

The Syllabus Design of a Blended EFL University Writing Course

Ping-Ju CHEN

Soochow University, Taipei, Taiwan

Due to the importance of English written communication in the era of Internet, more and more colleges in Taiwan offer English writing courses for their students to enhance their competitiveness by way of good English writing ability. Literature on teaching ESL/EFL writing provides writing teachers with a lot of instructional ideas. The advent of computer later not only influences but also changes writing teachers' ways of instruction. With the prevalence of social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, Google+, etc., nowadays, it seems that writing teachers do not lack instructional ideas because practitioners are willing to share their experiences on the forums. The author, however, thinks that teachers would appreciate suggestions for designing an integrated writing course instead of busy collecting scattered ideas all the time. Hence, following educational principles of syllabus design, L1 & L2 writing models, and research on computer-assisted writing, the author proposes a blended EFL writing course which integrates traditional classroom activities and technology. It is hoped that the attempt will provide some useful guidelines for EFL writing teachers who wish to integrate technology into their conventional writing courses.

Keywords: EFL, blended learning, course design, computer-assisted English writing

Introduction

As defined by Bonk and Graham (2006), blended learning means the synthesis of a wide variety of learning methods. Nowadays, according to Norm (2012), blended learning mostly combines Internet and digital media with established classroom structures. In the field of foreign language learning and teaching, due to the validation of the effectiveness of technology in recent studies, blended instruction has been increasingly adopted by practitioners. Studies conducted for teaching and learning English as A Second/Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) showed that computer-assisted language learning (CALL) can *motivate learners* (e.g., CHANG, 2005; Cummings, 2004; Mahmood, Huzaina, Ghani, & Rajindra, 2014; Polat, Mancilla, & Mahalingappa, 2013; Hartman et al., 1991; Hoffman, 1994; Keller, 1999; Mabrito, 1992; Pennington & Brock, 1992; Phinny, 1991; Phinney & Mathis, 1990; Sullivan & Pratt, 1996; Ushida, 2005; Vinther, 2011; Warschauer, 1996b), *develop learner autonomy* (Chik, 2014; Fuchs, Hauck, & Muller-Hatmann, 2012; Kessler & Bikowski, 2010; Rosell-Aguilar, 2013; YANG, 2015), *reduce anxiety* (Mabrito, 1992; Kessler, 2010; Phinney, 1991; Ritter, 1993), *increase learners' participation* (Gonza'lez-Bueno, 1998; Miceli, Murray, & Kennedy, 2010; Peterson, 2010)

Ping-Ju CHEN, assistant professor, Ph.D., English Department, Soochow University, Taipei, Taiwan.

and class interaction (Bahrani, 2011; Beatty, 2003; Hwu, 1997), and even raise learners' metalinguistic awareness (CHEN, 2016). Though being enthusiastic for experimenting a blended writing course, most of the time, teachers are at a loss for finding an appropriate design model to follow. As a matter of fact, the design model for informing teachers of the essential elements of a blended writing course has not been found yet (Wold, 2011), let alone dictating the proportions of each element. Nevertheless, the attempt seems not be in vain. We teachers do have something to guide us. During the process of developing a general CALL model, Egbert, Hanson-Smith, and Chao (2007) argued that educators do not need a discrete theory of CALL to understand the role of technology in the classroom and believed that a clear theory of second language acquisition (SLA) and its implications for the learning environment would well serve the goal. Therefore, abiding by the widely acknowledged ideas of SLA, especially suggestions for L2 writing and EFL instructional design (e.g., Allwright, 1981; Benson & Voller, 1997; Grab & Kaplan, 1996; Grab, 2001; Hayes, 1996; Nunan, 1989; Richards, 2001; Spolsky, 1989), the author designs a blended university writing course and will put it into practice for one year in a university in the northern Taiwan. This paper reviews the literature that is related to the course design, describes the process of the design, and displays the content of the syllabus with annotations.

Background and Rationale

L1 & L2 Writing Models

By raising a number of differences between L1 and L2 writing, Grab (2001) stated that "At present, there are no specifically L2 theories of writing development nor are there strongly predictive models of writing for L1 contexts" (Silva & Matsuda, 2001, p. 46). In order to consider the possibilities for developing a theory of L2 writing, after analyzing two descriptive writing models, one proposed by Hayes (1996) and the other by Grab and Kaplan (1996), Grab (2001) finally turned to a *conditions approach* because he thought that it was a good way to embrace a large set of components about L2 writing that would need to be accounted for (p. 54). *A conditions approach*, in fact, echoes Egbert et al.'s (2007) call for the theory of SLA in developing a general CALL model (see Appendix A). In a similar vein, Grab suggested researchers to follow Spolsky's (1989) lead for SLA and categorizes conditions on writing development. The major categories for conditions on learning to write are as follows:

- (1) Knowing the language;
- (2) Knowing how to use the language (communicative competence);
- (3) The human learner;
- (4) Individual abilities and preferences;
- (5) The social context;
- (6) Attitudes and Motivation;
- (7) Opportunities for learning and practice;
- (8) Formal instructional contexts;
- (9) Processing factors;
- (10) Cultural variability;
- (11) Content and topical knowledge;
- (12) Discourse, genre, and register knowledge (p. 53).

Computer-Assisted English Writing

The computer as a writing tool and communication medium has changed how and why people write as well as changed the teaching practice among teachers. In her study on the effectiveness of applying technology to teach English composition, CHEN (2010; 2016) has pointed out that computer technology, with its variable affordances at different times, has been used to help learners improve their writing from word processors, computer-mediated communication (CMC), Internet, to Web 2.0's blogs.

The earliest and the most cited benefits of computer application to writing is *word-processors* (Akyel & Kamisli, 1999; Neu & Scarcella, 1991; Pennington & Brock, 1992; Phinny, 1991; Phinny & Mathis, 1990). Word processors are useful for learning to write because they facilitate the mechanical processes, ease the process of revising, and help produce appealing and intelligible finished copy (e.g., Hoffman, 1994; Pennington, 1996a; Steelman, 1994). Other than these benefits, word processors are found to improve students' attitudes toward writing (Joram, Woodruff, Lindsay, & Bryson, 1990; Beck & Fetherston, 2003) and build up their confidence (Beck & Fetherston, 2003; Hardy, 1999). They also help students brainstorm, plan, and produce longer texts (Bangert-Drowns, 1993; Pennington, 2003), increase the time, type, and depth of students' revisions (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Pennington, 1996a; 1996b; 1999a; 1999b; 2003), and produce better work (Goldberg, Russell, & Cook, 2003).

Computer-Mediated Communication

Following word processors, the development and spread of computer-mediated communication (CMC), later on, had a significant impact on teaching and learning writing in less than a decade. CMC is defined as "multimodal, often (but not exclusively) Internet-mediated communication" (Thorne, 2008, pp. 325-336) which can utilize a wide variety of online tools including social networking site, virtual realities, gaming, etc. (Goertler, 2009, p. 75). CMC can be asynchronous including email exchanges, listserves, and message board type of communication (e.g., bulletin boards and discussion board) as well as synchronous including online chat rooms and text-based virtual reality, such as multi-user domains (MUDs) and multi-user domains object oriented (MOOs).

With networking technology, teachers, native speakers, and students can be linked and formed a specific learning community to develop collaborative work or gain input from one another. It has been shown that online writing through linking computers together can help learners gain a deeper understanding of texts, audiences, and their peers as well as help them seek out the resources they need for developing their ideas (Pennington, 2003). This embodies both socio-cultural learning theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf, 2000) and SLA interactionist theory (Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long, 1996) as evidenced in some writing research (e.g., Bruce, Peyton, & Bastson, 1993; Bruce & Rubin, 1993; Gere, 1987; Hartman et al., 1991; Mabrito, 1992; Palmquist, 1993; Park, 2000; Warschauer, 1996a; 1997), which suggest that learning is co-constructed jointly through interaction and collaboration. In a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of CMC in second language acquisition (2000-2012), LIN (2015) found that CMC is more effective in facilitating the acquisition of writing skills among the four language skills. For example, in some experimental studies, CMC is proved to be able to increase learners' writing fluency (Camacho, 2008; Fellner & Apple, 2006; Hung, 2007), boost their motivation to write (Amer, 2006; Warschauer, 1996b), and change their attitudes toward writing (HUANG & Hung, 2008; Mahdi & El-Naim, 2013). Other than

these, in networking writing environments, learners are also found to value peer support in their composing process (Hyland, 2003; LIN, LIU, & Sie, 2009) and peer-response/review activity seems to benefit the revision practices for it raises learners' awareness of the writing processes (CHEN, 2016; Stoddard & MacArthur, 1993).

Internet

The Internet, alone, with its makeup of linked hypertext sites, has a profound impact on students' learning to write. Studies have shown that the hypertext modes can spark students' creativity and draw their attention to meaning (Marcoul & Pennington, 1999; Warschauer, 2004). These "layered texts" (Pennington, 2003) which are presented in the form of textual, visual, auditory, or any combination of these may help support "an enriched network of thoughts and associations that assists writers to explore and develop their ideas" (Pennington, 1996a, p. 23). In addition to the hypertext/multimedia effect on composing, the Internet itself is a goldmine for language learning/teaching resources. Available on the web are various online writing projects and resources targeted for different levels of learners, e.g., keypal exchange sites, online dictionaries, thesaurus, online writing centers, grammar references, discussion lists, corpora, writing tools, etc. With the advent of the Internet, learners are undergoing not only individual but also collaborative learning at the same time in a writing class. They reach out the world beyond themselves via the Internet; meanwhile, they can set up their personal blogs or webs to create their own writing agenda as an autonomous learner.

Blogs

In this study, blogs will play an important role. The students will be required to create their own blogs to turn in assignments, to free write, and to build up hyperlinks for autonomous learning. In an analysis of the application of blogs to ESL/EFL writing, CHEN (2016) synthesized the benefits of using blogs in teaching/learning ESL/EFL writing. These include providing a real audience for students to write for (Godwin-Jones, 2003), *offering extra reading practice for students* (Campbell, 2003; Johnson, 2004; Stanley, 2005), *functioning as online learner journals* that can be read by their peers (Campbell, 2003; Stanley, 2005), *guiding students to online resources* appropriate for their level (Camilleri, Ford, Leja, & Sollars, 2007; Campbell, 2005; DING, 2008; Fellner & Apple, 2006; Jones & Nuhfer-Halten, 2006; LIN, LIU, & Sie, 2009; Soares, 2008; Stepp-Greany, 2002; ZHANG, 2009), *increasing the sense of community in a class* (Al-Aayed, 2009; Bakar & Ismail, 2008; Bakar, 2009; Bloch & Crosby, 2008; Camilleri et al., 2007; Campbell, 2005; DING, 2008; Farmer, 2004; Fellner & Apple, 2006; Pinkman & Bortolin, 2006; Shin, 2009), *encouraging shy students to participate* (Cummings, 2004; Stanley, 2005), *stimulating out-of-class discussion* (Al-Aayed, 2009; Bakar & Ismail, 2008; Bakar, 2009; Bloch, 2008; Camilleri et al., 2007; Campbell, 2005; DING, 2008; Fellner, 2006; Nishikiori, 2007; Park, 2000; Pinkman & Bortolin, 2006; Shin, 2009; WANG & Woo, 2010), *encouraging a process-writing approach* (Campbell, 2005; Murray & Hourigan, 2008; Stanley, 2005; Ward, 2004; ZHANG, 2009), *functioning as an online portfolio of student written work* (Campbell, 2003; Fiedler, 2003; Stanley, 2005; ZHANG, 2009), and *helping build a closer relationship between students in larger classes* (Farmer, 2004; Park, 2000; Stanley, 2005).

The Course Design

The proposed EFL writing course is a one-year, blended course which integrates the available off-line and online resources to develop students' English writing skills by process approach. The syllabus design follows the suggestions from the conditions approach (Grab, 2001), the CALL general model for optimal language learning environment (Egbert et al., 2007), and research on computer-assisted writing (mentioned in the previous section of background and rationale). It also takes into consideration the four dimensions of writing, *social, physical, cognitive, and affective*, which are discussed in L1 and L2 writing models above. The following steps show how the syllabus design is carried out.

Needs Analysis

Before coming up with specific course objectives, the instructor took into consideration the students' current and future needs as listed in the following.

- (1) To have intelligible written communication, which is indispensable in the era of social media;
- (2) To be able to write literature papers and other English reports in the field of study as an English major;
- (3) To be able to cope successfully with future standardized writing exam, such as TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication), TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), IELTS (International English Language Testing System), and GEPT (General English Proficiency Test);
- (4) To be competitive in hunting a job with adequate writing ability after graduation.

Determining Course Objectives

The writing course (English Composition I.) is a required course for the English-major participants. In order to have something consistent for the writing teachers to follow while allowing flexibility, the English department has set a general guideline for English Composition I. Stated explicitly in the guideline, it reads "This course aims to develop students' effective paragraph and short essay writing skills. Reading and writing will be linked closely in the course. By the end of the academic year, students are expected to (1) write accurately and appropriately on a selected range of topics/modes; (2) revise, edit, and correct their own work as well as provide feedback to their peers' work; and (3) improve their writing on the aspects of content, organization, sentence structure/grammar, vocabulary/spelling, and format".

The first goal in the instructor's teaching plan for this course is to develop the students' English writing skills and the second goal is to help students become autonomous learners. For the first goal, the students need to be aware of the characteristics of English writing, including linguistic, stylistic, and rhetorical features. They are also expected to transfer the learnt knowledge and skills in this course to other courses and standardized writing tests, such as TOEIC, TOEFL, and GEPT. For the second goal, it is hoped that the course will motivate the students to advance their writing skills on their own after the course of study with the affordances of the course materials.

Selecting Materials and Activities

Two textbooks, *At a glance: Sentences* and *At a glance: Paragraphs* (Brandon, 2012a; 2012b), will be used to build up the students' basics regarding sentence making and paragraph writing. The former focuses on grammar, rhetoric, sentence variety, sentence combining, diction, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling; the latter guides students through the process of prewriting and writing paragraphs and provides model short essays

in specific and combined rhetorical modes. To compliment the textbooks, the instructor will utilize multimedia such as instructor-made PowerPoint (PPT) files or useful online materials to emphasize some key points in each module. During the course of study, activities will be selected “according to their appropriateness for the goals of the course, the materials, the learners’ language proficiency levels, needs and their different learning styles” (Nunan, 1989, p. 30). For example, general activities will include various brainstorming techniques, practice of topic sentence & conclusion, prompt collaborative narration by the whole class in order to reinforce brainstorming techniques and the coherence of writing, etc. Personalized activity will include free writing on blogs that allows for fluency practice.

Determining Teaching Methodology and the Use of Technology

The teaching method of this course adopts the process-oriented approach to English writing. Though standardized writing exams assess students’ final learning outcome, it is widely known that only through constant practice on a good writing process can students be guaranteed to have a good performance on the exams. This course is also learner-centered. The instructor considers herself as a guide, facilitator, and writing counselor. Meanwhile, because the instructor regards language learning as a socially constructed outcome, she will also adopt the socio-cultural approach (CHEN, 2010; Hannafin, Land, & Oliver, 1999; Vygostky, 1978) to get both the students and herself involved in the approach of collective scaffolding. Specifically, two types of scaffolds will be employed in the class as recommended by Minh and Canh (2012, p. 45), teacher-assisted scaffolding and peer-assisted scaffolding. The former will include step-by-step instruction, modeling, language focus exercises, teacher-student conferencing, and teacher written feedback. The latter will include collaborative writing and peer-review. When it comes to the use of technology, five types of technology will be utilized in this blended writing course: (1) *blogs* (for students to free write, turn in their assignments, build up hyperlinks for learning to write, and interact with the class); (2) *instructor-made multimedia files*, e.g., PPT and audiovisual files (to provide supplementary materials other than textbooks); (3) *utilization of the e-learning system, Moodle* (to manage the class by way of language management system); (4) *useful websites for learning to write* (to provide supplementary materials and develop learner autonomy); and (5) *mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) materials* (to provide supplementary materials and develop learner autonomy).

Determining Assessment Methods

Following the suggestions of Brown and Hudson (1998), Shohamy (1998), and Kurt (2009), this course uses multiple sources of assessment in order to obtain a comprehensive picture of students’ actual progress and writing performance. Multiple sources in the study include exercises on sentence structures (to review the basics), free writing (to encourage fluency practice), genre-structured writing (to learn the conventions of genre writing), prompt writing, (to practice ideas generalization), collaborative writing (to learn to negotiate meaning with their peers and write collaboratively), timed-writing on computer (to help the students cope successfully with future standardized writing exam), and revision (to make the students aware that writing is a recursive process).

The Syllabus

The syllabus is presented in the following in terms of date, content, in-class activity, instructor-made multimedia materials, technology resources, and required assignments on blogs.

週次 Wk	課程內容 (Content)	課堂活動 (In-class Activity)	教師自製多媒體教材 (Instructor-made multimedia files)	電腦輔助及/ 或 行動裝置語言學習 資源 (CALL and/or MALL resources)	部落格寫作 (Blogging to Write)
1	(1) Introduction to the Course (2) Diagnostic Test (3) Parts of Speech: Subjects and Verbs	Pretest	PPT on <i>Sentences</i>	<i>Academic Word List (AWL)</i> ¹	Introduction to E-blogger Free writing/ Journal writing
2	(1) Kinds of Sentences: Combining Sentences, and Avoiding Omissions (2) Achieving Sentence Variety	Review and in-class exercises on <i>Sentences</i> (1)	PPT on <i>Sentences</i>	<i>Academic Word List (AWL)</i>	Free writing/ Journal writing
3	(1) Correcting Fragments, Comma Splices, and Run-Ons (2) Balancing Sentence Parts	Review and in-class exercises on <i>Sentences</i> (2)	PPT on <i>Sentences</i>	<i>Academic Word List (AWL)</i>	Free writing/ Journal writing
4	(1) Verbs (2) Pronouns	Review and in-class exercises on <i>Sentences</i> (3)	PPT on <i>Sentences</i>	<i>MALL in Vocabulary Learning: Spelling City</i> ²	Free writing/ Journal writing
5	(1) Adjectives and Adverbs (2) Punctuation and Capitalization (3) Spelling and Commonly Confused Words	Review and in-class exercises on <i>Sentences</i> (4)	PPT on <i>Sentences</i>	<i>9 websites That Solve Grammatical Mistakes</i> ³	Free writing/ Journal writing
6	The Writing Process: Paragraphs and Essays & Combined and Specific Patterns of Writing and Writing Topics	In-class exercises on <i>Sentences</i> (5)	PPT on the <i>Comparison of Paragraphs and Short Essays</i>	<i>9 websites That Solve Grammatical Mistakes</i>	Free writing/ Journal writing

¹ *Academic Word List (AWL)* (www.academicvocabularyexercises.com)

“The AWL is a list of words which appear with high frequency in English-language academic texts. The list was compiled by Averil Coxhead at the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. The list contains 570 word families and is divided into 10 sub-lists. To find these words, an analysis was done of academic journals, textbooks, course workbooks, lab manuals, and course notes. The list was compiled following an analysis of over 3,500,000 words of text. The words selected for the AWL are words which occur frequently in a range of academic subjects, including the Arts (including history, psychology, sociology, etc.), Commerce (including economics, marketing, management, etc.), Law and the Sciences (including biology, computer science, mathematics, etc.). This means that the AWL is useful to all second-language learners who wish to study in an English-speaking institution no matter what their field of study. You will need to know this academic vocabulary if you want to study in an English-speaking college or university. In fact, because these words are so common, they are even useful to those who do not plan to go on to post-secondary study in English. These are words that you will frequently see in newspapers, magazines, and novels, and hear on television, movies or in conversation” (Retrieved on July, 20, 2016).

² *Spelling City* (<https://www.spellingcity.com/>)

Vocabulary Spelling City is an award-winning app with online version. It is “a fun way to learn spelling and vocabulary words by playing engaging learning games using any word list. The most popular activities are Spelling TestMe, HangMouse, and our vocabulary games, available to Premium Members. The most popular word lists are Sound Alikes, Compound Words, Hunger Games and SAT Words. The free app includes ten of [the] most popular word lists and eight of [the] most popular learning games and activities” (Retrieved on July, 20, 2016).

³ *9 websites That Solve Grammatical Mistakes*

(<http://www.makeuseof.com/tag/websites-solve-dumb-english-grammar-mistakes-instantly/>)

This internet resource is compiled by Mark O’Neill. The nine websites that he introduces are *Grammar Monster*, *Grammar Girl*, *Chicago Manual of Style*, *Daily Grammar*, *Lousy Writer*, *Grammarly*, *The British Council*, *Road to Grammar*, *English Grammar Infographics*.

週次 Wk	課程內容 (Content)	課堂活動 (In-class Activity)	教師自製多媒體教材 (Instructor-made multimedia files)	電腦輔助及/ 行動裝置語言學習 資源 (CALL and/or MALL resources)	部落格寫作 (Blogging to Write)
7	Ch. 1: The Paragraph and Prewriting (<i>At A Glance: Paragraphs</i>) Ch. 2: Writing, Revising, and Editing the Paragraph Ch. 3: From Reading to Writing	Introduction to brainstorming techniques 10-minute prompt writing		<i>Purdue OWL</i> ⁴	Free writing/ Journal writing
8	Ch. 4: Paragraph and Essays	Introduction to summary writing How to avoid plagiarism		<i>Purdue OWL</i>	Free writing/ Journal writing
9	(1) Review (2) Topic Sentence and Thesis (3) Ch. 5: Narration	Practice on topic sentence Prompt narration by the whole class Instruction of narrative writing	Handouts of topic sentence and conclusion	<i>Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)</i> ⁵	Writing Assignment (1)
10	(1) Ch. 5: Narration (2) Peer-review of Writing Assignment (1)	Analysis of good narrative writing Peer-review Conferencing		<i>Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)</i>	Revision
11	Ch. 6: Description	Describe a person that you admire 10-minute prompt writing Instruction of descriptive writing	PPT on a model descriptive writing: <i>My backpack</i>	<i>British National Corpus (BNC)</i> ⁶	Writing Assignment (2)
12	(1) Discussion of Writing Assignment (1) (2) Peer-review of Writing Assignment (2)	Debriefing on the common errors made by the class Highlights of good work Peer-review		<i>British National Corpus (BNC)</i>	Revision
13	Ch. 7: Exemplification	Instruction of exemplification Writing Drafting your exemplification writing	PPT on a model exemplification writing: <i>Red is the Winning Color</i>	<i>Learning English on Voice of America</i> ⁷	Writing Assignment (3)
14	(1) Ch. 7: Exemplification (2) Peer-review of Writing	Analysis of model exemplification writing		<i>Learning English on Voice of America</i>	Revision

⁴ *Purdue OWL* (<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/>)

The Online Writing Lab (OWL) at Purdue University offers writing resources and instructional material as a free service to its students, members of the community, and users worldwide. This is the oldest, the most organized, and probably the most popular OWL around the globe.

⁵ *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)* (<http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>)

“The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) is the largest freely-available corpus of English, and the only large and balanced corpus of American English. COCA is probably the most widely-used corpus of English, and it is related to many other corpora of English that we have created, which offer unparalleled insight into variation in English” (Retrieved on July 24, 2016).

⁶ British National Corpus (BNC) (<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>)

“The British National Corpus (BNC) is a 100 million word collection of samples of written and spoken language from a wide range of sources, designed to represent a wide cross-section of British English, both spoken and written, from the late twentieth century” (Retrieved on July 24, 2016).

⁷ *Learning English on Voice of America* (<http://learningenglish.voanews.com/p/5373.html>)

“Learning English is VOA’s multimedia source of news and information for millions of English learners worldwide. [The] audio programs and captioned videos are written using vocabulary at the intermediate and upper-beginner level. [The] programs are read one-third slower than normal English speed. Online texts, MP3s and podcasts let people read, listen and learn American English and much more” (Retrieved on July 24, 2016).

Assignment (3)	Peer-review				
週次 Wk	課程內容 (Content)	課堂活動 (In-class Activity)	教師自製多媒體教材 (Instructor-made multimedia files)	電腦輔助及/ 行動裝置語言學習 資源 (CALL and/or MALL resources)	部落格寫作 (Blogging to Write)
15	Discussion of Writing Assignment (2)	Debriefing on the common errors made by the class Highlights of good work		<i>BBC English Learning</i> ⁸	Free writing/ Journal writing
16	Independent Study				Writing Assignment (3)
17	Discussion of Writing Assignment (3) Wrap-up	Debriefing on the common errors made by the class Highlights of good work Conferencing			Revision
18	Final Exam: In-class Timed Writing on Computer				

第二學期 (The second semester)

週次 Wk	課程內容 (Content)	課堂活動 (In-class Activity)	教師自製多媒體教材 (Instructor-made multimedia files)	電腦輔助及/ 行動裝置語言學習 材料 (CALL and/or MALL materials)	部落格寫作 (Blogging to Write)
1	Overview of the course Discussion of last semester's final exam	Small group discussion and writing of your winter vacation	Introduction to the exemplary <i>blogging to write</i> of former students	Overview of the resources that we used last semester	Free writing/ Journal writing Come up with your writing plan
2	Chapter 8: Analysis by Division	Instruction of classification/division writing Drafting your A1	PPT on classification writing, possible topics, and a model work	<i>Grammarly</i> ⁹	Assignment 1 (A1)
3	Chapter 8: Analysis by Division	Analysis of good division writing Peer-review Conferencing			Free writing/ Journal writing
4	Chapter 9: Process Analysis	Instruction of process writing Drafting your A2	PPT on a model process writing: <i>How to overcome stage fright</i>		A2
5	Chapter 9: Process Analysis Peer-review	Debriefing on the common errors made by the class re. A1		<i>Grammarly</i>	Free writing/ Journal writing

⁸ *BBC English Learning* (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/learningenglish/english/hygiene>)

"As part of the BBC World Service, BBC Learning English has been teaching English to global audiences since 1943, offering free audio, video and text materials to learners around the world. From [the] mobile English courses in Bangladesh and Latin America to [the] online offer for millions of Chinese learners, BBC Learning English provides multimedia English language teaching materials to meet learners' needs" (Retrieved on July 24, 2016).

⁹ *Grammarly* (www.grammarly.com)

"Grammarly is a writing-enhancement platform developed by Grammarly, Inc., and launched in 2009. Grammarly carries out more than 250 grammar checks; it proofreads and detects plagiarism in the process and finally provides users with a list of possible errors for correction. During its text review, Grammarly presents potential errors one at a time, with commonly confused words or faulty sentences highlighted in light red and a text box below offering an explanation that provides good and bad examples and suggests corrections. Grammarly also provides citations when it detects plagiarism" (Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grammarly> on July 25, 2016).

Highlights of good work
Peer-review

第二學期 (The second semester)					
週次 Wk	課程內容 (Content)	課堂活動 (In-class Activity)	教師自製多媒體教材 (Instructor-made multimedia files)	電腦輔助及/ 行動裝置語言學習 材料 (CALL and/or MALL materials)	部落格寫作 (Blogging to Write)
6	Chapter 10: Cause & Effect	Instruction of cause & effect writing Drafting your A3 with your group collaboratively Debriefing on the common errors made by the class re.	PPT on a model cause & effect writing: <i>Rainforest</i>		A3
7	Chapter 10: Cause & Effect	A2 Highlights of good work Peer-review			Free writing/ Journal writing
8	Independent Study				A3
9	Midterm (Report on Collaborative Writing-A3)				Free writing/ Journal writing
10	Chapter 11: Comparison & Contrast	Instruction of comparison & contrast writing Drafting your A4	PPT on a model comparison & contrast writing: Movies & Plays		A4
11	Chapter 11: Comparison & Contrast Peer-review	Debriefing on the common errors made by the class re. A3 Highlights of good work Peer-review		<i>Purdue OWL</i> https://owl.english.purdue.edu/ on citation and references	Free writing/ Journal writing
12	Chapter 12: Definition	Instruction of definition writing Drafting your A5 Debriefing on the common errors made by the class re.	PPT on a model definition writing: <i>My hero</i>		A5
13	Chapter 12: Definition Peer-review	A4 Highlights of good work Peer-review		<i>WriteAhead</i> ¹⁰	
14	Chapter 13: Argument	Instruction of argumentative writing Collaborative composing by the whole class (from word combing to sentence combing) Debriefing on the common errors made by the class re.		<i>WriteAhead</i>	Free writing/ Journal writing
15	Chapter 13:Argument Collaborative Work	A5 Highlights of good work Drafting your A6 with your group collaboratively		<i>WriteAhead</i>	A6
16	Peer-review and	Peer-review			Free writing/

¹⁰ *WriteAhead* (<http://writeahead.nlpweb.org/more>)

WriteAhead is a web-based platform developed by the Natural Language Processing Lab at Tsing-Hua University in Taiwan. This “resource-rich, Interactive Writing Environment provides English learners with writing prompts, as well as ‘get it right’ advice in order to help them write fluently and accurately” (Retrieved on July 26, 2016 from <http://www.nlpweb.org/>).

	Conference on Collaborative Writing-A6	Conferencing	Journal writing
17	Oral Report on A6 and Wrap-up		
	Final Exam: In-class		
18	Timed Writing on Computer		

Conclusion

This article discusses the rationale of the syllabus design of a blended EFL university writing course. Reviewing SLA theory, L1 & L2 writing models, and research on computer-assisted writing, the researcher proposes an EFL writing course which integrates traditional classroom activities with technology. Following the article, the researcher is about to evaluate the effectiveness of this one-year course by way of qualitative and quantitative methods in the near future.

References

- Akyel, A., & Kamisli, S. (1999). Word processing in the EFL classroom: Effects on writing strategies, attitudes, and products. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Writing in an electronic medium: Research with language learners* (pp. 27-60). Houston: Athelstan.
- Al-Aayed, B. S. (2009). *Blog assisted language learning: The use of blog in language learning in Saudi schools*. Retrieve March 21, 2016 from <http://libback.uqu.edu.sa/hipres/ABS/ind8026.pdf>
- Allwright, R. L. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *English Language Teaching Journal*, 36(1), 5-18.
- Amer, A. (2006). The use of computer mediated communication for increasing motivation and improving acquisition of English as a foreign language in high school (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the Senate of Bar-Ilan University Ramat-Gan, Israel).
- Bahrani, T. (2011). Computer-assisted language learning—Some aspects. *Language in India*, 11(9), 271-278.
- Bakar, N. A. (2009). E-learning environment: Blogging as a platform for language learning. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9, 594-605.
- Bakar, N. A., & Ismail, K. (2008). Using blogs to encourage ESL students to write constructively in English. *Asian Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 1, 45-57.
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L. (1993). The word processor as an instructional tool: A meta-analysis of word processing in writing instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 69-93.
- Beatty, K. (2003). *Teaching and researching computer-assisted language learning*. London/New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Beck, N., & Fetherston, T. (2003). The effects of incorporating a word processor into a year three writing program. *Information Technology in Childhood Education Annual, 2003*(1), 139-161. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Benson, P., & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Bloch, J., & Crosby, C. (2008). Blogging and academic writing development. In F. ZHANG (Ed.), *Handbook of research on computer-enhanced language acquisition and learning* (pp. 36-47). PA: Information Science Reference.
- Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (2006). *The handbook of blended learning environments: Global perspectives, local designs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Brandon, L. (2012a). *At a glance: Sentences*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Brandon, L. (2012b). *At a glance: Paragraphs*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 653-675. doi:10.2307/3587999
- Bruce, B. C., & Rubin, A. (1993). *Electronic quills: A situated evaluation of using computers for writing in classrooms*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bruce, B., Peyton, J. K., & Batson, T. (Eds.) (1993). *Network-based classrooms: Promises and realities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Camacho, R. (2008). Developing writing fluency through synchronic computer-mediated communication (Unpublished master thesis, Brigham Young University, USA).
- Camilleri, M., Ford, P., Leja, H., & Sollars, V. (2007). *Blogs: Web journals in language education*. European Center for Modern Languages, Council of Europe.

- Campbell, A. P. (2003). Weblogs for use with ESL classes. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(2). Retrieved March 20, 2006 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Campbell-Weblog.html>
- Campbell, A. P. (2005). Weblog applications for EFL/ESL classroom blogging: A comparative review. *TESL-EJ*, 9. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej35/m1.html>
- CHANG, M. M. (2005). Applying self-regulated learning strategies in a web-based instruction—An investigation of motivation perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(3), 217-230.
- CHEN, P. J. (2010). A study on the effectiveness of a blog-integrated EFL college writing course (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan).
- CHEN, P. J. (2016). Learners' metalinguistic and affective performance in blogging to write. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(4), 790-814. doi:10.1080/09588221.2015.1068813
- Chik, A. (2014). Digital gaming and language learning: Autonomy and community. *Language Learning and Technology*, 18(2), 85-100.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Word processing and writing in elementary classrooms: A critical review of related literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 107-155.
- Cummings, M. C. (2004). "Because we are shy and fear mistaking": Computer mediated communication with EFL writers. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 23(2), 23-49.
- DING, Z. G. (2008). Application of blog to English language teaching in China. *CSSE (Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering)*, 5, 31-34. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from <http://www.computer.org/portal/web/csdl/doi/10.1109/CSSE.2008.16>
- Egbert, J., Hanson-Smith, E., & Chao, C. (2007). Introduction: Foundations for teaching and learning. In J. Egbert and E. Hanson-Smith (Eds.), *CALL environments: Research, practice, and critical issues* (2nd ed., pp. 1-15). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Farmer, J. (2004). Communication dynamics: Discussion boards, weblogs and the development of communities of inquiry in online learning environments. Paper presented at *The 21st ASCILITE Conference*. Retrieved December 12, 2015 from <http://incsub.org/blog/index.php?p=3>
- Fellner, T., & Apple, M. (2006). Developing writing fluency and lexical complexity with blogs. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 2, 15-26.
- Fiedler, S. (2003). Personal web-publishing as a reflective conversational tool for self-organized learning. In T. D. Burg (Ed.), *Blog talks* (pp. 190-216). Vienna, Austria: Academic Press.
- Fuchs, C., Hauck, M., & Muller-Hatmann, A. (2012). Promoting learner autonomy through multi-literacy skills development in cross-institutional exchanges. *Language Learning and Technology*, 16(3), 82-102.
- Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- Gere, A. (1987). *Writing groups: History, theory, and implications*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2003). Emerging technologies: Blogs and wikis: Environments for on-line collaboration. *Language, Learning & Technology*, 7(2), 1-12.
- Goertler, S. (2009). Using computer-mediated communication (CMC) in language teaching. *UP*, 42(1), 74-84.
- Goldberg, A., Russell, M., & Cook, A. (2003). The effect of computers on student writing: A meta-analysis of studies from 1992 to 2002. *The Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 2(1), 1-51.
- González-Bueno, M. (1998). The effect of electronic mail on Spanish L2 discourse. *Language Learning and Technology*, 1(2), 55-70.
- Grab, W. (2001). Notes toward a theory of second language writing. In T. Silva and P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 39-58). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Grab, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistics perspective*. NY: Longman.
- Hannafin, M. J., Land, S., & Oliver, K. M. (1999). Open learning environments: Foundations, methods, and models. In C. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models: Volume II* (pp. 115-140). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Hardy, C. (1999). Raising self-esteem. In M. Blamires (Ed.), *Enabling technology for inclusion* (pp. 52-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hartman, K., Neuwirth, C., Kiesler, S., Sproull, L., Cochran, C., Palmquist, M., & Zibrpw, D. (1991). Patterns of social interaction and learning to write: Some effects of networked technologies. *Written Communication*, 8, 79-113.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In M. Levy and S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The*

- science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hoffman, R. (1994). Powerful, personal: Electronic mail and the L2 writing process. *ReCALL*, 6(2), 53-62.
- HUANG, H. T. D., & Hung, S. T. A. (2008). Chatting to write: Synchronous computer-mediated communication in an EFL writing classroom. In C. J. Bonk, M. M. Lee, and T. Reynolds (Eds.), *The proceedings of world conference on E-learning in corporate, government, healthcare, and higher education* (pp. 1638-1645). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Hung, P. Y. (2007). The effects of exchanging emails with American key pals on Taiwanese college students' writing in English (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, USA).
- Hwu, F. (1997). Providing an effective and affective learning environment for Spanish phonetics with a hypermedia application. *CALICO Journal*, 14(2-4), 115-134.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, A. (2004). Creating a writing course utilizing class and student blog. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10. Retrieved August 25, 2016 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Campbell-Weblog.html>
- Jones, Z., & Nuhfer-Halten, B. (2006). Uses of blogs in L2 instruction. In M. L. Wilbur and C. M. Cherry (Eds.), *Languages for today's world: Dimension* (pp. 25-35). Valdosta, GA: SCOLT/Southern Conference on Language Teaching.
- Joram, E., Woodruff, E., Lindsay, P., & Bryson, M. (1990). Students' editing skills and attitudes toward word processing. *Computers and Composition*, 7(2), 55-72.
- Keller, J. M. (1999). Motivation in cyber learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 1(1), 7-30.
- Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2010). Developing collaborative autonomous learning abilities in computer mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(1), 41-58.
- Kurt. (2009). Standards for the assessment of reading and writing: Standard 8—The assessment process should involve multiple perspectives and sources of data. *National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)*. Retrieved August 23, 2015 from <http://www.ncte.org/standards/assessmentstandards/standard8>
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- LIN, H. (2015). A meta-analysis of empirical research on computer-mediated communication (CMC) on SLA. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(2), 85-117.
- LIN, Y. C., LIU, J. J., & Sie, M. F. (2009). *The analysis of the application of weblogs to English writing*. Retrieved March 14, 2010 from http://210.59.19.199/editor_model/u_editor_v1.asp?id={A0B9A252-D4F5-4F77-A017-FF8F8E AA5D07
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mabrito, M. (1992). Computer-mediated communication and high-apprehensive writers: Rethinking the collaborative process. *Bulletin of the Association of Business Communication*, 55(4), 26-31.
- Mahdi, H. S., & El-Naim, M. E. M. (2013). The effects of informal use of computer-mediated communication on EFL learner interaction. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 5(3), 75-81.
- Mahmood, F., Huzaina, A. H., Ghani, M. M., & Rajindra, S. (2014). Motivational aspects of using computers for writing among the Malaysian ESL students. *Advances in Social Science Research Journal*, 1(2), 70-82.
- Marcoul, I., & Pennington, M. C. (1999). Composing with computer technology: A case study of a group of students in computer studies learning French as a second language. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Writing in an electronic medium: Research with language learners* (pp. 285-318). Houston: Athelstan.
- Miceli, T., Murray, S. V., & Kennedy, C. (2010). Using an L2 blog to enhance learners' participation and sense of community. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 23(4), 321-41.
- Minh, N. T. T., & Canh, L. V. (2012). Designing an intensive EAP writing course for Vietnamese EFL students. *VNU Journal of Science, Foreign language*, 28, 37-51.
- Murray, L., & Hourigan, T. (2008). Blogs for specific purposes: Expressivist or socio-cognitivist approach? *ReCALL*, 20(1), 83-98.
- Neu, J., & Scarcella, R. (1991). Word processing in the ESL writing classroom: A survey of student attitudes. In P. Dunkel (Ed.), *Computer-assisted language learning and testing: Research issues and practice* (pp. 169-187). NY: Newbury House/Harper Collines.
- Nishikiori, Y. (2007). Writing in CALL: A pilot study on how online journaling can be effective in language learning. *Working Paper Series (HPU)*, 5, 17-31.
- Norm, F. (2012). *Report: Defining blended learning*. Retrieved August 15, 2015 from

- http://learningspaces.org/papers/Defining_Blended_Learning_NF.pdf
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmquist, M. E. (1993). Network-supported interaction in two writing classrooms. *Computers and Composition*, 10, 25-57.
- Park, E. (2000). *The effectiveness of electronic discussion in cooperative second language learning*. Retrieved December 21, 2015 from The University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.: <http://www.coedu.usf.edu/itphdsem/eme7938/ep800.pdf>
- Pennington, M. C. (1996a). *The computer and the non-native writer: A natural partnership*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Pennington, M. C. (1996b). Writing the natural way: On computer. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 9, 125-142.
- Pennington, M. C. (1999a). The missing link in computer-assisted writing. In K. Cameron (Ed.), *CALL: Media, design & applications* (pp. 271-292). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Pennington, M. C. (1999b). Word processing and beyond: Writing in an electronic medium. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Writing in an electronic medium: Research with language learners* (pp. 1-26). Houston: Athelstan.
- Pennington, M. C. (2003). The impact of the computer in second language writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 287-311). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennington, M. C., & Brock, M. N. (1992). Process and product approaches to computer-assisted communication. In M. C. Pennington and V. Stevens (Eds.), *Computers in applied linguistics: An international perspective* (pp. 79-109). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Peterson, M. (2010). Learner participation patterns and strategy use in second life: An exploratory case study. *ReCALL Journal*, 22(3), 273-292.
- Phinney, M. (1991). Word processing and writing apprehension in first and second language writers. *Computers and Composition*, 9, 65-82.
- Phinney, M., & Mathis, C. (1990). ESL student responses to writing with computers. *TESOL Newsletter*, 24(2), 30-31.
- Pinkman, K., & Bortolin, R. (2006). Communicating with blogs: Spiraling toward global interaction in the EFL classroom. *Annual Research Report of the Language Center, Kwansai Gakuin University*, 9, 91-106.
- Polat, N., Mancilla, R., & Mahalingappa, L. (2013). Anonymity and motivation in asynchronous discussions and L2 vocabulary learning. *Language Learning and Technology*, 17(17), 57-74.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ritter, M. (1993). That's us! A book about ourselves: An EFL project with intermediate learners, incorporating the computer as a tool. *CALICO Journal*, 10(4), 57-69.
- Rosell-Aguilar, F. (2013). Podcasting for language learning through iTunes U: The learner's view. *Language Learning and Technology*, 17(3), 74-93.
- Shin, D. S. (2009). *A blog-mediated curriculum for teaching academic genres in an urban classroom: Second grade ELL students' emergent pathways to literacy development* (Open Access Dissertations, Paper 134). Retrieved March 19, 2016 from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/open_access_dissertations/134
- Shohamy, E. (1998). Critical language testing and beyond. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 24, 331-345.
- Soares, D. de A. (2008). Understanding class blogs as a tool for language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 517-533.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning—Introduction to a general theory*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, G. (2005). Blogging for ELT. *The BBC and British Council Teaching English*. Retrieved November 14, 2005 from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/resources/blogging.shtml>
- Steelman, J. D. (1994). Revision strategies employed by middle level students using computers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 11, 141-152.
- Stepp-Greany, J. (2002). Student perceptions on language learning in a technology environment: Implications for the new millennium. *Language Learning and Technology*, 6(1), 165-180.
- Stoddard, B., & MacArthur, C. (1993). A peer editor strategy: Guiding learning disabled students in response and revision. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27(1), 76-103.
- Sullivan, N., & Pratt, E. (1996). A comparative study of two writing environments: A computer-assisted classroom and a traditional oral classroom. *System*, 24(4), 491-501.
- Thorne, S. L. (2008). Computer-mediated communication. In N. Hornberger and N. Van Duesen-Scholl (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 4): *Second and foreign language education* (pp. 325-336). New York: Springer.
- Ushida, E. (2005). The role of students' attitudes and motivation in second language learning in online language course. *CALICO Journal*, 23(1), 49-78.
- Vinther, J. (2011). Enhancing motivation with cultural narratives in computer-mediated communication. *Computer Assisted*

Language Learning, 24(4), 337-352.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- WANG, Q., & Woo, H. L. (2010). Investigating students' critical thinking in weblogs: An exploratory study in a Singapore secondary school. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11, 541-551.
- Ward, J. M. (2004). Blog assisted language learning (BALL): Push button publishing for the pupils. *TEFL Web Journal*, 3(2), 1-15.
- Warschauer, M. (2004). Of digital divides and social multipliers: Combining language and technology for human development. In *Information and communication technologies in the teaching and learning of foreign languages: State of the art, needs and perspectives* (pp. 46-52). Moscow: UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education.
- Warschauer, M. (1996a). Comparing face-to-face and electronic communication in the second language classroom. *CALICO Journal*, 13, 7-26.
- Warschauer, M. (1996b). Motivational aspects of using computers for writing and communication. In M. Warschauer (Ed.), *Telecollaboration in foreign language learning* (pp. 29-46). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Warschauer, M. (1997). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: Theory and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 470-481.
- Wold, K. A. (2011). Blending theories for instructional design: Creating and implementing the structure, environment, experience, and people (SEEP) model. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(4), 371-382.
- YANG, Y. F. (2015). Self-directed learning to develop autonomy in an ESP community. *Interactive Learning Environment* (in press), 24(7), 1629-1646.
- ZHANG, D. (2009). The application of blog in English writing. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 64, 64-73.

Appendix A

A CALL Model for Optimal Language Learning Environments (OLLE)

Conditions for Optimal Language Learning Environment

1. Learners have opportunities to interact and negotiate meaning.
 2. Learners interact in the target language with an authentic audience.
 3. Learners are involved in authentic tasks.
 4. Learners are exposed to and encouraged to produce varied and creative language.
 5. Learners have enough time and feedback.
 6. Learners are guided to attend mindfully to the learning process.
 7. Learners work in an atmosphere with an ideal stress/anxiety level.
 8. Learner autonomy is supported.
-

(Egbert, Chao, & Hanson-Smith, 2007).