Eight students (36%) commented that they liked wh-questions generation. There were two reasons for them choosing wh-questions generation. First, five students mentioned that they got used to use these wh-questions when they studied English. Therefore,

they could use the familiar wh- words to generate ideas more easily. Second, three students mentioned that using wh-words could relieve their pressure when they wrote in English; that is, using wh-words was not difficult for them when facing English tasks. Six students (28%) commented that they liked both prewriting activities. These students commented that they loved both prewriting activities and thought these prewriting activities were meaningful to learn as writing strategies.

The positive findings of the participants' attitude toward prewriting activities were also consistent with previous studies (Rao, 2007; Schuyler, 2006; Wei, 2010). Rao (2007) used attitude surveys to explore EFL college students' writing perceptions. The results found that students had positive attitude toward brainstorming. Schuyler (2006) used attitude surveys to explore seventh graders' attitudes. The results found that students responded positively about graphic organizers since prewriting helped students organize their thoughts faster. Similarly, Wei's study (2010) showed that elementary students in Taiwan held positive attitudes toward listing and drawing; the prewriting activities helped young learners learn English writing.

In conclusion, the results of this study showed that prewriting activities had limited effects on junior high school EFL students' English writing anxiety but they had positive effects on English writing performance. Moreover, the students held positive attitudes towards prewriting activities. The students might be worried about sentence production, vocabulary, organization skills, and time limitations.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the investigation of the present study. Summary of the major findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of this study, and suggestions for future studies are also included.

Summary of the Major Findings

The present study examined the influence of prewriting strategies, listing and asking wh-questions on twenty-two junior high school EFL students' self-rated degrees of English writing anxiety before and after the implementation of prewriting activities. Moreover, their English writing performance before and after the implementation of prewriting activities was examined. This study also analyzed the students' attitudes toward these activities and the difficulties they encountered during prewriting. The major findings are summarized in the following sections.

Participants' Self-rated Degrees of English Writing Anxiety before Prewriting Activities

The descriptive results of the SLWAI showed that the seventh-grade participants had moderate degrees of English writing anxiety before the prewriting implementation. The descriptive results of the SLWAI showed that the participants' writing anxiety was higher on the cognitive anxiety subscale before the prewriting implementation. That is, students felt more anxious when writing under time pressure and thinking about the improper expressions of writings. Some students mentioned in the semi-structured interview that they had writing anxiety before the writing class.

They did not know how to generate ideas and use subordinated conjunctions to connect their ideas. Time limitation caused students' English writing anxiety as well.

The Differences between the Participants' Self-rated Degrees of Writing Anxiety before and after the Implementation of Prewriting Activities

The descriptive results of the SLWAI showed that the seventh-grade participants had moderate degrees of English writing anxiety after the prewriting implementation. The results of the paired-samples t-test showed that there was no significant difference between the participants' self-rated degrees of writing anxiety before and after the implementation of prewriting activities. However, the means of the paired-sampled t-test had decreased after prewriting activities. That is, the implementation of prewriting slightly decreased the participants' overall writing anxiety. Moreover, the results of the paired-samples t-test of the three subscales of SLWAI also showed that there was no significant difference before and after the implementation of prewriting activities. However, the means of pair-sampled t-test had decreased on the somatic anxiety subscale and the cognitive anxiety subscale. That is, the implementation of prewriting activities slightly lowered the participants' somatic anxiety and cognitive anxiety.

Students reported in prewriting attitude questionnaire and semi-structured interview that they lowered their writing anxiety. They felt ease when being familiar with prewriting strategies. Moreover, they felt less stressed when they knew how to write introduction and conclusion of writings.

The Differences between the Participants' English Writing Performance before and after the Implementation of Prewriting Activities

The results of the pair-samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the participants' English writing performance before and after the implementation of prewriting activities. The finding indicated that prewriting activities could help the participants improve their writing quality and get higher grades. Moreover, the results of the pair-samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the length of the participants' paragraphs before and after the implementation of prewriting activities.

In addition, according to the analysis of the semi-structured interviews, students mentioned that prewriting activities helped them write better compositions than before. It showed that prewriting activities could help the participants to have more ideas and thus write longer paragraphs.

The Participants' Attitudes toward Prewriting Activities

The majority of the participants showed positive attitudes toward prewriting activities. The descriptive results of the attitude subscale showed that most of the participants agreed that the use of prewriting activities helped them get more ideas, sketch their thoughts into words, like prewriting activities, and like English writing more. The descriptive results of the performance improvements subscale showed that most of the participants agreed that they could clarify the raw thoughts, use correct grammar to write a composition, and write longer passages. Moreover, the descriptive result of the decreasing writing anxiety subscale showed that most of the participants felt less nervous of picture writings.

The results of the open-ended questions also showed four difficulties the participants encountered during the prewriting process– the sentence production, lack of vocabulary, lack of organization skills, and the time limitation. In addition, most students liked the prewriting activities they practiced in the semester. Eight students liked listing. Eight students liked asking wh-questions. Six students liked both prewriting activities. In sum, the students agree to use their preferable prewriting activities before they write English writings in the future.

Pedagogical Implications

The main implication of this study is that the junior high school English teachers in Taiwan can use prewriting activities to help the JHS EFL students improve their English writing. In addition, prewriting activities can help the students who want to pass the elementary-level GEPT writing test. Moreover, prewriting activities can slightly ease students' English writing anxiety during writing English compositions. With systematic prewriting instruction, even the beginning writers such as the seventh graders in this study can do their English writings in an easy and fast way.

To implement prewriting strategies in the writing process, writing teachers are suggested to pay attention to the following. First, prewriting training is necessary. Before students write their compositions, writing teachers need to demonstrate how to do prewriting activities. In addition, teachers should provide enough time for EFL students to generate ideas in English. It is suggested that writing teachers make flexible lesson plans for beginners and give clear instructions and guidelines about the purpose of prewriting activities. Moreover, teachers should control the prewriting time before prewriting activities. Students may spend too much time doing prewriting but forget to write the compositions. Finally, students should be allowed to seek help

from writing teachers since they are not familiar with prewriting activities. In particular, for lower-level students, writing teachers are suggested to have writing conferences with them to help them improve their prewriting problems.

For presenting the topic-related words and sentences in English, writing teachers can provide dictionaries for students to look up unfamiliar words. In addition, group prewriting discussions are beneficial for students to overcome the problems of vocabulary and sentence production. In sum, students are encouraged to use prewriting strategies such as listing and asking wh-questions during their writing process in the future.

Limitations of the Study

The present study had five major limitations. First, the teacher-researcher taught only two prewriting activities during the ten-week English writing classes. Since there was time limitation, the teacher-researcher only used the most common and easiest prewriting activities like listing and asking wh-questions to examine the effects of students' English writing performance and English writing anxiety.

Second, there were only 22 seventh-grade participants in a private junior high school in central Taiwan in the study. Concerning the small amount of students and the high concentration of their residence in one area, the results might not be a good representation of the entirety of junior high school EFL students in Taiwan.

Third, the within group comparison of effects on English writing anxiety and English writing performances had its limitations. Other factors in the learning contexts may have impact on the results of the study.

Fourth, in view of the short-term ten-week study, the time was not long enough for examining long-term effects of prewriting on English writing anxiety. In addition, the teacher-researcher was not the participants' English teacher in the school. Students might not have any writing anxiety due to the fact that the teacher-researcher was not the actual evaluator of their English writing.

Last, the participants' attitudes toward prewriting activities might not have been explored thoroughly due to the time limitation of interview time. Therefore, the results of the prewriting and semi-structured interview might not be complete nor detailed enough to explain the participants' attitudes toward prewriting activities.

Suggestions for Future Research

The use of prewriting activities in Taiwanese junior high school EFL classes is still uncommon. The present study only examined the effects of listing and asking wh-questions on JHS EFL school students' English writing anxiety and English writing performance. There are more prewriting activities which have been found beneficial in L1 and L2 writing. The studies of the effects of other prewriting activities on students' writing need to be investigated.

Second, many studies of prewriting implementation focused on the effects of advanced level and university students' writings (Fahim & Rahimi, 2011; Hashempour & Behjat, 2015; Hemn, 2010; Huang, 2006; Ismail, 2010; Lao, 2013; Lee, 2013; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Reima, 2009). The effects of prewriting activities on beginners like elementary school students can be investigated as well.

Third, the one-group discussion of the present study was limited for explaining the effects of prewriting on students' writing performance and students' writing anxiety. The two-group comparison of prewriting activities needs to be investigated as well.

Finally, it is suggested that future studies examine the long-term effects of prewriting activities on EFL students' English writing anxiety and English writing performance. Due to the short research duration, the findings of the present study only revealed the short term effects of prewriting activities. The participants of the present study only had eight weeks of prewriting practices. It is suggested that future studies can provide the participants enough time to practice prewriting so the participants' attitudes toward prewriting activities can be explored further. In addition, the researchers of future studies can provide more detailed interviews for exploring participants' thoughts.

In conclusion, this study investigated the effects of prewriting activities on JHS EFL students' English writing anxiety and English writing performance; moreover, the attitudes toward prewriting activities were investigated as well. There are still many relevant issues to be discussed for implementing prewriting activities on EFL students in Taiwan.

REFERENCES

- Abu Shawish, J. I., & Atea Abdelraheem, M. (2010). An investigation of Palestinian EFL majors' writing apprehension causes and remedies. *Online Submission*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service #ED512894.
- Akimen, C. (1985). Writing anxiety—barrier to success. *National Adult Education Conference (Milwaukee, WI, November 6-10, 1985)*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproductive Service # ED 262 191.
- Brockman, E. B. (2001). Prewriting, planning, and profession communication. *The English Journal*, 91(2), 51-53.
- Brown, D. H. (1987). *Principle of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentic Hall Inc.
- Chaot, A. U., Toth, S., Kupper, L., Nielsen, R., & Barrueta, M. (1990). Learning strategy instruction in the foreign language classroom: Writing. *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED358694.
- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 417-446.
- Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(5), 647-655.
- Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 313-335.

- Corolyn, G. L. (2000). First language influences in second language composition: The effect of prewriting. *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*, 33(4), 428-432.
- Daly, J. A. (1997). The effects of writing apprehension on message encoding. *Journalism Quarterly*, 54, 566-572.
- Daud, N. M., & Abu Kassim, N. L. (2005). Second language writing anxiety: Cause or effect. *Malaysian Journal of ELT*, 1-19.
- Fahim, M., & Rahimi, A.H. (2011). The effect of concept mapping strategy on the writing performance of EFL learners. *Journal of academic and applied studies*, 1(5), 1-8.
- Fowler, E. D. (2001). The effects of four writing strategies on fifth graders' production of written ideas across three aims of discourse. *Reports*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED458596.
- Hashempour, Z., Rostampour, M., & Behjat, F. (2015). The effects of brainstorming as a prewriting strategy on EFL advanced learners' writing ability. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(1), 86-99.
- Hassan, B. (2001). The relationships of writing apprehension and self-esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL university students. *Mansoura University, College of Education, Pamietta, Egypt*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED459671.
- Hemn, A. K. (2010). *The use of L1 and L2 in prewriting discussions in EFL writing and students' attitudes towards L1 and L2 use in prewriting discussions*. Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Holmes, V. L., & Moulton, M. R. (2003). Behind the picture: apprehension in the L2 writing process. *TESL Reporter*, 36(2), 27-40.

- Huang, C. Y. (2006). *The effects of story mapping on picture writing for EFL senior high school students in Taiwan*. Unpublished master's thesis. Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.
- Huey, F. V. (2010). The use of brainstorming and role playing as a pre-writing strategy. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(3), 537-558.
- Ibnian, S. S. K. (2011). Brainstorming and essay writing in EFL class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 1(3), 263-272.
- Ismail, N., Elias, S., Albakri, I. S. M. A. A., & Perumal, D. (2010). Exploring ESL students' apprehension level and attitude towards academic writing. *The International Journal of Learning*. 17(6), 475-483.
- Ismail. N., Maulan, S., & Hassan, N. (2008). The impact of teacher feedback on ESL students' writing performance. *Academic Journal of Social Science*, 8(1), 45-54.
- Karakaya, I., & Ulper, H., (2011). Developing a writing anxiety scale and examining writing anxiety based on various variables. *Education Science: Theory & Practice*, 11(2), 703-707.
- Kozma, R. B. (1991). Computer-based writing tools and the cognitive needs of novice writers. *Computers and Composition*, 8(2), 31-45.
- Lao, Y. W. (2013). *The effects of peer reviews on university English majors' writing anxiety: a case of a continuing education program*. Unpublished master's thesis. Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan.
- Lally, C. G. (2000). First language influences in second language composition: The effect of prewriting. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 33(4), 428-432. °
- Lee, Y. (2013). Collaborative concept mapping as a pre-writing strategy for L2 learning: a Korean application. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 3(2), 254-258.

- Lin, S. Y., Strickland, J., Ray, B., & Denner, P. (2010). Computer-based concept mapping as a prewriting strategy for middle school students. *Meridian: A Middle School Computer Technologies Journal*, 8(1), 1-17.
- Lin, G. H. C., & Ho, M. M. S. (2009). An exploration into foreign language writing anxiety from Taiwanese university students' perspectives. *2009 NCUE Fourth Annual Conference on Language, Teaching, Linguistics, Translations and Interpretation*, 307-318.
- Lorenz, B., Green, T., & Brown, A. (2009). Using multimedia graphic organizer software in the prewriting activities of primary school students: What are the benefits? *Computers in the Schools*, 26, 115-129.
- Maghsoudi, M., & Haririan, J. (2013). The impact of brainstorming strategies Iranian EFL learners writing skill regarding their social class status. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(1), 60-67.
- Mahnam, L., & Nejadansari, D. (2012). The effects on different pre-writing strategies in Iranian EFL writing achievement. *International Educational Studies*, 5(1), 154-160.
- Marra, K. E., & Marra, W. T. (2000). Investigating the effects on prewriting activities on writing performance and anxiety of at-risk students. *Reading Psychology*, 21(9), 99-114.
- McLeod, S. (1987). Some thoughts about feeling: The affective domain and the writing process. *College Composition and Communication*, 38, 426-435.
- Mogahed, M. M. (2013). Planning out pre-writing activities. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 4(3), 60-68.

- Mohseniasl. F. (2014). Examining the effect of strategy instruction on writing apprehension and writing achievement of EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(4), 811-817.
- Rao, Z. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT Journal*, 61, 100-105.
- Reza, P., & Afsaneh, G. (2006). On the impact of concept mapping as a prewriting activity on EFL learners' writing ability. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 101-126.
- Reima, A. J. (2009). Enhancing freshman students' writing skills with a mind-mapping software. *The 5th International Scientific Conference: e-learning and Software for Education*, 20(9), 1-8.
- Schulyer, R. (2006). Prewriting achievement on the seventh grade writing test. *Proceeding of the National Conference on Undergraduate Research*, 450-457.
- Schwiker-Marria, K. E., & Marra, W. T. (2000). Investigating the effects of prewriting activities on writing performance and anxiety of at-risk students. *Reading Psychology*, 21, 99-114.
- Smith, A. F. (1999). Generating ideas cooperatively in writing class: Prewriting activities for junior college students. *Cooperative Learning: JALT Applied Materials*, 145-152.
- Smalley, R. L., Ruetten, M. K., & Kozyrev, J. R. (2001). *Refining composition skills*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Su, Y. H. (1999). EFL students' use of ideas provided by peers during prewriting discussions conducted on networked computers. *Reports*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED428563.

- Sujeong, C. (2011). Language anxiety in second language writing: is it really a stumbling block?. *Second Language Studies*, 31(2), 1-42.
- Voon, F. V. (2010). The use of brainstorming and role playing as pre-writing strategy. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(3), 537-558.
- Wei, T. Y. (2010). *Effects of rewriting activities on elementary school EFL students' compositions: Implementing listing and drawing*. Unpublished master's thesis. Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan.
- Wyrick, J. (2011). *Steps to writing well*. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Appendix A

Second Language Writing Anxiety Questionnaire (English Version)

Dear students:

Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of prewriting activities on English writing performance and English writing anxiety. The results of the study will only be used for academic study. Please respond to the following questions according to your own opinions and experiences.

Teacher Carrie Shen

Part I: Basic Personal Background Information

1. Gender:

Male Female

2. How long have you been learning English?

over 7 years over 5-7 years over 3-5 years 1-3 years

3. Have you taken any classes or lessons about English composition?

No Yes

4. Have you ever taken GEPT?

No Yes

If yes, when did you pass the GEPT?

2014 2013 2012

What is your level?

Elementary Intermediate High-intermediate

Your score:

Listening _____

Reading _____

Writing _____

Speaking _____

Part II: Second Language Writing Anxiety Scale

For the following items, please indicate your answer with a check.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1. While writing English compositions, I'm not nervous.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time pressure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. While writing English compositions, I feel worry and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I choose to write down my thoughts in English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. While writing English compositions, I worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. I try to avoid writing English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. My mind goes blank when I start to work on English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. I don't worry that my English compositions are worse than others'.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. If my English compositions are to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a poor grade.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. When I write English compositions, my ideas and words flow smoothly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. I try to avoid situations in which I have to write English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraint.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Unless I have to write in English, I would not use English to write compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. I feel panic when I write English compositions under time constraint.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
16. While writing English compositions, I worry that the ways I express and organize my ideas do not conform to the norm of English writing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. I'm afraid that the other students would deride my English compositions if they read it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. I would try to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. When I write English compositions, my mind is clear.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. I don't worry about what other people would think of my English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. I seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. I feel my body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. I'm afraid of my English compositions being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. I feel comfortable and at ease when writing English compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. I'm not afraid that my English compositions would be rated as poor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. I seek every opportunity to use English to write compositions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Adapted from Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 313-335.

Second Language Writing Anxiety Questionnaire

第二語言寫作焦慮調查 (Chinese Version)

親愛的同學們好：

謝謝你們參與此研究，此研究的目標是探討寫作前導活動對英文寫作表現及寫作焦慮的影響，此研究結果只用在學術研究，不做其他用途，請根據你們的寫作經驗回答以下的問題，答案均不計分，請不要擔心。

教師 沈凭義

第一部分：背景資料

1. 性別：

男生 女生

2. 請問你學英文多久了？

超過七年 超過五~七年 超過三~五年 一至三年

3. 請問你上過英文作文課程嗎？

我沒學過 我學過

4. 請問你曾經考過全民英檢嗎？

沒有考過 有考過

如果你曾經考過，請問你在哪一年度通過考試呢？

2014 2013 2012

請問你考過的級數為？

初級 中級 中高級

你的分數：

閱讀____分

聽力____分

寫作____分

口說____分

第三部分：寫作焦慮量表

	非常不同意	不同意	沒意見	同意	非常同意
1. 我在寫英文作文時，我不會緊張。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 我在時間壓力下寫英文作文時，我覺得我的心會蹦蹦跳。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 當我寫英文作文時，如果我知道此作文會被批改，我會感到擔心和不安。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 我選擇用英文作文寫下我的想法。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 寫英文作文時，我擔心我用不適當的表達方式和句型。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 我試著避免寫英文作文。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 當我寫一篇英文作文時，我覺得腦筋一片空白。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 我不擔心我的英文作文比別人差很多。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 我在時間壓力下寫英文作文時，我會發抖或冒汗。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. 如果我的英文作文被評閱，我擔心得到不好的成績。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. 我寫英文作文時，我的想法和字彙會自然浮現。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. 我會避免必須寫英文作文的情況。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. 我在時間壓力下寫英文作文時，我的想法會變混亂。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. 除非我沒有選擇，我不會用英文寫作文。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. 當我在時間限制下寫英文作文，我會恐慌。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. 當我寫英文作文時，我擔心我表達和組織想法的方式沒有符合英文作文的常規。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. 我害怕其他學生會嘲笑我的英文作文。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. 當我意外地被要求寫英文作文時，我會愣住。……	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	非常 不同意	不同 意	沒 意見	同 意	非常 同意
19. 如果被要求寫英文作文，我會找藉口不寫。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. 我寫英文作文時，我的頭腦清楚。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. 我不擔心別人對我英文作文的看法。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. 我找任何可能的機會在課餘時間寫英文作文。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. 我寫英文作文時，我全身會僵硬和緊張。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. 我害怕我的英文作文會選為班上討論時的樣本。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. 我寫英文作文時，我覺得輕鬆自在。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. 我不害怕我的英文作文會被評為「差」。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. 我會利用每次機會用英文寫作文。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Adapted from Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 313-335.

Appendix B

GEPT Holistic Scoring Guidelines

級分	說明
5	正確表達題目之要求；文法、用字等幾乎無誤。
4	大致正確表達題目之要求；文法、用字等有誤，但不影響讀者之理解。
3	大致回答題目之要求，但未能完全達意；文法、用字等有誤，稍影響讀者之理解。
2	部分回答題目之要求，表達上有令人不解/誤解之處；文法、用字等皆有誤，讀者須耐心解讀。
1	僅回答 1 個問題或重點；文法、用字等錯誤過多，嚴重影響讀者之理解。
0	未答、等同未答。

Adopted from <https://www.gept.org.tw/index.asp>

GEPT official website elementary writing test score explanation

GEPT 全民英檢官方網站寫作測驗分數說明

Appendix C

Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire (English version)

Prewriting activities make me...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. clarify my raw thoughts.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. get more ideas to write.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. sketch the thoughts into words by using listing and asking wh-questions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. use correct grammar to write a composition.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. think of more thoughts to write when seeing the picture.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. write longer passages.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. like all prewriting activities we practiced in this semester.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. like English writing more.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. feel less nervous when seeing English picture writing.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Did you have any difficulties when doing prewriting activities?					
11. Do you have any suggestions for the teacher-researcher about prewriting classes?	<hr/>				
12. Do you prefer using “listing” and “wh-questions generation” before writing?	<hr/>				

Prewriting Attitude Questionnaire 寫作前導活動態度問卷(Chinese Version)

寫作前導活動可以讓我……	非常 不同意	不 同意	沒 意見	同 意	非常 同意
1. 原來模糊的想法變清楚。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 可以得到更多的靈感寫作。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 看到圖片會使用 listing & asking wh- questions 打草稿。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 使用正確的文法寫出作文。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 看到圖片細節想到更多內容可寫。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 寫出較長的文章。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 開始喜歡寫作前導活動(listing & asking wh-questions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 開始喜歡英文寫作。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 看到英文圖片寫作不緊張。……………	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. 在做寫作前導活動時曾遇到什麼困難嗎? _____					
11. 想對老師說什麼關於課堂的建議嗎? _____					
12. 在寫作前比較喜歡使用 listing 或是 asking wh-questions 的方式?					

Appendix D

Consent Form (Chinese Version)

同意書

親愛的同學們：

此研究的目的主要在了解中學生的英文寫作焦慮，並且幫助學生改善英文寫作能力，在本學期英文寫作課程期間，將會有寫作前的活動練習和全民英檢寫作練習，你們所寫的練習、問卷和訪談內容皆使用於研究論文分析，請不用擔心，所有練習的分數跟學期成績完全無關。為了將大家的個人資料保密，在研究論文中將以號碼做為編號，老師的研究成果將有助於大家英文寫作的進步，請同學們一起參與。

同意參與老師研究的同學請簽名

學生姓名：_____

教師：沈凭義

Appendix E

Pre-test

英文寫作練習題

班級： _____ 姓名： _____

全民英檢初級寫作模擬試題

上個星期，你到高雄(Kaohsiung)的親戚家玩，下面是你每天的活動，請根據這些圖片寫一篇約 50 字的簡短遊記。

 <p>高雄車站</p>		
星期五	星期六	星期日

Adopted from <https://www.lttc.ntu.edu.tw/geptpracticee.htm>

GEPT Elementary Online Practice Writing

(GEPT 全民英檢官方網站線上初級練習題)

Appendix F

Post-test

英文寫作練習題

班級：_____ 姓名：_____

Listing

Introduction:

1st picture

Conclusion:

2nd picture

3rd picture

Question generation

Introduction:

Conclusion:

1st picture (Who, What, When, Where, How, Why?)

2nd picture (Who, What, When, Where, How, Why?)

3rd picture (Who, What, When, Where, How, Why?)

Appendix G

Semi-structured Interview Questions

1. Did you use any prewriting activities for the first and last writing test?
If you did, what methods did you do?
If you didn't, can you explain why you didn't use prewriting activities?
請問你有在第一次和最後一次寫作測驗使用寫作前練習活動嗎?
如果你有使用，你使用哪一種呢?
(listing 列舉/ asking wh-questions 提問)
如果你沒有使用，可以請你告知為什麼你沒有使用？

2. Do you think the prewriting activities helped you write better English composition?
Why?
請問你認為寫作前練習活動可以幫助你把作文寫得更好嗎？為什麼？

3. Have you ever had writing anxiety? Why or why not?
你曾經有感受到寫作的焦慮嗎？為什麼呢？

4. How did you feel during your first and last English writing tests?
Did you feel anxious while composing through pictures?
Why or why not?
你在第一次考試和最後一次考試感覺如何？
你在看圖寫作的作文練習中(上課)時有感到焦慮嗎？
為什麼呢？

5. Do you think prewriting activities help to reduce writing anxiety? Why or why not?
你認為寫作前練習活動幫助你減少寫作焦慮嗎？為什麼？

6. What positive/negative comments do you have on the prewriting activities and writing through pictures?
Any suggestions?
請問你對於看圖寫作前練習活動有任何正面/負面的建議嗎？

Appendix H

Lesson Plan for the First Instruction Session- Listing

Topic: Prewriting instruction: Listing (as example)	
Length of the lesson	60 minutes
Location	Affiliated Junior High School of Tunghai University
Class size	Medium size (20 students)
Skills	Writing (Prewriting strategies instruction)
Materials/Aids	<i>Beginning Composition through practice</i> written by J.B.Heation. 2005

Time	Teacher's Activities	Students' Activities	Teaching materials
Warm up			
000-005	➤ Teacher briefly introduces the definition of "prewriting activities".	Listen to the teacher and share their opinions and ask questions if any.	
005-010	➤ Teacher briefly introduces the definition of "listing"	Share their writing experiences about listing practice.	
Lead-in stage			
010-025	➤ Distribute two handouts – picture and listing worksheet. ➤ Lead the class discussion over listing the words/phrases	Have two handouts in hand and raise their hands to give answers to the teacher.	Handouts 1. Picture 2. Listing worksheet

025-040	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Combine listing words/phrases to several sentences. ➤ Grammar instruction (past tense) 	Listen to the explanation and follow the teacher's instruction	Handouts 1. Writing worksheet
Production			
040-060	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Combine sentences into a narrative writing. ➤ Give praise to all students for their efforts for the first writing practice. 	Combine their sentences and add more sentences on their own. Hand their final writing handouts to teacher.	Their final handout of writing
The End of The Class			

Lesson Plan for the Second Instruction Session- Asking wh-questions

Topic: Prewriting instruction: asking wh-questions (as example)	
Length of the lesson	60 minutes
Location	Affiliated Junior High School of Tunghai University
Class size	Medium size (20 students)
Skills	Writing (Prewriting strategies instruction)
Materials/Aids	<i>Beginning Composition through practice</i> written by J.B.Heation. 2005

Time	Teacher's Activities	Students' Activities	Teaching materials
Warm up			
000-005	➤ Teacher briefly reviews the definition of "prewriting activities".	Listen to the teacher and share their opinions and ask questions if any.	
005-010	➤ Teacher briefly introduces the definition of "asking wh-questions".	Share their writing experiences about wh-questions practice.	
Lead-in stage			
010-020	➤ Distribute two handouts – picture and wh-questions worksheet. ➤ Lead the class discussion	Have two handouts in hand and raise their hands to give answers to the teacher.	Handouts 1. Picture 2. wh-questions worksheet
020-25	➤ Grammar instruction review (past tense)	Listen to the explanation and follow the teacher's instruction	Handouts 1. Writing worksheet

025-040	➤	Time sequence review	Answer the teachers' question about time sequence conjunctions	Handouts
Production				
040-060	➤	Combine sentences into a narrative writing.	Combine their sentences and add more sentences on their own.	Their final handout of writing
	➤	Give praise to all students for their efforts for the sixth writing practice.	Hand their final writing handouts to teacher.	
The End of The Class				

APPENDIX I
GEPT Grading Samples

全民英檢初級寫作模擬試題

上個星期，你到高雄(Kaohsiung)的親戚家玩，下面是你每天的活動，請根據這些圖片寫一篇約 50 字的簡短遊記。



星期五



星期六



星期日

5 級分：正確表達題目之要求；文法、用字幾乎無誤

I had a joyful time in Kaohsiung last weekend. On Friday, I arrived to Kaohsiung train station at nineteen past three p.m. I was very excited on that day. My cousin went to pick me up. The second day was a rainy day. We stayed at home and played cards all day. I won the games. I felt really happy. In surprise, Sunday was a sunny day. We went to a beach and played balls there. It was very hot, but it was also the happiest day during this vacation. Even if there was a full day staying at my cousin's house, it was still my best vacation ever. (109 字)

評語：時態正確，文句大致正確，雖然簡短但清楚表示其意，幾乎完全切合圖片重點。

4 級分：大致正確表達題目之要求；文法、用字等有誤，但不影響讀者之理解。

Last Friday, I went to Kaohsiung to visit my aunt. My aunt took us to her house. Saturday morning, Ben, Jenny, and I were playing cards. Because of the raining, we were chatting at the living room all day. The next day, we went to the beach. We had a lot of fun. We played the beach ball and swam and even walk in the sea. It was a great sunny day. I hope I can visit there every weekend. (80 字)

評語：能正確描述圖片，時態稍有錯誤(walk 未用過去式)，用字也稍有錯誤(其他畫線部分)，整體而言，文句通順且事件順序交代合理清楚，不影響讀者理解。

3 級分：大致回答題目之要求，但未能完全達意；文法、用字皆有錯誤，稍影響

讀者之理解。

Last week I went to my anty's house for holidays. We got there at three nighteen p.m. It's rainy at Saturday. We played card in the room. It's a little bit boring. But Sunday morning is a great hot day. My anty bought us a beach ball. We went to beach and played so many game. These is my greated holiday ever. (62 字)

評語：雖能大致描述圖片內容，但用字和拼字有不少錯誤，例如“nighteen”，“anty”，“greated”，“game 沒加複數 s”；時態由過去式變成現在式“Sunday morning is...”，再變成過去式，最後一句又變回現在式(These is...)，總體來說，文法和拼字需加強。

2 級分：部分回答題目之要求，表達上有令人不解／誤解之處；文法、用字等皆有錯誤，讀者需耐心解讀。

Last week, I went to Kaohsiung to find my friend. Next day is rainny so we play card inside, at Sundy is sunny we went to beach and play in the ocean, I had happy time last week. (38 字)

評語：雖然讀者勉強看懂語意，時態掌握不佳(第一句為過去式，但是第二句又跳到現在式，第三句過去式和現在式混用)，標點符號使用不佳(多次逗點誤用成句點)，句構不佳(at Sunday is sunny...)，拼字錯誤(rainny, Sundy)，並且未達要求字數五十字，需費力解讀。

APPENDIX J
Students Grades and Word Count
before and after Prewriting Activities

Students No.	Pre-test	Post-test
1	2 (53 words)	4 (81 words)
2	2 (62 words)	3 (112 words)
3	3 (80 words)	4 (105 words)
4	3 (49 words)	4 (63 words)
5	3 (54 words)	4 (77 words)
6	2 (69 words)	3 (73 words)
7	2 (50 words)	2 (38 words)
8	3 (64 words)	4 (77 words)
9	2 (48 words)	3 (66 words)
10	4 (82 words)	4 (70 words)
11	2 (55 words)	3 (52 words)
12	3 (54 words)	4 (76 words)
13	4 (92 words)	5 (119 words)
14	3 (58 words)	4 (86 words)
15	2 (49 words)	3 (52 words)
16	3 (74 words)	4 (124 words)
17	3 (98 words)	3 (80 words)
18	3 (81 words)	4 (111 words)
19	4 (87 words)	4 (75 words)
20	2 (61 words)	3 (62 words)
21	2 (50 words)	3 (54 words)
22	2 (70 words)	3 (69 words)

APPENDIX K

Examples of Students' Pre-test, Post-test Writing, and Prewriting Sheet

Student A's Pre-test Writing

東大附中英文寫作課程
英文寫作練習題

Score: 4

92 words

全民英檢初級寫作模擬試題

上個星期，你到高雄(Kaohsiung)的親戚家玩；下面是你每天的活動，請根據這些圖片寫一篇約 50 字的簡短遊記。

星期五 星期六 星期日

I went to my cousin's house in Kaohsiung last week. I have a lot of fun at there. I arrived at 3:19 pm in Kaohsiung ^{last Friday}. It's raining outside, so we played cards for all day. Maybe it looked boring for you, but I'm very happy for winning the game. It's a sunny day that Sunday. Just liked the photo, we played outside at the beach. The waves were very smooth, which made me feel really relax for swimming in the clear ocean. This was the fun vacation I had last week!

能正確描述圖片，時態偶有錯誤、句型也稍有錯誤。但不影響讀者理解。

Student A's Post-test Writing

Score:

5

英文寫作練習題(post-test)

119 words

全民英檢初級寫作模擬試題

上個星期，你到高雄(Kaohsiung)的親戚家玩，下面是你每天的活動，請根據這些圖片寫一篇約 50 字的簡短遊記。



I had a joyful time to Kaohsiung last week, my last three days vacation. I arrived Kaohsiung train station at nineteen past three p.m. I was very exciting on that day. My cousin went to pick me up. The second day was a rainy day. We stayed at home and played cards all day long. I won the games. I felt really happy because of that. In surprise, Sunday was a sunny day. We went to a beach and played balls at there. It was very hot through out the day, but it was also the happiest day in this vacation. Even if there was a full day staying at my cousins' house, it was still my best vacation ever.

5

時態正確，文句大致正確，簡短清楚表示其意，
敘事完全切合圖片重點。

Student A's Prewriting Sheet

<u>Listing</u>	
<p>Introduction: <u>Last three days vacation,</u> I had a trip to Kaohsiung.</p> <p>Conclusion: Even if there was a rainy day, it was still my best vacation ever.</p>	<p>1st picture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a train station in Kaohsiung 2. four people 3. It was nineteen past three p.m. 4. exciting 5. Friday
<p>2nd picture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a rainy day 2. a girl and three boys 3. worry 4. happy 5. many cards 	<p>3rd picture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a sunny day 4. swimming suits 2. beach 5. rocks 3. hot 6. the last day

Question generation
<p>Introduction: I had a joyful time to Kaohsiung on my last three <u>days</u> vacation.</p> <p>Conclusion: Even if there was a full day staying at my cousins' house, it was still my best vacation ever.</p>
<p>1st picture (Who, Where, When, What, How?)</p> <p>Where <u>were</u> the places they <u>went</u>?</p>
<p>2nd picture (Who, Where, When, What, How?)</p> <p>When did you go there?</p>
<p>3rd picture (Who, Where, When, What, How?)</p> <p>What did you do with your cousins?</p>

Student B's Pre-test Writing

東大附中英文寫作課程

英文寫作練習題

53
words

全民英檢初級寫作模擬試題

上個星期，你到高雄(Kaohsiung)的親戚家玩！下面是你每天的活動，請根據這些圖片寫一篇約 50 字的簡短遊記。

Score:

2



Last week, I took a train to kaohsiung^{with my da}.
 I arived at 3 P.M. My
 aunt took us to her house. I played
 with my aunt's son, his name was
 Patrick. The next day, we want
 to the beach and played in
 the sea. We all had a
 great time!

部分回答題目的要求，但星期皆無寫出；易造成讀者混淆
 時態 亦有拼字錯誤，需耐心解讀

Student B's Post-test Writing

81 words

Score: 4

英文寫作練習題(post-test)

全民英檢初級寫作模擬試題

上個星期，你到高雄(Kaohsiung)的親戚家玩，下面是你每天的活動，請根據這些圖片寫一篇約 50 字的簡短遊記。



Last Friday, I went to kaohsiung to visit my aunt. My aunt took us to her house. Saturday morning, Ben, Jenny and I were playing cards. Because of the raining, we were chatting at the living room. The next day, we went to the beach, and we had a lot of fun. We played the beach ball and swam around each others and even walk in the sea. It was a great sunny day. I hope I can visit here every day.

能正確描述圖片。時態稍有錯誤，用字也稍有錯誤，但整體而言，文字通順且事件順序交代合理清楚，不影響讀者理解。

Student B's Prewriting Sheet

<u>Listing</u>	
<p>Introduction: Friday on the train train station kaohsiung</p> <p>Conclusion: trip aunt a great day say goodbye sunny day happy ending go home take a train</p>	<p>1st picture kaohsiung train station my aunt my aunt's house It is Friday fifteen past ninteen</p>
<p>2nd picture cards playing my aunt's son Ben Ben's sister Jenny chat living room floor</p>	<p>3rd picture beach sunny day sea playing hit the ball walk in the sea beach</p>