

Relative Impact of Windows Movie Maker Journaling on Writing Proficiency and Apprehension

Ghada Awada

American University of Beirut, Lebanon

Abstract

This article reports the results of an experimental study that examined the relative effectiveness of Windows Movie Maker (WMM) as a computer-assisted language learning tool versus journal writing in improving the English as a foreign language (EFL) writing Proficiency and decreasing the levels of writing apprehension of grade eleven students in Lebanon. The study, too, looked into the perceptions of the participants of the relevance and efficacy of using Windows Movie Maker (WMM) as an instructional tool. The study is based on the assumption that the WMM computer-assisted language learning tool, unlike the traditional pen and paper journal writing, provides an excellent opportunity for students to creatively write and express themselves using music, script, pictures and visual effects that reflect learners' personal experiences. The study employed an experimental pretest- posttest control group design whereby two intact classes were randomly assigned to control and experimental conditions. Descriptive statistics were calculated and a series of independent sample t-tests were conducted in order to address the questions raised in the study. Finally, a content analysis of the qualitative data gathered from the study participants to the open ended questions in the experimental group was carried out to describe and concretize their perceptions of the WMM experience. The results of the study indicated that the WMM journaling proved to be more effective than the traditional pen and paper journaling in enhancing Proficiency and decreasing writing apprehension. In addition, the participants in the experimental group underscored both the importance and usefulness of using the WMM tool in enhancing EFL journal writing. Further research is recommended in order to determine the extent of the generalizability of the findings of the present study into other school contexts and across different grade and proficiency levels.

Key words: English as a foreign language (EFL), journal writing, journal writing Proficiency, Windows Movie Maker (WMM), Writing apprehension

Introduction

The growing availability of educational technology tools and software resources is one of the hallmarks that characterize contemporary schools all over the globe. Likewise, journal writing has become a widely-accepted practice in the English as foreign language (EFL) classroom as the process approach has gradually replaced product-oriented instruction. As such, teachers are expected to use modern technology in their teaching (Branigan, 2005; Ramos, 2007; Sweeder, 2007; Alderman & Beyers, 2009) as well as incorporate journal writing in their teaching (Huff & Kiline, 1987). This is especially the case given that the new generation of school goers is considered to be “digital-natives” and “technologically-savvy” as described by Prensky (2001).

The rationale for using technology in the English as a second/foreign language is now well-established and the paradigm shift from product to process writing instruction has been almost completed in various EFL contexts and settings all over the globe. Several researcher have advocated the role of technology in teaching the various language skills such as listening comprehension (Hoven,1999), reading (Kasper, 2000), and Writing (Cunningham, 2000, & Kasper 2000). Likewise, Hoven (1999) has underscored the role of computers in creating learners’ autonomy. Similarly, EFL writing researchers and educators have long embraced the tenets of process writing which encourage exploration, conceptualization, multiple drafting, and revision of written products (Matsuda, 2003; Nunan, 2003; Schmitt, 2002).

Consequently, the purpose of this article is to report the results of an experimental study on the effect of using the Windows Making Movie (WMM) versus journal writing on improving EFL writing Proficiency and decreasing writing apprehension.

The Present Study

The present study is conducted in a private high-school in Lebanon where English is used as the language of instruction as well is taught as an important school subject due starting with pre-school and up to grade 12. The importance accorded to studying English as foreign language in the context of this study is based on the perceived vitality of English as an important world language used extensively in the domains of education, communication and commerce. Presently, there are no previous studies which investigated the effect of the WMM technological model in improving the writing proficiency of grade 11 Lebanese learners of EFL and decreasing their levels of writing apprehension.

Specifically, the study addressed the following questions:

1. What is the relative effect of using the WMM journaling in comparison with traditional pen and paper journaling in improving the writing Proficiency of grade 11 learners of EFL?
2. What is the relative effect of using the WMM in comparison with traditional pen and paper journaling in decreasing the writing apprehension level of grade 11 learners of EFL?
3. What are the perceptions of the participants in the experimental group of their experience in using the WMM technological model in their writing class?

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested in order to address the questions raised in the study:

Ho 1: There is no statistically significant difference in the posttest writing proficiency scores of the experimental and control group at the $p \leq 0.05$ alpha level.

Ho 2: There is no statistically significant difference in the posttest writing apprehension scores of the experimental and control group at the $p \leq 0.05$ alpha level.

Literature Review

The Windows Movie Maker

The review of the literature on the development of the Windows Movie Maker (WMM) application suggests that it is a very recent innovation. Version 1.1 of WMM was only included in Windows XP in 2001 and has been installed in computers in its current edition, with music, effects and transitions, only in 2005. Quite naturally, there seems to be at present a noticeable scarcity of research related to WMM journaling and its effects on educational outcomes.

Portnoy (1985) asserts that as students take on creative roles while working on authentic and real life themes in their video production, they will be able to practice authentic language, not only among themselves but also with other users of the language outside the classroom. Consequently, the process of language learning can be made more interesting and meaningful through video as learners are exposed to contexts outside the restrictions of the classroom (Brown & Kegan, 1986; Wagschal, 1987). Similarly, Valmont (1995), Evans (1998) and Rudkin, (2004) maintained that language teachers should be able to maneuver the equipment and software so that the learners would be enabled to utilize the vital functions of the available software applications. The research of Branigan (2005), Ramos (2007), Sweeder (2007) and Alderman and Beyers (2009) asserts that the use of video in the language classroom should not be limited to a mere instructional tool. Instead, student video journals should be encouraged and given importance in order to enhance the learners' confidence and promote proficiency.

The Windows Movie Maker (WMM) is a computer-based application that can be potentially useful in promoting learners' writing skills. Specifically, the WMM tool actively engages learners in the stages of the video production thereby take ownership of their own learning and progressively develop into independent learners. As such, the WMM tool may enhance students' motivation and interest in journal writing as well as increase their proficiency and decrease their apprehension. This is because journaling allows students to express their thoughts and feelings, thereby gaining valuable self-knowledge. It is also a good problem-solving tool. Keeping a journal and writing regularly have been proven to promote writing dexterity and fluency. The preceding review of the literature reveals a strong rationale for using technology and journals in teaching writing. However, previous research on the effectiveness of specific technological models and tools appears to be still scanty or non-existent due to the recentness of this application as shown above.

Studies on Journaling and Writing Proficiency

Regarding the impact of Journal writing on writing proficiency, the extant research on the subject suggests that journal writing enables students to improve their writing skills and promotes critical their thinking (O'Connell & Dymont, 2006). In the same vein, Connor-Greene (2000) reports, "... the students who wrote 15 journals may have received other benefits (e.g. improved writing skills, increased confidence about writing) that are not reflected in their grades on a psychology test." (p. 45). Some research also suggests that journal writing improves students' writing and enhances their learning and writing as reflected in test scores (Connor-Greene, 2000, Bartscher, Lawler, Rameriz, and Schinault, 2001). These researchers reported that the use of reflective journaling is effective, having seen gains in the writing abilities of participants in their research. Similarly, Bartscher et al., (2001) suggests that journal writing improves significantly students' writing, and students "grew into the emotional commitment of expressing their feelings" (p. 46).

However, Cisero (2006) reported that many students did not like the journal assignment and considered journal writing as “just a nuisance,” “busy work,” and “tedious and unnecessary” (p.233). Cisero (2006) also noted that students’ lack of interest in the journal writing activities could provide a clue to the minimal improvement attained by some students. This researcher added stated that “students’ overall ability as well as motivation are factors that need to be considered in future research and effectiveness of journal writing” (p. 234).

Studies on Journaling and Writing Apprehension

Learners of English as a foreign language EFL may experience high levels of speech and writing apprehension when they produce language. However, engaging them in producing their own video projects throughout the teaching/learning process may create a stress-reduced environment which lowers the affective filter of learners and increase their self-confidence due to the interesting nature of videos (Bennette,1988; Kinnaman, 1993; & Clovis 1997). Ullrich and Lutgendorf (2002) assert that, unlike some physical stress management techniques such as yoga or exercise, journal writing is a viable option for the people who need to express themselves. These researchers consider journaling as a great practice for overall stress reduction as well as self-knowledge and emotional healing.

Dunlap (2006) maintained that journal writing decreases writing apprehension and is an enjoyable experience for learners. Likewise, Gau, Hermanson, Logar, and Smerek (2003) reported that reflective journaling supports the educational process given that it promotes writing fluency and quality. These findings echo those reported by Gau et al., (2003) and Hubbs and Brand (2005) who established that reflective journaling could be the key to diminishing student and teachers’ writing apprehension in the classroom. Hubbs and Brand (2005) stated that “... anecdotal evidence suggests that the use of reflective journals can hone students’ reflective skills, assist students in applying course content, help students’ process learning activities, and encourage personal growth and development” (p. 65). These researchers further also report that “... reflective journaling can provide ways to illuminate automatic thinking and habits of mind, and can lead students through a transformative process, especially when the instructor engages the student in mutual dialogue” (p.63). Conversely, Reeves (1997) reports that a writer could be “... more apprehensive when writing personal narratives” and less so “... when writing argumentative or persuasive essays” (p. 39).

Because students enjoy uploading and using authentic materials including pictures and music they choose, WMM journaling may serve as a facilitator for speaking and writing. The benefits of using WMM journaling in language teaching are related to the provisions of rich, authentic, and current information, exposure to colorful visual elements, enhanced flexibility of individual learning pace, reinforced learning of the subject matter, heightened motivation, and increased interest. A number of empirical studies have also indicated that students had an overall positive attitude towards learning in a computer-assisted language learning environment (Felix, 2001; Osuna & Meskill, 1998; Shen, 1999).

The preview suggests that although journal writing may have positive impact on writing development, findings of previous research are somewhat non-conclusive and perspicacious with the regard to the effects of journaling writing proficiency and apprehension..

Methodology

The study employed a quasi-experimental pretest- posttest control design. Two intact classes were randomly assigned to control and experimental conditions and the treatment lasted for 4

weeks of instruction at the rate of 3 class periods per week to teach the language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking along with language rules and mechanics, cultural awareness, and critical thinking in an integrated manner.

Participants

The study was conducted in a public high-school in Beirut, the capital of Lebanon. A convenient sample total of 24 grade 11 EFL learners participated in the study. The participants were randomly assigned to control and experimental conditions, and the sample included a total of 16 males (75 %) and 8 females (25%). All the participants are native speakers of Arabic and came from similar socio-economic backgrounds. They were studying EFL at a rate of 3 hours per week in accordance with the curriculum requirements proclaimed by the National Ministry of Education. A total of 20 students had completed their grade 10 schooling at the same school and the remaining 4 at other public schools which follow the same curriculum. Finally, there were 13 students in the control group and 11 in the experimental group, and the age of the participants ranged from 16- 19 years.

Research Context

As indicated earlier, the research context of the present study is a public high-school in Lebanon. This context is characterized by enrolling students from low socio-economic background with limited opportunities to use English for communication in daily life and outside of school. However, the importance of studying English is emphasized in the context of the present study both as a language of instruction in which all other school subjects are taught with the exception of Arabic language and literature and as an independent school subject as well. This is because English is considered an important international language to be studied starting with kindergarten and up to grade 12 due to its recognized value in communication, education, and commerce. Yet, it should be noted that the majority of students in this study context, as well as in other similar public school contexts, can be considered largely as limited English proficient (LEP) learners and without much access to computers and modern technology, despite the fact that smart boards and computers are becoming more available in many public schools including the site of the present study.

Instruments

Three instruments were used to collect data and measure the variables of writing Proficiency and apprehension under investigation. These included a writing apprehension scale (Appendix I), a journal rubric (Appendix II), and reflection logs. The writing apprehension and journal rubric were used as pre-test and post-test measures of writing apprehension Proficiency. The writing apprehension scale consists of a total of 26 likert-type items. Scores on the negatively worded items (Items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26) were reversed to ensure that high scores mean higher apprehension. The participants in the study indicated their levels of agreement with the statements in the scale by circling a number on range from 1 strongly disagree -6 strongly agree. The internal consistency was moderate (α .54) based on data from the present study. On the other hand, the journal rubric was used to score the pre-writing and post-writing written products of the participants and resulted in a holistic score in the range of 3-15 and converted to a percentage score out of 100 based on the quality of ideas, focus, organization, word choice, and language mechanics shown in the written responses of the participants. Finally, a set guiding

questions which focused on the participants' reaction to the writing assignment, whether they enjoyed their WMM experiences and the expectations and challenges they faced.

Treatment

The treatment lasted for four weeks at the rate of three contact hours of integrated instruction per week. The study participants of both the control and experimental group were asked to perform a journal writing task which required writing a journal in response to a prompt which asked them to describe an experience that touched them and taught them new values. The journal writing instructional component of the control group consisted of traditional pen and paper journal writing practices which included instruction in pre-drafting, drafting, and revision strategies. Specifically, the pre-drafting stage focused on enabling learners to explore their topics in order to generate ideas in addition to learning how to write up their ideas and revise their written products. Meanwhile, the experimental group learners practiced journal writing through using the WMM procedures which involves using computers to incorporate music, pictures, visual effects, word choice, font, design they like

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (Means and Standard Deviations) were calculated on the pre-test and post-test performance scores of learners in the control and experimental groups, following which four independent sample t-tests were conducted to investigate the differences in journal writing proficiency and apprehension prior to and subsequent to the intervention between the groups of learners in the control and experimental groups. The treatment conditions (control vs experimental) were used as an independent variable and journal writing Proficiency and apprehension as dependent variables.

In addition, content analysis was used as the method of data analysis of the qualitative data gathered from learners written reflection logs about their perceptions of the WMM experience. These logs were used to write up the study results regarding learners' perceptions.

Results

Findings on journal writing proficiency

We found that, prior to intervention; there was no significant difference in the writing proficiency of the participants in the control group and the experimental group. ($M = 66.33$, $SD = 5.77$) and the experimental group ($M = 62.72$, $SD = 4.85$), $t(21) = -1.61$, $P = .12$.

Conversely, after the intervention, the experimental group outperformed the control group: Control group ($M = 74.66$, $SD = 4.86$) and the experimental group ($M = 84.27$, $SD = 4.81$), $t(21) = 4.75$, $P = .00$. The effect size of improvement was $d = 1.96$, which suggests a highly significant gain in proficiency from an educational point of view. Therefore, the first null hypothesis of the study regarding difference in the posttest writing performance of the control and experimental group was rejected.

Findings on writing apprehension

Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference in the writing apprehension of the participants in the control group ($M = 92.85$, $SD = 9.68$) and the experimental group ($M = 97.25$, $SD = 42.02$), $t(29) = .36$, $P = .70$.

Meanwhile, the post-test intervention difference between the two groups was statistically significant: Control group ($M = 89.71$, $SD = 11.06$) and the experimental group ($M = 67.4$, $SD = 31.82$), $t(25) = -2.20$, $P = .03$. The effect size of improvement was $d = 1.90$, which also suggests a highly significant gain in decreasing writing apprehension. Therefore, the second null hypothesis of the study regarding difference in the posttest writing apprehension of the control and experimental group was rejected.

Findings on perceptions of WMM Journaling Experience

The results of the content analysis of qualitative data from reflective logs about learners' experience with the WMM suggest two aspects of interest: 1) the importance of using WMM in the writing process and 2) the usefulness of this educational tool in teaching EFL writing skills, in general, and journal writing in particular. Specifically, the theme of the importance of the WMM emerged from the data as many learners in the experimental group expressed their positive perception of this experience. For instance, while some learners expressed satisfaction upon the completion of the video, one learner reported that "the most interesting part was adding the pictures and the frustrating part was editing as we didn't realize that after applying the effects we need to relocate all the subtitles the second time for the whole video." Another said, "the most beautiful part was adding the music which helped me with creating a soothing impact." A third learner added, "the good part was the freedom in choosing the animations that made the script look great." Two other learners respectively asserted, the lovely part was the color and the font of the script, easily chosen. "Nothing was boring or difficult and that was the good thing."

Some learners highlighted the elements that led to the success of the WMM journaling when one of the grade 11 learners wrote, "the teacher managed to give all the needed steps, and she showed us the creation of the whole process." Another learner also wrote, "all of my group members had contributed their ideas and helped me with getting my video journal done. The teamwork was practiced in my group. We managed to help each other with the making the video journals."

The majority of the learners asserted the relevance of WMM journaling to language learning when three learners respectively wrote, "I think video journaling was relevant to my study. This is because I can learn the language, express myself and use the pictures and the computer skills I want from this video."

"We learned how to use English in a meaningful way. I learned a lot on this assignment because I gained more confidence when giving ideas and thoughts."

"I learned more about the lovely effect of journaling through using the pictures that harmonize with the words used."

This positive perception was also echoed in the comments of other learners who wrote that "I learned to be more confident, and I loved the music expressing my words." "I enhanced my computer skills. I discovered the creative side of me." "I learnt not only how to write but also to express myself confidently from this assignment." "I enjoyed the Movie Maker production." "I learned a lot during the movie production because I learned how to speak fluently and write accurately."

Another student added, "I learned a lot about the movie maker software and computer skills." Along similar lines, another learner remarked, "I like how the movie tells stories related to the outer world. After all, my movie was based on my true stories. I liked about the concept of my video because it voiced out my situation and my own dream without getting 'permission' or receive 'judgment' or 'consideration', from my parents."

These comments and remarks suggest that the MM journaling is perceived as an important teaching tool by learners. These remarks also show that the learners in the study have perceived the WMM journaling experience as very useful in employing language to freely and interestingly express their thoughts on their own.

Discussion

The present study set to examine the relative effectiveness of the Windows Movie Maker technological tool in improving EFL Journal writing proficiency and decreasing feelings of writing apprehension. As discussed earlier, the results proved to be positive given that the learners who produced EFL journal writing using the WMM outperformed their counterparts who produced the same content according to the dynamics of traditional journal writing. These findings corroborate those of Portnoy (1985), Brown and Kegan(1986), Wagschal (1987),Valmont (1995), Evans (1998) ,Rudkin, (2004), Branigan (2005), Ramos (2007), Sweeder(2007) and Alderman and Beyers, (2009), O’Connell & Dymont(2006) ,Connor-Greene (2000) , and Bartscher, Lawler, Rameriz, and Schinault(2001) who assert that video journals should be encouraged and given importance in order to enhance the learners’ confidence and promote proficiency. Conversely, the results of the study contradict with those of Cisero (2006) reported that many students did not like the journal assignment and considered journal writing as“tedious and unnecessary” (p.233).

Concerning writing apprehension, the findings of the present study corroborate those of Bennette(1988), Kinnaman (1993), Clovis (1997) , Ullrich and Lutgendorf (2002), Dunlap (2006), Gau, Hermanson, Logar, and Smerek (2003), and Hubbs and Brand (2005) who report that journal writing decreases writing apprehension. The findings of the present study, however, are not in agreement with those of Reeves (1997) who maintain that a writer could be “... more apprehensive when writing personal narratives” and less so “... when writing argumentative or persuasive essays” (p. 39).

A probable explanation of the efficacy and positive attitudes towards WMM journaling could be attributed to the provision of opportunities for students to write using a variety of pictures, visual effects, music, animations, fonts, designs and text. However, future research should be conducted involving representative samples of different EFL populations and grade levels in order to determine to what extent the findings of the present study are generalizable as well as determine the effect of context-specific factors such as gender, linguistic composition, and levels of first and foreign language proficiency on the interface of technology and language Proficiency and dispositions.

The present study revealed that the grade 11 students were generally motivated and excited about the WMM journaling although initially there were some hesitations due to lack of experience as well as skills in movie-making. Detailed process on operating the WMM software before the commencement of the project was found to be vital and necessary as some subjects disclosed their dissatisfaction mainly during the video-editing process. The WMM journaling project was able to draw out the students’ creativity in integrating language with computer skills. Students also responded that the WMM project has raised their self-esteem, and they were more willing to express themselves using EFL. Above all, student-created video is an authentic way to link language learning to the real life setting outside the language classroom. All teachers who wish to engage their students in authentic language learning should consider classroom videos.

Limitations

The present study employed a relatively small and convenient sample size, which has negative implications for the generalizability of the findings into other contexts. Further research with a larger and more representative sample size should be conducted in order to test the generalizability of the findings as well as examine the interaction of the treatment effects of with other contextual variables such as students, level of language proficiency, gender, technology apprehension.

Conclusion

It is probable in the future that WMM as a computer –assisted learning tool will continue to be an important component in teaching writing. As such, language teachers should be fully aware of how computer-assisted language learning tools can benefit language teaching, learning and educational outcomes more generally.

References

- Alderman, I. M. and Beyers, D. J. (2009), Documentary visions, theological insights. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 12, 233–247.
- Anderson, C. M., & MacCurdy, M. M. (2000). *Writing and Healing: Toward an Informed Practice*. Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bartscher, M., Lawler, K., Rameriz, A., Schinault, K. (2001). Improving student's writing ability through journals and creative writing exercises. (Report No. CS 217 644) Chicago, IL: Saint Xavier University & IRI/Skylight. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 455525).
- Bennett, J. (1988). Student-produced video: Focus on learning. *Tech Trends*, 33(1), 32.
- Braine, G. (1997). Beyond word processing: Networked computers in ESL writing classes. *Computers and Composition*, 14(1), 45-58.
- Branigan, C. (2005). Video goes to school. *eSchool News*, 8(4), 25-29.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Brown, L. K. & Kegan, P. (1989). *Taking advantage of media*. Boston: Routledge.
- Cisero, C. (2006). Does reflective journal writing improve course performance? *College Teaching*, 54(2), 231-236.
- Clarke, D., Waywood, A., & Stephens, M. (1993). Probing the structure of mathematical writing. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 25, 235-250.
- Connor-Greene, P. (2000). Making connections: Evaluating the effectiveness of journal writing in enhancing student learning. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27(1), 44-46.
- Clovis, D.L. (1997). Lights, Television, Action!. *Educational Leadership*, 55(3), 38-40.
- Cunningham, K. (2000). Integrating CALL into the Writing Curriculum. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Vol. VI No.5. Retrieved May 2000 from World Wide Web: www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/Articles/Cunningham-CALLWriting/
- Douillard, K. (2000). Implementation of ... Reflective friday: time out to think. *National Writing Project, The Quarterly-Fall*, 29-35.

- Dunlap, J.C. (2006). Using guided reflective journaling activities to capture students' changing perceptions. *Tech Trends*, 50(6), 20-26.
- Evans, P. (1998). A self-learning project with undergraduate accountancy students using video and computer technology. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 13(3), 729 – 746.
- Felix, U. (2001). *A multivariate analysis of students' experience of web-based learning. Proceedings of the ASCILITE Conference*. Retrieved January 20, 2014, from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet17/felix.html>.
- Gau, E., Hermanson, J., Logar, M., Smerek, C. (2003). Improving student attitudes and writing abilities through increased writing time and opportunities. (Report No. CS 512 508). Chicago, IL: Saint Xavier University & IRI /Skylight. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED481441)
- Hubbs, D.L., and Brand, C.F. (2005). The paper mirror: Understanding reflective journaling. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 28(1), 60-71.
- Hoven, D. (1999). A Model for Listening and Viewing Comprehension in Multimedia Environments. *Language Learning & Technology*, 3(1), 88-103.
- Huff, R., and C. Kiline (1987). *The Contemporary Writing Curriculum: Rehearsing, Composing, and Valuing*. New York: Teachers College.
- Kasper, L. F. (2000). New technologies, new literacies: Focus discipline research and ESL learning communities. *Language Learning & Technology*, 4 (2), Retrieved on 3 July, 2104 from <http://ilt.msu.edu/vol104num102/kasper/default.html>: 109-128.
- Kinnaman, D.E. (1993). Technology and situated cognitive. *Technology and Learning*, 14 (1) 86.
- Levin, S. (2010). Student created video. *Knowledge Quest Film in Education*, 38 (4), 52–55.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15-34). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McCoy, S. (2011). Pedagogic truth in the age of YouTube. *Journal of Singing*. 67 (5), 549–550.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. U.S.: Heinle & Heinle.
- O'Connell, T. & Dymont, J. (2006). Reflections on using journals in higher education: a focus group discussion with faculty. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(6), 671-691.
- Osuna, M. M., & Meskill, C. (1998). Using the World Wide Web to integrate Spanish language and culture: A pilot study. *Language Learning & Technology*, 1 (2), 71-92.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon* 9, 5.
- Portnoy, K. (1985). *Video in script writing projects. Media and Methods*, 22 (2), 13–15.
- Ramos, P.H. (2007). Aim, shoot, ready! Future teachers learn to do video. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38 (1), 33–41.
- Reeves, L. (1997). Minimizing writing apprehension in the learner-centered classroom. *English Journal*, 86(6), 38-45.
- Rudkin J. (2004). *The instructional design portfolio: Students video project impacts lives beyond the classroom. Tech Trends*, 48 (3), 62–64.

- Schmitt, N. (2002). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. (Ed.). London: Arnold & Oxford University Press.
- Shen, J. (1999). Learner anxiety & computer-assisted writing. *CALL-EJ*, 3 (2). Retrieved on February 2, 2014, from <http://www.tell.is.ritsumei.ac.jp/callej/3-2/shen.html>
- Sweeder, J. (2008). *Differentiating Instruction through Digital Storytelling*. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, 967-974.
- Ullrich, P. M., & Lutgendorf, S. K. (2002). Journaling about stressful events: Effects of cognitive processing and emotional expression. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 244.
- Wagschal, P.H. (1987). *Literacy in the electronic age*. *Education Technology*, 27 (6), 5–9.

Appendix A**Writing Apprehension**

Please circle the number of the alternative below the statement that best indicates your feelings about that statement.

1. I avoid writing.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

4. I am afraid of writing journals when I know they will be evaluated.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

5. Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

6. Handing in a composition course is a very frightening experience.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a journal .

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

9. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

10. I like to write my ideas down.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

11. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 12. I like to have my friends read what I have written. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 13. I'm nervous about writing. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 14. People seem to enjoy what I write. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 15. I enjoy writing. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 16. I never seem to enjoy what I write. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 17. Writing is a lot of fun. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 18. I expect to do poorly in writing classes even before I enter them. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a journal writing course. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |
| 22. when I hand in a journal , I know I'm going to do poorly. | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|--|
| 23. it's easy for me to write good journals . | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree | |
| 24. I don't think I write as well as most other people. | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree | |
| 25. I don't like my journals to be evaluated. | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree | |
| 26. I'm no good at writing. | | | | | | | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree | |

Appendix B

Rubric for Journal

1. *Adapted from Rubric for Journals and Essays.doc - BWSD*
www.bwsd.k12.wi.us/highschool/.../Rubric%20for%20Journals%20and...

s

| Content | Voice | Rules |
|--|---|---|
| 5 The journal is well thought out, honest, and creative. The entry is emotionally deep. | 5 The entry is engaging, honest and legible. The questions and answers are included. | 5 The entry has few grammar and spelling mistakes. There are no fragments or run-on sentences. |
| 3 The journal entry is honest, creative, but lacks diving deep. | 3 The journal entry is honest and engaging. The entry includes the answers, but not the re-written questions. | 3 The journal entry has noticeable grammar and spelling mistakes. |
| 1 The journal entry lacks honesty and creativity. There are one word answers. | 1 The journal entry lacks honesty, hard to read, and is rambling. The questions are not re-written and the answers are hard to follow. | 1 The journal entry is difficult to read due to too many errors in grammar. |