

CHRISTOPHER ALTON BALDWIN

**CMD ASSIGNMENT**

**Development of a website to improve motivation towards  
writing in exam courses**

*MSc/Diploma in TESOL, English Studies, Aston University*

**JANUARY 2007**

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Background .....	1
<b>Writing Development</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Product/Process .....	2
Feedback .....	3
Error correction .....	4
Backwash .....	5
Computers in the writing classroom	5
<b>The research</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Description of the site .....	6
Piloting and implementation .....	8
Results .....	8
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Successes .....	10
Drawbacks .....	11
The Future .....	11
<b>References</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Web sites referred to</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>16</b>
1a .....	16
1b .....	17
2a .....	18
2b .....	19
3 .....	20
4a .....	21
4b .....	22

## Introduction

This paper examines the development of a website to help teenage students improve their motivation towards writing lessons for the Cambridge ESOL PET and FCE exams. The paper examines writing development, including process and product models of writing, and error correction issues. It then goes on to discuss the structure of the site created, including a teachers' guide, relating it to writing development theory. We then consider the implementation of the site, and reactions from students and teachers.

## Background

This study takes place in a private language school in the North of Italy, specialising in young learners, from 4-19 years old. In the high school department the students, from 14-19 years old study for the [Cambridge ESOL PET](#) and [FCE](#) exams, attending lessons after normal school hours in the afternoon or early evening. Students on these courses are generally highly motivated and are at a much higher level than their classmates at school. There are approximately 50 students in classes of no more than six students, giving a total of ten courses. The courses last two years for PET then two years for FCE. These courses are taught by five different teachers of varying levels of experience, but none with much experience as writing teachers. They all also teach other age groups. The courses focus mainly on developing linguistic ability in all four skills in the first year, moving on to exam skills in the second year using a communicative approach.

Many students say that the writing part of these exams is the most daunting, and teachers report a hesitance to teach writing, fearing that it leads to boring lessons, an important concern in a private language school, where lessons must be enjoyable for the students to keep coming. One way to help both teachers and students to improve motivation to work on writing skills is to include an online component. Krajka (2000) states that

*“with the help of selected websites or other on-line techniques, writing instruction can be made more interesting, appealing, motivating and authentic.”*

The question addressed in this paper is how this can be the case within the context of exam courses such as PET and FCE in a private language school. This paper will first look at the literature to examine the question of how to develop writing skills, taking in the areas of process and product models of writing, feedback, error correction and exam backwash. We will then move on in the

literature review to consider computers in the writing classroom. All the above points will be synthesised to help create a website to develop students' exam writing skills and encourage teachers to develop their writing teaching skills.

## Writing Development

### Product/Process

We will now look at the literature on the subject of writing development. There are two main models in writing pedagogy – product and process. Badger and White (2000) offer a comparison of the two approaches, describing four stages to a product approach:

*“familiarization; controlled writing; guided writing; and free writing”* (ibid:153)

This method stresses linguistic *knowledge* in writing, such as vocabulary and grammar. The process approach, on the other hand stresses “linguistic *skills*, such as planning and drafting” (ibid:154, emphasis added), requiring the writing of several drafts before the final version is produced. Keh (1990:294) describes the process approach as

*“a multiple-draft process which consists of: generating ideas (pre-writing); writing a first draft with an emphasis on content ... second and third (and possibly more) drafts to revise ideas and the communication of those ideas.”*

Keh also mentions the fact that many teachers are unsure of how to implement the process approach in the classroom, which is a point to taken up in this project.

The two approaches are often seen as conflicting, however Badger and White (2000) suggest that this dichotomy is misguided and that writing teaching methodology, and therefore skills development materials, should draw from the two approaches. Silva et al (1994:201) note that students often request a model as a guide, a technique often used in the product approach. This, they suggest, can be given after a first draft has been produced, thus linking the two approaches. In the context of these exams students are required to write linguistically correctly, thus indicating the need for a product approach, but also creatively, which comes more from the process approach. In the FCE exam the students have one and a half hours to produce two texts of between 120-180 words each, requiring approximately 100 words in 30 minutes, compared with a fluency rate of 100 words in 15 minutes by writers after one years writing instruction in a study by Chandler (2003:285). This indicates that there is ample time to produce more than one draft, thus leading to a backwash effect (see below) pushing towards a process approach. Thus these exams encourage a

combined product/process method, which teaching materials should reflect, as they are both in line with research in L2 writing. Considering the controversy on the subject, however, materials should also be flexible enough to allow teachers to take their own stance on the matter, whilst being guided by the materials writer.

## **Feedback**

Another important area for consideration is that of feedback – by who, and in what way?

Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) note that teacher response is the principle means by which students understand their development as writers. Keh (1990) highlights the role of the student in peer feedback, although she notes the importance of training students to give feedback. Villamil and Guerrero (1998) report a study which found that 74% of revisions suggested by peers were incorporated into the final draft, and that most of these revisions were correct. They also note that there was a tendency to focus on grammar correction to the exclusion of other areas. It follows that any writing materials should encourage both teacher and peer review. With computer based materials this aspect can be developed more easily than with pen and paper – a text in an exercise book can only be read by one person, but a text uploaded onto the internet can be reviewed by the whole class.

Guerrero and Villamil (2000) invoke sociocultural theory and Vygotsky's zone of proximal development to help explain why peer correction is effective, although they note that pairs working together sometimes produce correct decisions and sometimes incorrect, indicating the importance of teacher correction of final drafts.

Davidson and Tomic (1994) and Keh (1990) talk about the importance of not focusing exclusively on surface errors, such as grammar and spelling to the exclusion of 'higher order concerns' (Keh 1990:296) such as the development of ideas and the overall structure of the text. Davidson and Tomic note the advantages of computers in encouraging students to revise on a global level, as well as sentence level, it being much easier to cut and paste to move a paragraph on a computer than to re-write a whole essay on paper. Students need to know how to revise texts on both a surface level and global level and this issue can be addressed by computer materials designers (see Davidson and Tomic 1994:206).

## Error correction

We have seen that both teachers and students *can* correct surface level errors, but *should* they, and if so how? This is an area of much controversy in the field of L2 writing, notably because of an article by Truscott (1996) arguing strongly against correcting grammar in students' texts. His argument is that correcting grammar causes students to avoid difficult structures, thus harming their writing, and that they spend less time writing than they could as they spend time correcting the errors. He contends that their time is better spent producing new texts. This was strongly refuted by Ferris (1999), who claimed that Truscott had understated the evidence in favour of error correction. Truscott (1999) and Ferris (2004) continue the debate, and these articles make fascinating reading, both authors citing the same studies, but drawing opposing conclusions, with Ferris (2004:56) giving three lines of reasoning in favour of error correction: SLA research, L2 writing research, and student survey research. The aspect of SLA research is based on a fear of fossilisation (Selinker 1972), although Kepner (1991) does not consider this to be a valid fear. Both Truscott and Ferris agree on one point – that more research is necessary. One example of a piece of research carried out in response to this appeal is Chandler (2003), who interprets her results to support correction, although Truscott (2004) in response suggests that conclusions against error correction are more likely from the same evidence.

With this controversy in mind, to cite Ferris' (2004) title, "what do we do in the meantime?" More specifically how should writing teachers treat student errors and how should materials developers encourage both students and teachers to deal with the issue?

Ferris lists six 'practical suggestions' for error correction, which try to strike a balance, and encourage high quality error correction/general feedback. These points are:

1. Correct errors competently, incorporating correction in course planning.
2. Use indirect feedback, to encourage problem solving and self-editing.
3. Different types of errors need different treatment.
4. Students should revise their text after feedback (see Chandler, 2003 and also Truscott's 2004 rebuttal on this point)
5. Give extra grammar instruction, tailored to students needs, and combined with other error treatment methods.
6. Encourage students to keep error charts, to monitor progress and heighten awareness of weakness.

(Adapted from Ferris 2004:59-60)

This first point is certainly an area for course and materials developers, and the other points need to be borne in mind when writing teachers' guides for writing teaching. The last point is something which can be included easily in computer based materials.

### **Backwash**

The courses under consideration here all lead to exams, so students need to learn how to pass the exams. Whether or not this also helps them to develop their language skills depends on the backwash effect from the exams (Prodromou 1995), the teaching methodology employed and the materials used. It has already been mentioned that these exams encourage both a product and process approach to writing if the teachers and materials encourage this combined approach. Prodromou talks about the importance of avoiding just repeating exam style questions in a dry way, but breathing life into materials to encourage a high level of learner input, which he sees as the key to transforming negative into positive backwash. This can be brought about by computer based writing materials.

On the subject of teacher developed materials Sheldon (1988:238) implies that home-grown materials can cope less well with backwash than those professionally produced. Block (1991) refers to this, but reaches a more positive conclusion about teacher developed materials. This aspect needs to be taken into account when exam teaching materials are being produced.

### **Computers in the writing classroom**

A great deal of research has been carried out into various ways of using computers to help develop writing skills, for example Krajka (2000) talks about the benefits of internet writing lessons, such as material always being up to date, and increased motivation. He then gives a number of practical suggestions as to how to use the internet in writing classes.

Hertz-Lazarowitz and Bar-Natan (2001) talk about a study of elementary school students whose writing improved more with a combination of computer mediated instruction and cooperative learning than one or the other learning situations on their own.

Matsumura and Hann (2004), however, warn about the dangers of computer anxiety, showing that students with lower computer skills prefer face to face feedback, although they note that computers can produce a motivating effect. An important point they make is that students work in their study was not anonymous, which discouraged many students from posting their work on the internet for all other students to see. Davidson and Tomic (1994) talk about ways to help teachers overcome their fear of computers in the writing classroom.

## **The research**

It has been seen that computer techniques have much to offer the writing materials developer. It was decided for this project to develop a website which incorporates the above points in materials for students and teachers.

One type of website which is very flexible and easy to set up is a wiki site. The most famous wiki is the [wikipedia](#), an encyclopaedia created and edited by anyone on the web (see LeLoup and Ponterio (2006) for a description). Wikis are sites where every page can be edited easily by anyone. Godwin-Jones (2003:15) describes a wiki as a “*collaborative environment which is more naturally suited for collaborative on-line projects.*” A quick search on a wiki site such as [seedwiki](#) shows that many teachers are using these types of sites, but there is little research on their use. Anderson (2004), however, describes a wiki project to help new participants in an MSc programme.

## **Description of the site**

The site, called “Big Ben Exam Writing” after the name of the school, has three main sections: [FCE](#), [PET](#) and [Teachers’ page](#), all accessible from the [homepage](#). The FCE and PET parts work on the same principle – there is one exam type question per month of the course on a page, and pages for students to write their answers on (see appendices 1a and 1b for sample pages). As wiki pages are all editable anyone can add comments and corrections to students answers (see appendix 2 for a sample answer, original and edited). How this is carried out could depend on individual teachers, so the teachers’ page gives some suggestions, taking a pro-correction stance in the Ferris-Truscott debate (see above), considering Ferris’ (2004:56) point about students liking their errors corrected to be persuasive, in that the aim of the site is to motivate students. See appendix 3 for the teachers’ page. The following colour code is suggested:

Grammar, capitals, word, spelling

Teachers can use this or other codes adapted to their students' needs to highlight errors, and then make general comments under the text. This goes against Chandler's (2003:267) findings that

*“both direct correction and simple underlining of errors are significantly superior to describing the type of error, even with underlining, for reducing long-term error.”*

Chandler's comments were quite complex, and possibly confused her students, while the above method is something like 'underlining plus' to give students a little help in identifying the error. The proposed system follows Sugita's (2006:35) advice *“clarity is the first thing to bear in mind in writing a comment.”* The site is, however, flexible which allows teachers to take their own stance on the matter of correction and on whether to concentrate more on sentence level issues or global concerns.

The pages can also be edited by fellow students, either correcting or highlighting the errors. This aspect of the site promotes a social constructivist (see below) view of writing development in that it encourages peer revision. Teachers are advised to have students write anonymously as this diminishes the problem of anxiety, and highlights the idea of group possession of the work – one person starts, but many others collaborate in order to produce a finished 'perfect' text.

The fact that the pages are editable leads to a process view of writing development, with many drafts being written of each answer. An interesting feature of wiki sites is the ability to view old versions of the page, thus making it possible to see how the text evolves over successive drafts. This becomes a type of error correction chart as mentioned by Ferris (2004:60, see page 4, point 6), helping students keep track of the errors they made, thus aiding acquisition of the correct form. A combined process/product approach can also be fostered in that students can look at answers written by other students, and edit them before attempting their own answer. To follow the Badger and White (2000, see above) suggestion of combining the approaches it would be good to alternate between students editing first then writing and writing before editing. This point is mentioned on the teachers' page.

The teachers' page also encourages teachers to have students re-write their original texts incorporating the changes, to foster acquisition of the correct forms, in line with Chandler's (2003) results.

The home page also includes links to the Cambridge ESOL exam site, to encourage students to learn more about the exam, and to the school's main site, for commercial purposes.

### **Piloting and implementation**

The site was piloted on a group of first year FCE students who wrote answers to a question, these answers were commented upon by the teacher/researcher, and shown to another group, this time of second year students, who then revised the text. After this trial several technical problems were cleared up, and the structure of the site was improved to allow for expansion throughout the year. The teacher/researcher also understood more fully how to use the site for correction and feedback. These observations were included in the teachers' page.

The site was then launched school wide, by holding a short teacher training session with the teachers on the exam courses, showing them how the site works, and demonstrating the suggestions given on the teachers' page. Students' opinions were sought by means of a questionnaire to gauge reaction to the site in terms of motivation to write, feelings about having their work on public display, what they felt about having other students correct their work, correcting the work of others and if they felt that the site helped develop their writing skills. The questionnaire was given to 25 students from six different classes across all the levels. See appendix 4a for the questionnaire and 4b for the full results table. (See Fray, 2002 for questionnaire design). The opinions of the teachers were also sought in informal interviews to see how the site could be improved, and whether or not they thought that the site had changed their view of writing teaching.

### **Results**

The purpose of this project was to design computer based materials to improve motivation of students in writing lessons. Questions 1, 2 and 3 probe this area.

Question 1 asked “do you enjoy using the site?” 72% of students said “yes”, and 24% “so so”. Only one student (4%) answered “no” to this question, indicating a positive reaction to these writing lessons.

Question 2, “do you prefer writing on the computer or on paper?” showed that 68% of students prefer using the computer, thus giving a majority in favour of this type of writing lesson. Question 3 asked directly if students felt that their motivation to write had increased or decreased. 52% said that it had increased, whilst 48% reported no change. No students felt that their motivation had decreased. No pre-intervention survey was carried out, so it is difficult to gauge any change in attitudes towards writing as a result of this project, but these reactions show a generally positive reaction to the site.

Question 4. What do you think about having your work on the internet for everyone to see?

This question showed 92% either positive or neutral, with only 8% of students not liking their work on the internet. This is the opposite of Matsumura and Hann’s (2004:412) findings that students didn’t like posting their work for all to see. This difference could be due to the anonymity of the work in the present study, an important aspect in increasing motivation and decreasing anxiety.

The most popular aspect of the site with students was the editing aspect. Only one student was against his work being corrected by other students, whilst 77% of students liked changing the work of others with only 8% against.

88% of students felt that the site had improved their writing skills, 12% saying “maybe”, again showing a positive reaction in terms of student opinions of the use of the site.

Students comments on question 8 – ways to improve the site – included technical points about the text editor, requests for a greater variety of questions and requests for explanations of errors, not just corrections. This last aspect is in line with the findings of Ferris & Roberts (2001) but it is a question of methodology, not materials design. The flexibility of the site allows it to be used with a variety of correction methods. One problem highlighted by one student is that errors can be removed completely, instead of being left, to help learn from the mistake. The site still allows access to old versions of answers, but it could be helpful to encourage teachers and students to leave

the errors visible as in the example in appendix 2b. Several younger students mentioned adding games or quizzes to the site to help motivation.

These results, although from a small sample, show a very positive reaction to the site on the whole, with very few negative opinions, although this reaction was more due to editing other students' work than writing itself. This was observed in the classroom in the form of very positive lessons, especially at the correction stage. The more negative answers were from younger students, with the exams further away than others, thus implying a positive backwash effect from those with the exams closer. It is expected that use of the site will increase as the exams get closer. It can thus be said that the site has achieved its objective of increasing student motivation to write for the majority of students.

Teachers' opinions were sought in informal interviews after they had used the site in one lesson. Attitudes were universally positive about the site, finding that it helped produce interesting and stimulating lessons. They all reported that the most enjoyable aspect for the students was peer correction, with one teacher saying that her students were looking forward to checking their work at home to see if anyone had edited it.. Some teachers felt uneasy about using computers, but the training session helped to show the simplicity of the site, which reassured them. One teacher said that it made writing teaching more interesting, giving an extra tool to use in the course. Another teacher commented that she was very busy and didn't have time to read the teachers' page, thus highlighting the importance of the training session in helping teachers to understand different correction methods available to them. The school director was also very positive about the site.

## **Conclusions**

### **Successes**

The site has been successful in its two primary aims of increasing student and teacher motivation for writing. Part of the success of the site could be explained by students feeling important, having a website created just for them, and that feedback, given by whatever means was considered as something positive, thus aiding motivation, possibly leading to acquisition of the corrected errors. This is in line with Perpignan's (2003) observations that

*“it is therefore not the explicitly conveyed messages and their encoding that should be focused by teachers and researchers, in order to generate better conditions for feedback effectiveness, but the intentions which inspire them and the means which promote them.”*

This highlights the value of a social constructivist view of writing development, where peer reviewers and teachers are not there to find faults, but to help, considering “*L2 acquisition as a situated, co-constructed process*” (Young 2004:519). This view can be fostered by computer assisted language learning according to Ortega (1997). This is a vital aspect of this site, as it would not work if students only corrected, and didn’t post their own work, so students must become part of the group both *helping* and *being helped* to become better writers.

### **Drawbacks**

The site requires the use of the internet, which in this school is available to students, but they usually have to work two students per computer, which is sometimes beneficial, in the social constructivist view, but sometimes negative in that working individually helps develop learner autonomy. Most students in this context have the internet at home, but sometimes when there are technical problems it is difficult for students to do their homework. Pen and paper writing work can be done easily anywhere, but this site requires internet connection and the ability to type, aspects which could discourage use.

### **The Future**

It can also be considered as a tool to help both teacher and student development. One important area raised in this project is that of correction. Most of the teachers in this school have relatively little experience as writing teachers, so do not have their own personal theory as to how to correct writing errors, so the teachers’ page could help them to develop a position. Keh (1990) and Min (2006) note the importance of training students to give peer review feedback, an area which has not been examined in this project. These are areas of methodology, but could be explored in the material in the teachers’ page in future development of the site.

Another aspect which has not been addressed is if the site actually helps to improve writing skills, and if so using what correction method. A longitudinal study to monitor the effects of use of the

site, and various correction methods, such as proposed by Ferris (2004) would be a useful follow up study.

In the future the site could be expanded in many ways, for example adding sections to help develop other skills such as reading and exam techniques, keeping in mind positive backwash, and adding pages for other exams such as Cambridge's CAE exam.

Chris Baldwin  
January 2007  
Words: 4217

## References

- Anderson, D.G. 2004. Sowing the seed: Wiki and student-initiated student support in distance learning. Unpublished MSc dissertation, Aston University.
- Badger, R and White, G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal* 54/2:153-160
- Block, D. 1991. Some thoughts on DIY materials design. *ELT Journal* 45/3:211-217
- Chandler, J. 2003. The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12:267–296
- Davidson, C. and Tomic, A. 1994. Removing computer phobia from the writing classroom. *ELT Journal* 48/3:205-213
- Ferris, D. R. 1999. The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8/1:1–10.
- Ferris, D.R. 2004. The “Grammar Correction” Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime . . .?) *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13/1:49–62
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. 2001. Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10/3:161–184.
- Fray R.B. 2002. A Brief Guide to Questionnaire Development. Available on:  
<http://www.ericae.net/ft/tamu/vpiques3.htm>
- Godwin-Jones, R. 2003. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES: Blogs and Wikis: Environments for On-line Collaboration. *Language Learning & Technology* 7/2:12-16. available on  
<http://llt.msu.edu/vol7num2/emerging/>
- Guerrero, M.C.M.D. and Villamil ,O.S. 2000. Activating the ZPD: Mutual Scaffolding in L2 Peer Revision. *The Modern Language Journal* 84/1:51-68

- Hedgcock, J. and Lefkowitz, N. 1996. Some Input on Input: Two Analyses of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2 Writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 80/3:287-308
- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R and Bar-Natan, I. 2001. Writing development of Arab and Jewish students using cooperative learning (CL) and computer-mediated communication (CMC). *Computers & Education* 3: 19–36
- Keh, C.L. 1990. Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal* Volume 44/4:294-304
- Kepner, C.G. 1991. An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills. *Modern Language Journal* 75/3:305-313
- Krajka, J. 2000. Using the Internet in ESL Writing Instruction. *The Internet TESL Journal* 6/11. Available on <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Krajka-WritingUsingNet.html>
- LeLoup, J.W. and Ponterio, R. 2006. Wikipedia: A Multilingual Treasure Trove. *Language Learning & Technology* 10/2:4 -7. Available on <http://llt.msu.edu/vol10num2/pdf/net.pdf>
- Matsumura, S and Hann, G. 2004. Computer Anxiety and Students' Preferred Feedback Methods in EFL Writing. *The Modern Language Journal* 88/3:403-415
- Min, H.T. 2006. The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15/2:118-141
- Ortega, L. 1997. Processes and outcomes in networked classroom interaction: defining the research agenda for L2 computer-assisted classroom discussion. *Language Learning and Technology* 1/1:82-93. Available on: <http://llt.msu.edu/vol1num1/ortega/default.html>
- Perpignan, H. 2003. Exploring the written feedback dialogue: a research, learning and teaching practice. *Language Teaching Research* 7/2:259–278
- Prodromou, L. 1995. The backwash effect: from testing to teaching. *ELT Journal* 49/1:13-25
- Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *IRAL* 10.2: 209–31.
- Sheldon, L.E. 1988. Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal* 42/4:237-246
- Silva, T., Reichelt, M. and Lax-Farr, J. 1994. Writing instructions for- ESL graduate students. *ELT Journal* 48/3:197-204
- Sugita, Y. 2006. The impact of teachers' comment types on students' revision. *ELT Journal* 60/1:34-41
- Truscott, J. 1996. The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning* 46:327–369.
- Truscott, J. 1999. The case for “the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8/2:111–122.

- Truscott, J. 2004. Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13/4: 337-343
- Young, R.F. 2004. Learning as Changing Participation: Discourse Roles in ESL Writing Conferences. *The Modern Language Journal* 88/4:519-535
- Villamil, O.S. and Guerrero, M.C.M.D. 1998. Assessing the Impact of Peer Revision on L2 Writing. *Applied Linguistics* 19/4:491-514

## **Web sites referred to:**

Big Ben Exam writing: [www.seedwiki.com/wiki/big\\_ben\\_exam\\_writing/big\\_ben\\_exam\\_writing](http://www.seedwiki.com/wiki/big_ben_exam_writing/big_ben_exam_writing)

Cambridge ESOL: [www.cambridgeesol.org](http://www.cambridgeesol.org)

Seedwiki: [www.seedwiki.com](http://www.seedwiki.com)

Wikipedia: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main\\_Page](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page)

Appendix 1a. The home page (Please note that the format has been modified to fit on A4 pages, and that as the site is in continuous evolution, the current versions of pages may differ slightly from those in these appendices.)



Welcome to the Big Ben School Writing Exam site.

search

[Big Ben home page link](#)

[Cambridge University ESOL link](#)

edit page

We hope that you enjoy using this site and that it will be useful in developing your writing skills needed for the exams!

versions

directory

There are two parts to this site for students:

changes

[PET](#) and [FCE](#)

help

[There is also a teachers page](#)

make a page

Have fun writing and editing!

log in

start a free account

notifications

[The Big Ben School, Verona, Italy](#), hosted by [seedwiki](#)

Appendix 1b. Example question page, for FCE



**the  
big ben  
school**

[Big Ben Exam Writing](#) [January FCE](#)

Year 2 question

search

edit page

versions

directory

changes

help

make a page

log in

start a free account

notifications

Sample question for part 2:

Your pen friend Alex has written to you asking about your last holiday. Write a reply to Alex, saying what you did, what you enjoyed and what you didn't enjoy.

Write your letter using 120-180 words.

*Click on a link below to answer. If you "right click" and "open in another window" (apri in un'altra finestra) you can see the question and answer together.*

[Jan F2 A7](#) [Jan F2 A8](#) [Jan F2 A9](#) [Jan F2 A10](#) [Jan F2 A11](#) [Jan F2 A12](#)

[Jan F2 A1](#) [Jan F2 A2](#) [Jan F2 A3](#) [Jan F2 A4](#) [Jan F2 A5](#) [Jan F2 A6](#)

[The Big Ben School, Verona, Italy](#), hosted by [seedwiki](#)

Appendix 2a. A student's first attempt

Hi alex, i'm happy to have recived your letter that i have just read. On 25th december i left home and i went to the montains with my parents and my friends. There i have a small house in Val di Fiamme since when i was 2 years old. I really enjoyed myself because i went skiing with all my friends and also because i could get up late in the morning and i could relax myself. The weather was really good because it's sunny and not too cold and so i could sunbath. One evening my parents and all our friends went for dinner in a "baita" on the snow; there was very cold when we were going there with motosnows,it was very exciting. There we ate tipical food and we danced tipical music but the more exciting thing was the return because we saw the sky with all it's stars, which were shining.

Write back soon

With love

Appendix 2b. After two student edits, the first in blue, and the second in red.

Hi Alex, I'm happy to have received your letter that I have just read. On 25th December I left home and I went to the mountains with my parents and my friends. There I have had a small house there, in Val di Fiamme, since when I was 2 years old. I really enjoyed myself because I went skiing with all my friends, and also because I could get up late in the morning and I could relax myself. The weather was really good because it's was sunny and not too cold and so I could sunbathe. One evening my parents and all our friends we went for dinner in a "baita" on the snow with all our friends; there was it was very cold when we were going there with by motosnows, it was very exciting. There We ate typical food there and we danced to typical music, but the more most exciting thing was coming back because we saw the sky with all it's its stars, which were shining twinkling.

Write back soon.

With love

## Appendix 3. The teachers' page.



### Big Ben Writing Exam Site

search

edit page

versions

directory

changes

help

make a page

log in

start a free account

notifications

#### Teachers Page

This site is designed to be used by teachers and students of the [Cambridge ESOL FCE](#) and [PET](#) exams (links to teachers' site). The idea is that teachers can post exam style writing questions and students can answer the questions on their own page. Other students can then post comments and make changes in order to gradually improve the text. Teachers can also make corrections to the answers.

The writing exams have plenty of time, so it is good practise to encourage students to write a first draft and then correct it, thus developing a process approach to writing. This site also encourages a product approach in that eventually a "perfect" version of the answer will be produced, showing students what to aim for. It is a good idea to use a variety of methods, so one lesson you could get the students to write first, without looking at other answers first, the next time you use the site get them to edit first, then try answering the question.

The site can be used in lesson time or for homework. For technical reasons, make sure that no two students are working on the same page at the same time. If needed create more answer pages.

One idea for correcting students' texts is to use a colour-code, such as: **Grammar**, **capitals**, **word**, **spelling** for in-text errors, and to add comments below their answer to address points of style and overall structure of the text. It's generally better to focus first on structure and style, and to move on to grammar on later drafts.

Some students tend to avoid difficult structures when they have been corrected. In PET and FCE students are rewarded for ambitious use of language, even if it is not perfect, so students need to be encouraged to use more complex forms, and not be worried about making mistakes. It is also important to get students to re-write their texts including the corrections, to help them to acquire the points.

Students can put their names on their work if they wish, but as the texts are the product of several people editing and to avoid embarrassing shy students, it could be better to keep answers anonymous.

Happy teaching! 😊

Chris Baldwin

# Big Ben Exam Writing Website Questionnaire

I would like to get your ideas on what you think of the site, so that I can make it better. Please take a few moments to answer the following questions about the Big Ben writing site. Tick the answer you agree with most.

1. Do you enjoy using the site?
  - a. Yes
  - b. So so
  - c. No
2. Do you prefer writing:
  - a. on the computer or
  - b. on paper?
3. Does the site increase or decrease your motivation to write?
  - a. Increase
  - b. No change
  - c. Decrease
4. What do you think about having your work on the internet for everyone to see?
  - a. I like it
  - b. So so
  - c. I don't like it
5. Do you like other students changing your work?
  - a. I like it
  - b. So so
  - c. I don't like it
6. Do you like changing the work of other students?
  - a. I like it
  - b. So so
  - c. I don't like it
7. Do you think that the site helps you to improve your writing?
  - a. Yes
  - b. Maybe
  - c. No
8. Can you think of any ways to improve the site? (Please write your ideas below.)

.....

.....

Thanks for your answers.

Chris

Appendix 4b  
**Questionnaire Results**

**Question**

1. Do you enjoy using the site?

**Results**

Yes		So so		No	
Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
18	72%	6	24%	1	4%

2. Do you prefer writing:

on the computer		on paper	
Total	%	Total	%
17	68%	8	32%

3. Does the site increase or decrease your motivation to write?

Increase		No change		Decrease	
Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
13	52%	12	48%	0	0%

4. What do you think about having your work on the internet for everyone to see?

I like it		So so		I don't like it	
Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
17	68%	6	24%	2	8%

5. Do you like other students changing your work?

I like it		So so		I don't like it	
Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
12	48%	12	48%	1	4%

6. Do you like changing the work of other students?

I like it		So so		I don't like it	
Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
18	72%	5	20%	2	8%

7. Do you think that the site helps you to improve your writing?

Yes		Maybe		No	
Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
22	88%	3	12%	0	0%