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Effects of Self-Management Strategies on Journal Writing by College Freshmen

GLYNDA A. HULL
University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

Two experiments were designed to test the effects of self-management strategies on journal writing by beginning college writers. Experiment #1 tested the effects of self-monitoring and goal-setting on the journal writing of an intact freshman composition class (N = 18) by means of a multiple baseline design across subjects. Baseline measures (number of lines/entries per week in journals) were initially obtained for all subjects. Then goal-setting and self-monitoring procedures were begun with half of the subjects, while baseline was continued for the other half. Finally, treatment was begun for the second group of subjects. Experiment #1 shows that self-monitoring/goal-setting can increase the number of lines and entries written per week by traditional freshman composition students. The second study was intended to replicate that effect with basic (remedial) writers (N = 15), while providing a longer baseline and a controlled termination of treatment. In addition, the investigator wanted to find out whether self-determined goals (number of entries/lines per week) would affect journal writing differently than teacher-determined goals. Both experiments suggest the effectiveness of self-management strategies in increasing the amount and frequency of journal writing by traditional and basic writing students. Besides their applied value, the studies offer implications for a theory of the writing process.

Writing is a complex skill that requires practice for improvement. A common way to practice writing is to keep journals, or notebooks of daily personal reflection. Composition texts and well-known teachers of writing (Hairston, 1978; Schor & Fishman, 1978; Macrorie, 1968; Elbow, 1973) often recommend that students keep journals to improve their writing skills. And article after article, written by teachers at all levels, extol the virtues of particular approaches to journal keeping.

However, these anecdotal accounts deal with benefits that accrue after a student keeps a journal. There are no investigations of how to get students to write regularly in journals to begin with. The problem of how to promote the habit of regular writing is experienced not only by students who are just learning to compose, but by professional writers as well.

In a study on techniques used by famous writers, Wallace and Pear (1977)
point out that Anthony Trollope used several procedures to regulate his writing output. Author of some fifty popular novels, Trollope wrote in his *Autobiography* (1883) that he kept a diary, for every book he began, in order to record the number of pages he intended to write in a specific amount of time. To make his regimen even stricter, Trollope counted words: "my page has been made to contain 250 words; and as words, if not watched, will have a tendency to straggle, I have had every word counted as I went."

Trollope is not the only famous writer who used record-keeping to maintain his writing output. So did Arnold Bennett (1971), who also charted his progress in his novels by word count, and Ernest Hemingway (Plimpton, 1965), who plotted his daily output by words on a cardboard chart, wall-mounted under a gazelle head. If he did not complete the designated amount, Hemingway curtailed his planned fishing trips. More recently, Irving Wallace (1971) has described the elaborate work charts he has consistently kept for each of his novels in order to maintain his literary output.

In addition to these anecdotal reports, there have been several experimental attempts to promote regular writing habits. Brigham, Graubard and Stans (1972) studied a class of fifth graders. They awarded points that could be traded for special privileges to those students who increased the total number of words and number of different words in their compositions. Writing output increased, and overall quality of the students' stories improved during the contingent reinforcement phase.

In another application of reinforcement contingencies to writing, Maloney and Hopkins (1973) made points for privileges contingent upon the use of different adjectives, action verbs, and sentence beginnings in stories written by fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students. Not only did target elements increase; in addition, the stories written during the reinforcement periods were holistically scored as more creative than those written during baseline conditions.

The previous two studies involved the use of teacher control to improve writing skills. Ballard and Glynn (1975) investigated whether self-managed, as opposed to teacher-controlled, contingencies could be used to improve writing. Ballard and Glynn found that self-reinforcement, added to self-recording, more than doubled the number of sentences that third graders used in their stories, as well as improving the holistically assessed quality of the children's writing.

These studies demonstrate that behavioral principles like contingent reinforcement, self-monitoring, and self-reinforcement can be successfully applied to children's story writing in order to increase output (total amount written as well as specific components) and to improve quality. Thus, both the writing habits of professional novelists and beginning writers can be improved by the use of specific behavioral procedures. The goal of these procedures is to increase the quantity and quality of writing through self-control efforts by the writers. These self-control procedures represent a set of techniques which have been shown to improve a wide variety of academic and educational activities in an extensive body of research (Watson & Tharp, 1972; Kazdin, 1974).

*Self-management* or *self-control* can be defined as a set of responses made by an individual to change or maintain his/her own behavior (Jeffrey, 1974).
Watson and Tharp (1972) list the following four steps as characteristic of most self-management projects:

1) Defining the problem in terms of behavior in specific situations;
2) Making observations on how often the target behavior occurs, as well as its antecedents, and consequences;
3) Forming a plan to intervene by contingently reinforcing some desirable behavior and by arranging situations to increase chances of performing desirable behaviors;
4) Maintaining, adjusting, and finally terminating the intervention program.

The studies reported in this paper were designed to test the effects of similar self-management strategies on the journal writing behavior of beginning college writers.

Although self-management procedures have been used experimentally by researchers to improve the writing of elementary school children, and independently by professional adult writers to regulate their writing output, no research using self-management strategies has been conducted on writing by college students. A college population, however, seems particularly appropriate for such research since, after entering college, students are expected to assume a greatly increased amount of responsibility for their own learning.

The experiments reported in this paper also differ from previous studies in choice of dependent variables. A primary concern in the present studies was manipulating writing behavior in terms of frequency as well as amount written. Previous researchers provided in-class mandatory writing periods for their subjects, coupled with daily schedules of contingent reinforcement (i.e., extra recess for more action words). In the present studies, however, subjects established out-of-class, daily writing habits and received weekly or bi-weekly teacher feedback. Thus, emphasis was placed, not on inducing writing as a school performance, but on establishing a writing habit outside the classroom.

No attempt was made in the present studies to determine whether an increase in amount written would improve the quality of journal entries. A dramatic increase in quality during the span of the first study, six weeks, would not have been likely, nor would it have been possible to definitively attribute the increase to the experimental variable alone. But more importantly, the investigator was concerned in these initial studies not with making judgments of quality, but with changing writing behavior—making writing a habit.

**EXPERIMENT #1**  
The purpose of this study was to test the effects of self-monitoring and goal-setting strategies on journal writing of college freshmen. Journal writing was assessed by measuring the amount written in journals in number of lines per week and number of entries per week.

**Subjects**  
Subjects were members of an intact general writing class (N = 18) at a northeastern university. These students had been screened for placement in basic writing (a remedial course) or general writing (the traditional introductory writing course) by means of a holistically scored writing sample (students had to score a 3 on a 4-point scale in order
to take general writing) and Nelson-Denny reading tests. After the initial screening students were randomly assigned to sections by computer.

**Experimental Design** A multiple baseline across subjects (Hersen & Barlow, 1976) or time-lagged (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) design was used. A multiple baseline across subjects consists of applying the same treatment to groups of subjects sequentially. In this way, the effects of a procedure can be reliably assessed if change is observed after the introduction of treatment. In this study, baseline or non-treatment measures were initially obtained for all subjects. Then goal-setting and self-monitoring procedures were begun with half of the subjects, while baseline was continued for the other half. The second group of subjects was then introduced to goal-setting/self-monitoring. The inclusion of a longer baseline for the second group controls for non-specific effects that may have occurred when self-management was begun in the first.

**Procedures** The study spanned the first six weeks of a 15-week semester. Baseline. In the introductory class meeting students were instructed to purchase 8 × 10" spiral notebooks to use as journals. During the first regular class session students read and discussed a description of the benefits of journal keeping from Hairston's *A Contemporary Rhetoric* (1978). Students were then encouraged to make daily entries in their journals (although number of entries and length of entries were not specified) and to bring their journals to class each Friday, when their instructor would collect them for reading. The instructor announced that she would make written responses to half the journals on alternating weeks. Journals would be returned to students each Monday.

At the end of each week the investigator recorded the number of entries each student made per week and the number of lines per entry. The first three weeks of the study constituted baseline measures. At the end of this period the investigator calculated the number of lines and number of entries each student had averaged per week.

**Treatment.** After baseline, students were randomly assigned to two groups. Group A received personalized packets explaining and illustrating a record-keeping method students would be expected to engage in. Each student in Group A was given a personal target number: the lines per day he/she should aim for in writing in his/her journal. This goal was determined for each student by doubling his/her previous average. Each student was also given a graph, with the first data point marked (previous average for number of lines written per day), for recording the number of lines written for each future entry. Students in Group A were then asked to make their first journal entry in class and to plot on their graphs the number of lines per entry. Baseline was continued for Group B. At the beginning of Week 5, Group B received identical instructions for goal-setting/self-monitoring. Group A continued to self-monitor.

During treatment students handed in their journals each Friday, and the investigator recorded the number of lines per entry and number of entries per week. After self-monitoring began, the instructor gave feedback via written responses to students who met or exceeded their target number of lines per
No feedback was provided to subjects who did not meet their goal. Journals were collected at the end of the sixth week.

Results Separate two factor mixed ANOVA’S were performed on two dependent measures, number of lines per week and number of entries per week. Groups (A and B) was the between factor, and Weeks (1-6) was the within factor. The means and standard deviations for each group each week are shown in Table 1. The analysis showed a significant Weeks effect for lines \( [F (5, 73) = 14.84, p<.001] \) and entries \( [F (5, 73) = 18.21, p<.05] \), and a significant Groups by Week interaction for lines \( [F (5, 73) = 3.79, p<.005] \) and entries \( [F (5, 73) = 5.35, p<.05] \).

TABLE 1
Number of lines and entries per week during baseline and treatment phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (N = 8)</td>
<td>25.4 (14.6)</td>
<td>35.6 (28.7)</td>
<td>33.4 (24.7)</td>
<td>71.0 (39.2)</td>
<td>72.5 (30.9)</td>
<td>74.8 (45.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (N = 9)</td>
<td>25.8 (26.7)</td>
<td>19.1 (12.1)</td>
<td>28.2 (19.9)</td>
<td>14.7 (8.05)</td>
<td>61.0 (31.5)</td>
<td>79.3 (61.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (N = 8)</td>
<td>2.1 (.99)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.2)</td>
<td>4.3 (.46)</td>
<td>3.8 (1.17)</td>
<td>4.1 (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (N = 9)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.9 (.60)</td>
<td>1.9 (1.05)</td>
<td>1.7 (.87)</td>
<td>4.1 (.93)</td>
<td>4.4 (.73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The lines after Week 3 for Group A and Week 4 for Group B indicate when treatment was begun. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

Figure 1 demonstrates the results of Experiment #1 for mean number of lines per week. Students in Group A increased the number of lines they wrote per week from an average of 25 lines during the first week of baseline to an average of 74 lines the last week of treatment, and their average number of entries from 2 to 4. Similarly, subjects in Group B increased from 25 lines and 1.5 entries averaged during Week 1 to 79 lines and 4.2 entries during the sixth week. The consistency of results across both groups and the clear relationship between implementing treatment and change in output suggest the effectiveness of the procedure.
Figure 1. Mean number of lines written per week by two groups of freshman composition students during baseline and treatment.
EXPERIMENT #2  
The purpose of this study was to further test the effects of self-monitoring on the journal writing of college freshmen, and also to examine the effects of two different goal-setting strategies. The previous study showed that self-monitoring, goal-setting, and teacher feedback can increase the number of lines and entries per week of freshman composition students. The second study was intended to replicate that effect with basic writers, while providing a longer baseline and also a controlled termination of the intervention program. The study assessed whether, when subjects are given a longer period of practice, they increase their journal writing, and whether, after they are no longer required to self-monitor and set goals, subjects maintain their new levels of entries and lines per week. In addition, the investigator wanted to find out whether self-determined goals (number of entries/number of lines per week) would affect journal writing behavior differently than teacher-determined goals.

Subjects  
Subjects were members of an intact basic (remedial) writing class at a northeastern university (N = 15). These students had been screened for placement in basic writing by means of a holistically scored writing sample (a score of 2 on a 4-point scale required a student to register for Basic Writing) and Nelson-Denny reading scores, and then randomly assigned to sections by computer.

Experimental Design  
The design for this study was a between-group comparison with three phases over time. During Phase I baseline measures were taken for all subjects (A); during Phase II the effects of the two goal-setting strategies were compared (B); and then in Phase III the treatments were removed and subjects were returned to baseline condition (A). This constitutes a combination of between group and within group (ABA) comparisons. The ABA design tests, then, not only the effects of introducing the intervention strategy, but also the effects of removing treatment. The effects of treatment are determined in an ABA design by the changes from baseline and the subsequent return to baseline when intervention is terminated. The comparison between the effects of treatments during the B phase is assessed by changes from the initial baseline (A) phase.

Procedures  
The study spanned the first 12 weeks of a 15-week semester.

Baseline. Students were given mimeographed descriptions of journal keeping and its benefits and asked to purchase 8 × 10" notebooks to use as journals that term. Students were encouraged to make daily entries in their journals (although number of entries and length of entries were not specified) and to bring their journals to class each Friday, when their instructor would collect them for reading. The instructor announced that she would make written responses to half the journals on alternate weeks.

During baseline the investigator recorded, at the end of each week, the
number of entries and number of lines per entry by each student. After six weeks, the investigator calculated the number of lines and number of entries each student had averaged per week.

**Treatment.** During Week 7 students were randomly assigned to two groups. Both groups received personalized packets explaining and illustrating the self-monitoring procedures they would be expected to engage in. However, students in Group A were given personal target numbers (the lines per day and entries per week they should aim for) by their instructor. This number was arrived at by doubling each student's previous average. Students in Group B, on the other hand, were allowed to set their own target numbers, which they turned in to their instructor. Both groups received graphs, with the first data point marked (previous average of lines per day), for recording the number of lines written for each future entry. Students were then asked to make their first journal entry in class and to plot on their graphs the number of lines per entry.

Self-monitoring and goal-setting continued for both groups during Weeks 8 and 9. Students in Group A received the same target numbers for Weeks 8-9 as they did for Week 7. Students in Group B were allowed to set their own goals and to increase or decrease their goals each week, if they wished. The investigator recorded the number of lines and entries made per week. The instructor gave feedback via written responses to students who met or exceeded their target number of lines per entry.

**Return to Baseline.** Students were instructed at the beginning of Week 10 to continue keeping their journals, but goal-setting and self-monitoring would be optional. Journals were collected at the end of Week 12.

**Results** Separate two factor mixed ANOVA'S were performed on the two dependent measures, number of lines per week and number of entries per week. The data over the 12 weeks of the study were divided into four three-week blocks. Thus, in each analysis, Group was the between factor and the three-week data blocks the within factor. The results for each three-week block for each group and standard deviations are shown in Table 2. The analysis showed no significant difference between groups. Comparison within phases showed a significant Week effect for lines \[ F (3, 39) = 20.79, p<.001 \] and for entries \[ F (3, 39) = 23.04, p<.001 \].

Figure 2 demonstrates the results of Experiment #2 for lines per week. Baseline measures for lines and entries per week showed no stability across 6 data points. Group A averaged 43.12 lines and 2.1 entries during baseline, and Group B, 37.55 lines and 2.2 entries. After goal-setting and self-monitoring were begun in Week 7, Group A averaged 112.67 lines and 4.9 entries; Group B averaged 91 lines and 4 entries. Thus, Group A more than doubled baseline measures for lines. The broken lines on the graphs indicate that students in both groups consistently wrote more than their intended goals. Return to voluntary journal keeping (minus self-monitoring and goal-setting) resulted in a reduction of entries and lines to baseline levels. Group A averaged 22.67 lines and 2.05 entries per week; Group B averaged 38.59 lines and 1.46 entries.

Effect size (difference of two means between two groups of subjects divided by the standard deviation of one group, or \( ES = (\bar{X}_a - \bar{X}_b)/SD \)) was calculated
TABLE 2
Number of lines and entries during baseline, treatment, and return to baseline phases for subjects with teacher- or self-set goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of lines</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Teacher-set goal)</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>(25.4)</td>
<td>(26.8)</td>
<td>(47.6)</td>
<td>(29.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Self-set goal)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>(15.07)</td>
<td>(22.3)</td>
<td>(38.3)</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of entries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Teacher-set goal)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>(.62)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Self-set goal)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>(1.43)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Each data point represents 3 weeks of writing. The first two data points were during baseline, the third during treatment, and the fourth during return to baseline. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

to determine whether there was a difference between the results of Experiments 1 and 2. All d’ scores were within one standard deviation, ranging from -.29 to .97. Thus, the analyses showed no significant difference between the writing output for General and Basic writers for either lines or entries per week.

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

The results of both experiments suggest the effectiveness of self-management strategies in increasing the amount and frequency of journal writing by traditional and basic composition students. In the first study, freshman composition students significantly increased their number of lines and entries per week after self-monitoring/goal-setting strategies were instituted. The second study showed similar results with basic writers. In addition, the second study demonstrated that a longer baseline, which provided six weeks of voluntary journal practice, did not increase writing output. Nor did it matter whether goals during the self-management phase were set by teachers or by students; students wrote the same amount, at the same frequency, independent of who established their output goals. In addition, both groups consistently exceeded their goals for lines per week. Finally, the second study provided an assessment...
Figure 2. Mean number of lines per week written by two groups of basic writers during baseline, treatment, and return to baseline. Broken line in treatment phases represents the mean number of lines set as goals.
of the termination of self-management, which showed that subjects immediately returned to baseline rates when no longer required to self-monitor and set goals. This result suggests the power of the self-management procedures, but suggests as well that a three-week treatment phase is insufficient for establishing a permanent increase in writing output, or a new writing habit.

This research was designed to study the effects of a treatment package, consisting of self-monitoring, goal-setting, and feedback. Any one or combination of these components might have contributed to the studies' outcomes. It is therefore difficult to determine conclusively which part of the package was most helpful or whether a certain component was ineffective. It is possible, however, to infer from the results that, of the three components, teacher feedback was the least important factor in changing writing output. Students received feedback during all three phases, but neither increased their output during baseline, nor maintained it after self-monitoring/goal-setting ended.

The success of the treatment package may be due to the reactive effects of self-monitoring. First, self-monitoring requires subjects to observe and assess their own behavior, and this self-observation alone may result in changes in behavior. Such changes complicate interpretation of results when self-observation is intended just as an assessment method. In the journal experiments, however, self-monitoring was used primarily as part of a treatment package, with the hope that it would be "reactive," and only secondarily as an assessment method, in order for students to report their writing output.

Self-monitoring can be reactive in another sense—assessment. Reactive assessment is subjects' awareness that particular responses are being monitored. Again, reactivity can complicate interpretation of results. In the present studies, the question can be raised whether the application of self-management strategies resulted in an increase in writing output, or whether the increase was triggered by the students' awareness that their instructor had been tabulating, and would continue to monitor, their output. This is the point that Smith and Combs (1980) make with their study on the effects of covert and overt cues on syntactic complexity. Students may not be responding to sentence-combining practice when they increase words per T-Unit and words per clause, but rather to the notion that their teacher values such qualities. However, in the second journal study, students returned immediately to baseline rates after self-management ended despite the fact that their instructor encouraged them to continue their new rates and made reinforcement via comments contingent upon that continuation. This phenomenon suggests that changes in writing behavior were due to self-management procedures, instead of reactive assessment.

In addition to their applied value, the journal experiments offer implications for a theory of the writing process. The experiments illustrate that some aspects of writing can be regulated by self-monitoring, goal-setting, and feedback. Knowledge of the processes involved in these self-management strategies might then offer valuable insight into the processes involved in learning to write. If self-management principles like self-monitoring can result in systematic changes in writing behavior, then one should be able, by asking why those procedures effect such changes, to formulate a model of the process of learning to compose.

One explanation of the relationship between self-monitoring, goal-setting, and reinforcement is Kanfer's (1975) proposal that self-monitoring works by making a person attend to certain aspects of his behavior. As he attends, he recognizes
whether his behavior has conformed to a previously determined goal. Recognition of non-conformity triggers self-regulatory processes, and behavior in turn is adjusted. Self-monitoring and goal-setting, then, can be described as parts of a feedback loop in which self-adjustive responses are made until the standard for performance is met. Since research has shown that accurate self-observation is not essential for behavior change (Broden et al., 1971; Herbert & Baer, 1972), it seems likely that one's goal or standard for performance plays a very important role in the process. Figure 3 is a modified version of Kanfer’s model of the processes involved in self-management.

The feedback model has much in common with current theories of the writing process. Sommers (1978) offered a model of the revision process which emphasized the role of dissonance, suggesting that experienced writers have learned to tolerate, indeed to cultivate dissatisfaction with their written products, while inexperienced writers reach premature closure by exiting from the writing process too quickly. Perl (1980) has talked about a “felt sense,” an envisioned ideal of the final product that writers create and work toward each time they engage in a writing task. Perl’s felt sense is certainly a broad kind of goal-setting, and Sommers’ dissonance theory resembles the regulatory processes involved in self-monitoring.

Flower and Hayes (1979) have proposed that the writing process consists of planning (subdivided into generating, organizing, and goal-setting); translating; and reviewing (subdivided into reading and editing). They superimpose a monitor on the three major processes, which determines the operation that has priority at a given moment. The Flower-Hayes model attempts to account for every behavior that can take place during composing, for example, drawing information from long term memory, transcribing sentences, reading what has been written, revising.

The feedback loop model, on the other hand, represents a general behavior change theory which can be applied to many other behaviors besides writing. The advantage of the feedback loop model for the writing process is that it provides information on when and how to intervene in writing instruction. Simply stated, in order to change their writing behavior, students must first actively monitor that behavior. And in order to self-monitor they must have a
way to measure what they have done. Second, in order to evaluate what they have measured, they must have a performance goal for comparison with performance feedback. Then follows feedback which triggers repetition of the process or its discontinuation. Teachers can intervene in the writing process—in order to insure its continuation or to alter its outcome—by facilitating movement through the feedback loop.

The journal experiments reported here illustrated intervention procedures on a primary level—writing fluency. Students given elevated goals for the number of lines they should write each day, were able to monitor their own behavior (number of lines they wrote), compare their performance with their goal, and then match or exceed that goal. If they met their goal, the feedback they received encouraged future repetition of the feedback loop. The feedback model offers, then, not only a technology for research on writing and composing, but also a method for instruction which is applicable to a wide range of writing behaviors, and is based on a specific behavioral change theory applied to the writing process.
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