

‘ , 가

(* , **)

· ‘ , 가
『 』, 2002, 7 , 2 , 225-247.

· ‘ , 가 5
- 6 20 15 ‘ ,
,
, (, , ,)
, ‘ , ,
,

·
:

·
,
,
가 ,
(Vallecorsa, Ledford &
Parnell, 1991).
가
가
, ‘ , ‘ , ‘ ,
가

· ,

44 % (,

‘ , 가

1996).

(, 1997).

) .

, , 가

. 가,

(Newcomer & Barenbaum, 1991).

가

가

(Stoddard & MacArthur, 1993).

.

, ,

(MacArthur et al., 1995), 가

가 (Hiebert & Fisher, 1990).

‘ (collaborative writing)’가 .

, 가 (shared writing)’

(Williams & Wason, 1977; Marther & Lachowicz, 1992).

‘ , 가

(Marther & Lachowicz, 1992),

(Schraeder, 1997).

가 .

, 가

(Marther & Lachowicz, 1992).

.

‘ , , . Marther & Lachowicz

(1992) , , 가

,
 ,
 .
 ‘ ,
 (Marther & Lachowicz, 1992). ‘ ,
 ,
 (, 1997). ‘
 ,
 . Peery (1996)
 , 가
 .
 ‘ , , Routman (1997)
 (writing aloud),
 (guided writing) ‘ , , Marther & Lachowicz
 (1992) 가
 ‘ , 가
 .
 (1994) ‘ ,
 ,
 . (1997)
 ,
 (1) , (2) (), (3) 가
 가
 ,
 .
 Daiute & Dalton (1992) 3 14 ‘
 , , ‘ ,
 . ‘ , ,
 , ‘ 가 가
 .
 , (1999)

‘ ’ 가
 가
 (1998) 가
 . ‘ ’
 .
 , ‘ ’ 가
 ‘
 ’ 가 가
 :
 (, , ,) ‘ ’
 가 가?

1.

K 5 6 20
 , 5 4 6 6 10
 . 5, 6
 (Vallecorsa, Ledford & Parnell, 1991),
 ‘ ’
 (MacArthur et al., 1995).
 (KEDI-WISC, , 1991) 가 85 ,
 가 5 % (,
 1990), (/)
 90 . , ,
 . (,), /
 t- 가
 .

2.

가. /

. ‘ 가 ’
, , (, ,
) 가 .
가 가 .
.
‘ (< - 1>)’ ‘ (< -
2>)’ 15
, (1993) ‘ , (1997) ‘
,
5, 6 가
. ,
2 . / 가
, 가
.

3.

2000 9 14 10 28 7
, , .
. 가 ,
,
. .
.

‘ , 가

가.

‘가’, 40.

가 가 < - 3> 가 가 .

•

가 = _____ × 100

가 = $\frac{\quad}{\quad + \quad} \times 100$

가 = $\frac{\quad + \quad}{\quad} \times 100$

•

가 15 ‘ , .

(1) 15 1 .

•

가 15

(2) $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 = \emptyset$.

$$(3) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}} \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial x},$$

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

15 ‘ ’ ,
(‘ 가 ’) 가 40
가 , 가
97 %, 99 %, 94 % .

$$[(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}] \times 100]$$
$$[(\quad) \backslash (\quad)] \times 100]$$
$$[(\quad) \gamma (\quad)] \times 100]$$
$$[(\quad) / (\quad)] \times 100]$$
$$[(\text{---})/(\text{---}) \times 100]$$
$$[(\quad) \backslash (\quad)] \times 100]$$

■

 $\langle \sigma_{\text{tot}} \rangle = 2.0 \text{ mb}$, 0.1 %
$$(F_{(1,17)} = 26.656, p < .001).$$

	(n = 10) M(SD)	(n = 10) M(SD)
	18.30 (1.91)	17.10 (1.83)
	25.40 (1.43)	20.10 (2.81)
	24.97	20.54

‘ , ’ 가

< - 2>

				<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	33.151	1	33.151	10.037	.006
	88.042	1	88.042	26.656	.000***
	56.149	17	3.303		
	229.750	19			

****p* < .001.

2.

‘ , ’ ,
< - 3> < - 4> .

< - 3>

	(<i>n</i> = 10) M (SD)	(<i>n</i> = 10) M (SD)
	143.50 (71.50)	142.30 (23.93)
	172.10 (69.79)	158.70 (23.93)
	171.53	159.27

< - 4> ()

				<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	46847.578	1	46847.578	372.603	.000
	750.428	1	750.428	5.969	.026*
	2137.422	17	125.731		
	49882.800	19			

**p* < .05

< - 4> , 5 %
가 ($F_{(1,17)} = 5.969, p < .05$). , ‘ , ’ 가
가 .

3.

< - 5>

< - 5>

F

	M (SD) (n = 10)	M (SD) (n = 10)	<i>F</i> ()
(1)	81.61 (21.43) 93.38 (7.95) 94.84	88.41 (11.59) 89.46 (9.01) 88.00	12.346**
(2)	75.16 (19.45) 89.57 (7.11) 88.36	70.27 (22.43) 77.92 (15.64) 79.13	9.947**
(3)	75.24 (32.12) 95.32 (10.17) 92.56	58.19 (31.30) 77.06 (19.29) 79.82	5.353*
(4)	85.20 (8.57) 96.80 (2.39) 96.20	82.80 (12.89) 85.00 (9.60) 85.60	27.669***
가.	91.50 (5.60) 97.60 (2.95) 95.97	86.50 (11.03) 90.10 (10.02) 91.73	3.537
.	76.10 (19.35) 97.30 (6.46) 98.43	85.90 (14.97) 87.40 (10.56) 86.27	10.571**
.	90.00 (11.24) 94.30 (7.51) 90.85	80.80 (17.85) 82.90 (16.95) 86.35	1.854
.	95.80 (5.69) 98.00 (4.22) 98.10	87.90 (15.31) 91.50 (15.81) 91.40	1.474
.	91.20 (11.27) 99.10 (2.85) 98.70	79.00 (21.55) 79.10 (20.75) 79.50	5.575*
.	65.44 (33.38) 93.11 (10.53) 94.20	77.12 (36.65) 79.00 (34.08) 77.91	1.126

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001.

‘ , 가

< - 5> , , 1 %

가 ($F_{(1,17)} = 12.346, p < .01$). , ‘ , 가

·

1 % 가

($F_{(1,17)} = 9.947, p < .01$). , ‘ , 가

·

5 % 가

($F_{(1,17)} = 5.353, p < .05$). , ‘ , 가

·

0.1 %

가 ($F_{(1,17)} = 27.669, p < .001$). 6가 ,

($F_{(1,17)} = 10.571, p < .01$), ($F_{(1,17)} = 5.575, p < .05$)

가 , ‘ , 가

· , , ,

5 % 가

·

1.

0.1 % , Daiute &

Dalton (1992) . 가

,

·

Wong et al. (1996) . ‘ ,

가 .

,

‘ ’ 가

가 , 가

가 가

(0-6)가 가

가 가

가 6가

가 , (1999)

가 ,

Wong et al. (1996)

가 ,

가 ,

가 가

가 가

가 , ‘ ’ 가

가 ‘ ’ 가

가 ,

가 , ‘ ’ 가

가 ,

가 ,

가 ,

가 ,

가

가

3.

가
가 ,
가 , 5 %
가 . ,
15 7 .
가 .
가 .
‘ , ,
, ,
, 가
(Marther & Lachowicz, 1992)
, ‘
, ,
, ,
, ,
, ,
, ,
,
가
가 가
, ‘ , 가
가 . ,
,
,
가 ,
‘ ,

- 가
- ,
- .
- (1997).
- (1997). 『 : 』.
- (1992). 가 .
- (1996).
- (1991). 『Korean Educational Development Institute Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children (KEDI-WISC)』. :
- (1999).
- (1994). - 『 』, 10, 199-244.
- (1996). 『 : 』.
- (1998). 가
- (1997). 가 .
- (1997). :
- (1990). 『 : 』.
- (1993). 『 : 』.
- Angeletti, S. R. (1990). Collaborative writing in a second grade classroom. ERIC ED 319069.
- Bajtelsmit, L. & Naab, H. (1994). Partner writers: A shared reading and writing experience. *Reading Teacher*, 48, 91-93.
- Bondy, K. & Brownel, A. (1997). Overcoming barriers to collaboration among partners-in-teaching. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 33, 112-115.
- Dagenais, D. J. & Beadle, K. R. (1984). Written language: When and where to begin. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 4, 59-85.
- Daiute, C. & Dalton, B. (1992). Collaboration between children learning to write: Can novices be masters? ERIC Digest. ED 354522.
- DeGross, L. J. (1993). Process-writing teacher's responses to fourth-grade writer's first drafts. *The*

- Elementary School Journal*, 93, 131-141.
- Englert, C. S. (1992). Writing instruction from a sociocultural perspectives: The holistic, dialogic, and social enterprise of writing. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 25, 153-172.
- First, C., MacMillan, B. & Levy, C. (1995). Writing process versatility. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 13, 21-27.
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., MacArthur, C. A. & Schwartz, S. S. (1991). Writing and writing instruction with students with learning disabilities: A review of a program of research. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 14, 89-114.
- Graham, S., MacArthur, C., Schwartz, S. & PageVoth, V. (1992). Improving the compositions of students with learning disabilities using a strategy involving product and process goal setting. *Educational Children*, 58, 322-334.
- Harris, K., & Pressley, M. (1991). The nature of cognitive strategy instruction: Interactive strategy construction. *Exceptional Children*, 57, 392-404.
- Hiebert, E. H. & Fisher, C. M. (1990). Whole language: Three themes for the future. *Educational Leadership*, 47, 62-64.
- MacArthur, C. A. (1996). Using technology to enhance the writing process of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29, 344-354.
- MacArthur, C., Graham, S., Schwartz, S. & Schafer, W. (1995). Evaluation of a writing instruction model that integrated a process approach, strategy instruction, and word processing. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 18, 278-291.
- MacArthur, C., Schwartz, S. & Graham, S. (1991). Effects of a reciprocal peer revision strategy in special education classrooms. *Learning Disability Research and Practice*, 6, 201-210.
- Marther, N. & Lachowicz, B. L. (1992). Shared writing: An instructional approach for reluctant writers. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 25, 26-30.
- Murau, A. M. (1993). Shared writing: Students' perceptions and attitudes of peer review. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 9, 71-79.
- Newcomer, P. L. & Barenbaum, E. M. (1991). The written composing ability of children with learning disabilities: A review of the literature from 1980 to 1990. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24, 578-593.
- Palinscar, A. & Klenk, L. (1992). Fostering literacy learning in supportive contexts. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 25, 211-225.
- Peery, R. (1996). The effects of the shared writing process on reading comprehension of second and third grade students. Unpublished master's dissertation, Salem-Teikyo University.
- Routman, R. (1997). Back to the basics of whole language. *Educational Leadership*, 54(5), 70-74.
- Schraeder, L. (1997). Teaching narrative writing through the collaborative funnel. ERIC ED 415717.
- Slavin, R. E. & Stevens, R. J. (1995). Effects of a cooperative learning approach in reading and writing on academically handicapped and nonhandicapped students. *Elementary School Journal*, 95, 241-262.

- Stoddard, B. & MacArthur, C. A. (1993). A peer editor strategy: Guiding learning disabled students in response and revision. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27, 76-103.
- Stires, S. (1993). Real audiences and context for LD writers. *Academic Therapy*, 18, 561-568.
- Vallecorsa, A. & Garriss, C. (1990). Story composition skills of middle-grade students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 57, 48-53.
- Vallecorsa, A. L., Ledford, R. P. & Parnell, G. G. (1991). Strategies for teaching composition skills to students with learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 23, 52-55.
- Williams, J. & Wason, P. (1977). Collaborative writing games. Descriptive reports.
- Wong, B. Y. L., Butler, D. L., Ficzero, S. A. & Kuperis, S. (1996). Teaching low achievers and students with learning disabilities to plan, write, and revise opinion essays. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29, 197-212.

< - 1>

, ‘ ’ .

:					
		(/)			(/)
1			9	,	
2			10		
3	가		11		
4	가		12		
5			13	가	
6			14		
7			15		
8					

< - 2> ()

가.

가 . ____: _____ _____ : _____

.

‘ , 가

[illegible]

< - 3>

가 가				
		1	2	3
1.	가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	. (1-2 .)			
1 :	.			
2.	가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	.			
3.	가?			
3 :	.(2 .)			
2 :	.			
1 :	(1 .)			
	.(.)			
4.	가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	.			
5.	가 가 가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	가 .			
6.	가 가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	.			
7.	() 가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	. (가 1-2 .)			
1 :	.			
8.	가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	.			
9.	가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	.			
10.	() 가?			
3 :	.			
2 :	.			
1 :	.			

ABSTRACT

The Effects of Collaborative Writing on Written Expression Ability in Elementary Students with Composition Disabilities

Sung - mi, Bae (Seoul Pungnap Elementary School)

Hyun - Sook, Park (Dept. of Special Education,
Ewha Womans University)

The collaborative writing is a method by which a student shares the actual process of composition with his/her writing partner(s), and they alternate turns to complete the composition. A teacher, another student, or a group of student can be writing partner(s), and a teacher was chosen as the writing partner in this study. The purpose of this study was to test the effects of the writing instruction by the collaborative writing on written expression ability in elementary students with composition disabilities. For this purpose, 20 elementary students with composition difficulties were selected (8 from 5th grade and 12 from 6th grade) to be divided into two groups, an experimental and a control. The two groups were trained for 7 weeks (15 40 - minutes sessions) through the stages of choosing a title, planning, writing, and revising their writing products. In the stage of writing, the experimental group wrote the product collaboratively with a teacher and the control group wrote it individually. The written expression ability was evaluated by measuring story contents, story length, and story correctness using pre- and post-test. ANCOVA was used to analyze the collected data utilizing the pretest scores as covariates. The results obtained from this study are summarized as follows: (1) A significant difference was found between the experimental and the control groups in story contents, showing significantly higher performance in the former group; (2) A significant difference was found between the two groups in story length, showing significantly longer performance in the experimental group; and (3) The experimental group showed significantly higher performance in story correctness, that is, spelling, spacing words, punctuation, and grammar (in total). In terms of grammar, however, significant differences were found between the two groups in modifier and word order, while no significant differences were found in auxiliary words, subject-predicate concord, tense, and conjunction. In conclusion, these results imply that

‘ , 가

the written expression ability of students with composition disabilities could be enhanced by providing them with composition instruction through the collaborative writing.

- ▶ : 2002 5 30
- ▶ : 2002 7 16
- ▶ (1):
- ▶ ():

, e-mail: hspark@ewha.ac.kr