

(가)

가 .(가 , 1987:140) 1987 가

1.

가

‘ 가 ’

가

, 1993

가 2) 1987

‘ 가 ’

가

1)

‘ 가 ’

‘ 가 ’

3)

3

가

‘ 가 ’

()

‘ ’

30%

‘ ’

(가 ,

가

‘ ’

1987:101).

‘ ’

가

‘ 가 ’

,

‘ ’

(,

1994:44).

1) ‘ ’

2) 1993

1994 9 , 1995 47

3)

, 2) 1)

가

, 3)

가

‘ 가 ’

가

2.

(1989)

3

(1995)

가

, , ,

, ,

, ,

GCSE

(, 1985)

SATII

가

가

가

가

가

가

(Tompson, 1969)

가

(

, 1995: 30-31).

1983

가

(, 1983)

(1986)'

가

가

1)

가

가

(

1986).

가

, 2)

, 3)

가

가

1) 2)

(1985)'

(1986)'

(1992)'

(1992)'

(1984)'

가

가

가

가
가

가

가

가

(1984)

가

가

3.

가

가

3

가

(1995)

가

가

10

가

가

가

가

1.

가

4)

가

가.

1988).

(Phelps,

가

가

가

가

가

가,

4)

가

가

1.

가 (1988)

가?

가 가

가

6)

,가

가.

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

(, 1998:102

가

(가

가

, 1993).

가

가

가

가

(1988)

1)

, 2)

, 3)

, 4)

6)

(1)

8)

7)

가

가

가

가

가

가

Wicox (1979)

가

가

Beyer (1984)

가

가

가

가

(2)

Wales & Nardi (1984)

가

가

가

, 가

가

7)

가

가

8)

(1988)

가

,

,

,

가

.

(文語)

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

(argument)

(dispute)

()

가

가

가

()가

. Pual(1984)

가

가

(1)

(weak sense)

(strong sense)

가

가

()

가

가

가

가

가

가

(2)

() .

가

가

가

가

가

(가)

가

1

2

가 가

가 가

가

가

가

가

가

() -

<

?

>

가

() - -

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

(3)

(3) (Conceptual Knowledge)
(Procedural Knowledge)

(1)

가 가 가 ,

(2)

가

(4)

가

가

(Anderson, 1978).

(Kinneavy, 1971).

가

가

2.

< 2>

1		- , · , -		
2		· ,	(, 가)	

가
가

가

가

가

가

가

가

< 3>

가

< 3>

()

	()	·	-
	()	·	-

< 2>

3.

2

1)

, 2)

, 3)

가

가

가.

가

(1)

가

가

가

(what)²

(how)²

(when)²

1

(why)²

4>, < 5>

< 4>

1.	1-1. 가? 1-2. 가? 1-3. 가?
2.	2-1. 가? 2-2. 가? 2-3. 가?
3.	3-1. 가? 3-2. 가? 3-3. 가?

< 5>

1.	1-1. 가? 1-2. 가?
2.	2-1. 가? 2-2. 가?

(2)

< 6>, < 7>

< 6>

1.	1- 1.
2.	2- 1. 2- 1a. 2- 1b. 2- 1c. - 2- 1d. - 2- 1e. 2- 1f. 2- 1g.

< 7>

1.	1- 1. 1- 2. , , 1- 3.
2.	2- 1. 2- 2.
3.	3- 1. 가 3- 2. 가 가

가

< 8>

가? ‘ ’, ‘ ’
가.

1 , 2 가

가

가

가

가

(1985). 「
」. :
(1995). 「
」. :
(1980). 「
: 가」.
:
(1997). 「
」.
:
(1994). 「
가 」. :
(1992).

,1992, 25-46.

(1987). 「
」. :
(1994). 「
」. :
」. :

(1993). 「
」. 「
(1993).
37」.
(1986). 「
」. :
(1994). 「
」. :
(1995). 「
」. :
(1994). 「
」.
(1996). 「
」.

(1995). 「
-
가 」. :
(1992). 「
」. :
」. :

- (1988). 「
()」.
(1995). 「
(1988). 「
(1997). 「
(1981).
33-34
(1994). 「
(1998). 「
」.
(1995). 「
(1992). 「
(1997). 7
」.
(1997㉔).
, '97
」.
(1997). 「 7
」.
(1987). 「
」.
(1997). 「
(1994). 「
」.
(1994). 「
가 (1987). 「
」.
(1997). 「
(1994).
4
(1995). 「
(1989). 「
- (1984). 「
」.
(1990). 「
가」,
17.
(1994). 「
가
(1988). 「
가」.
Anderson, R. C.(1978). Schema-directed Processes in Language Comprehension. In A. Lesgold, J. Pelligreno, S. Fokkema, & R. Glaser(Eds.), *Cognitive Psychology and Instruction*. NY : Plenum.
Applebee,A.N.(1974). *Tradition and R&form in the Teaching of English*. Illinois : NCTE.
Applebee, A. N. & Purves, A.C.(1992). Literature and English Language Arts,In Jackson, P.W.(ed.). *Handbook of Reasearch on Curriculum*. N.Y. : MacMilan,, pp.726-748.
Barrass, R.(1982). *Students Must Write : A Guide to better Wring in Course Work and Examination*. London : Methuen.
Beyer, B. K.(1984). *Improving Thinking Skills- Dfining the Problem*. KAPPAN. March.
Brooks & Warren(1979). *Modern Rhetoric*. N.Y. : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Bruner, J.(1987). *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Massachusetts : Harvard Univ. Press.
California State Education Department.(1997). *State of California Academic Standards Commission*, <http://www.ca.gov/goldstandards/index.html>.
Boardof Studies.(1995). *English: Curriculum & Standards Framrwork*. Victoria: Board of Studies.
Cashdan,A.(1986). *Literacy: Teaching and Learning Language Skills*.N.Y.: Basil Blackwell.
Department for Education and Employment.(1995). *The National Curriculum : English*, <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/engfore.html>.

- Department of Education and Science.(1988). *Language Performance in Schools*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Doll,JR.,W.E. A.(1993). *Postmodern Perspective on Curriculum*. N.Y.:Teacher College, Columbia Univ.Press.
- Garton, A. & Pratt C.(1989). *Learning to be Literate: The Development of Spoken & Written Language*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Kinneavy, J. L.(1971). *A Theory of Discourse*. NY : Norton.
- Lawrence, M. S(1972). *Writing as a Thinking Process*. The Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Lloyd-Jones, R. & Lunsford A. A.(1989). *The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language*. Illinois: NCTE.
- Moffett, J.(1986). *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Massachusetts : Harvard Univ. Press.
- Moffett, J & Wagner, B.J.(1992). *Student-Centered Language Arts, K-12*. Portsmouth : Boyton/ Cook Publishers.
- Moll, L.C.(ED)(1992). *Vygotsky and Education*. N.Y. : Cambridge Univ. Press.
- New York State Education Department. *English Language Arts*(1997 Working Draft)
- Nystrand, M.(ED)(1982). *What Writers Know: The Language, Process, and Structure of Written Discourse*. N.Y. : Academic Press.
- Michigan State Board of Education.(1994). *Core Curriculum Content Standards : English Language Arts*.
- Phelps, L. W.(1988). *Composition as a Human Sciences*. NY : Oxford U.
- Pual, Richard W.(1984). Critical Thinking: Fundamental to Education for a Free Society, *Educational Leadership*. 42, 1, September.
- Vicki, S.(1988). *Writing Skills. Assessing Student Progress on the Common Curriculum Goals*. Oregon Department of Education.
- Wales, C. E., & Nardi, A.(1984). *Successful Decision Making*. Morgantown, W. Va : Center for Guided Design. West Virginia U.
- Wicox, M. M.(1979). *Developmental Journey*. Tenn : Parthenon.

ABSTRACT

A Study on Organization of Educational Contents for Improving Persuasive Writing Competence

Lee, In-Je

(KICE)

The persuasive writing instruction has been emphasized to improve the educational quality. That is, to overcome the multiple-choice evaluation-system, to enhance the higher-thinking skill and to improve school instruction-system. Although these grounds, yet the persuasive writing instruction has not been established in public education. This was caused by different opinions among educational professionals on the method, intent and the content of persuasive writing instruction. This situation was primarily caused by the non-establishment of the character and status of persuasive writing instruction and non-organization of the educational content to improve the writing competence. This study illuminates the status of persuasive writing competence and constructs the contents of persuasive writing instruction by several principles.

First, this study investigates the status of the persuasive writing competence as a tool of communication, a tool of enhancing thinking skills and making-decision. And then this study investigates the educational contents of persuasive writing instruction, which divided into thinking skill-based content, text-based content, writing process-based content and writing across curriculum-based content.

These educational contents are organized by the principle of clarification of objects, of emphasizing the educational contents, of unification of procedure. In according to the principle of clarification of objects, the more essential educational contents are text-based content and writing process-based content. While thinking skill-based content and writing across curriculum-based content are dispensable. In

according to the principle of emphasizing the educational content, each contents are classified into primary educational content and secondary educational content. This classification clarifies each educational significance more clearly. In according to the principle of unification of procedure, the contents, categorized as substance, principle and practice, were re-categorized as knowledge elements and skill elements.

The viewpoint of this study in organizing the contents of the persuasive writing instruction is followed. ; First, this study focused on 'practice' than 'substance' and 'principle'. The most important in persuasive writing instruction is text product competence-skill elements. And knowledge elements influence on product of persuasive writing, but these are not essential. Second, this study re-illuminates the ground and character of persuasive writing instruction which has been discussed differently. Finally, this study proposes the cooperative writing activity. Because persuasive writing competence mainly depends on text product, it also has close relation to text understanding.

For the importance of the persuasive writing instruction, there has been different viewpoints on the methodology and content of persuasive writing. But this confusion of viewpoint must not weaken the essential significance of persuasive writing instruction. So this study tries to organize the content of persuasive writing instruction, thereby contribute to settling the persuasive writing instruction. The elaboration of the educational contents of persuasive writing instruction is required in the future studies.