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ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a rationale and outline for the curriculum of a writing course for international students who require pre-freshman remedial writing programs such as those found at many American universities. The curriculum rationale is based on the research on skilled and unskilled native and nonnative student writers. The strategies and behaviors characteristic of skilled and unskilled native and nonnative writers are isolated and presented in a series of eleven tables corresponding to different phases of the writing process, i.e., prewriting, composing, revision, and post-writing. Based on a synthesis of the research, a curriculum is proposed in order to help inexperienced ESL writers learn to control and direct their writing process. A list of aims and objectives are drawn up to serve as the curriculum base, appropriate roles for students and teachers are recommended, a process-oriented pedagogy is discussed, and suggestions for the role and design of materials are made. The Appendices detail a comprehensive list of tasks, activities and procedures as well as present prototype materials. These are to be used by teachers to help students move towards achieving the aims, understandings, and objectives, which in turn, facilitate greater control and direction of the writing process. Suggestions for further case study and experimental research are also made.
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I. Introduction and Review of the Literature

As universities begin to recognize the importance of writing within the learning process, they are beginning to place greater emphasis on developing students' writing abilities. A case in point is the University of Hawaii, which proposes that all arts and science students be required to take fifteen credit hours in which written assignments must be completed in order to meet course requirements. (Stone 1984:1). This renewed emphasis upon writing across the curriculum increases the importance of writing courses which prepare international students to meet university entry level as well as continuing writing requirements.

Zamel (1976) and Taylor (1981) suggest that many pre-freshman ESL writing classes do not prepare students to assume the heavy burden of writing which will be encountered in their university writing courses. Zamel (1976), Taylor (1981), and Raimes (1979), among others, attribute this lack to traditional curriculum designs for pre-freshman writing courses which have a product focus; i.e., teach students to focus on grammatical and rhetorical correctness using pedagogical techniques which employ 1) the learning from models; 2) the prescribed organization of the writing process so that few errors result; and 3) the use of exercises
teaching grammar and form. Zamel (1976, 1982), Young (1978), Hairston (1982), and Buchanan (1982) maintain that this "current traditional" pedagogical paradigm is inherently weak because it is based on a received tradition rather than empirical research.

The second language methodologists Rubin (1975) and Stern (1980) declare that instead of analyzing learning outcomes (products), researchers and teachers should research the strategies and behaviors used by good language learners. This is so that procedures can be established to train poor learners to use these or similar strategies and behaviors. A substantial body of the L1 and L2 composition literature does indeed report research of the writing processes of skilled and unskilled native and nonnative writers. However, at present no ESL writing curriculum has been developed which is based on an analysis of this research.

Therefore, this thesis will present a rationale and outline for the curriculum of a writing course for international students who require pre-freshman remedial writing programs such as those found at many American universities. The rationale is based on the research on skilled and unskilled native and nonnative student writers. This first chapter isolates and analyzes the strategies and behaviors characteristic of skilled and unskilled native and nonnative writers. The information is presented in a series of eleven
tables corresponding to the different phases of the writing process. (See section 1.3 below.) Based on a synthesis of the research, Chapter Two suggests a curriculum designed to help inexperienced ESL writers learn to control and direct their writing processes. A list of aims and objectives are drawn up to serve as the curriculum base, appropriate roles for the students and the teacher are recommended, a process oriented pedagogy is discussed, and suggestions for the role and design of materials are made. The Appendices detail a comprehensive list of tasks, activities and procedures. These can be used by teachers to help students move towards achieving the aims, understandings, and objectives which, in turn, facilitate greater control and direction of the writing process. Chapter Three presents suggestions for further research.

1.1 Parallels in L1 and L2 Research

In presenting the strategies and behaviors characteristic of skilled and unskilled writers to support an ESL curriculum design, both first and second language research will be examined. There is a continuing tradition of influence from L1 research on L2 research and classroom instruction. For example, many of the L2 studies on the writing process which are cited below are replications of L1 studies. Similar research methodologies are used and the skilled versus unskilled dichotomy is usually present. The
findings of the L2 studies also do not appear to differ any more greatly from the findings of the L1 studies than such L1 findings differ from each other.

Indeed, many parallels in the L1 and L2 research have been found. Heuring (1984) reports that the revising capabilities of ESL/EFL writers correspond roughly to developmental stages reflecting a writer's progress in the second language. These findings are similar to the L1 findings; e.g., Faigley and Witte (1981), and Perl (1979). Another parallel observation was made by Zamel (1982), who reports that proficient ESL writers, like their native language counterparts, experience writing as a process of creating meaning. A third illustration comes from Jones' (1981a). This was a study of the behaviors of two ESL writers who were a monitor overuser and an underuser. He reports behaviors of unskilled writers which were similar to those reported in an L1 study by Perl (1980).

While reports of the similarities in the findings seem numerous, there are some noteworthy differences. Heuring (1984:25) observes that "translating is an option available to L2 writers" and notes that "its use requires additional processing time which may slow down or even inhibit the writing process." This additional processing time may be needed for ESL writers to evaluate language and syntactic choice which would be automatic for the native writer.
However, L1 and L2 research on the writing process generally describes a similar writing process with subjects employing similar strategies and behaviors during that process. Therefore, ESL researchers and methodologists such as Taylor (1981), Buchanan (1982), and Zamel (1976, 1982) strongly urge using the implications of the research on native-speaker writing to provide guidance in the development of tasks, activities, and procedures for the ESL writing classroom.

1.2 Research Sources

The research sources for this curriculum include a fairly large number of case studies of native speaking writers (hereafter referred to as NSWs) and nonnative speaking writers (hereafter referred to as NSWSs). The first such major case study, Emig (1971), was of eight twelfth grade NSWs. Emig identified and delineated the components of the writing process and established its nonlinear nature. Other researchers have used Emig's findings as starting points for their own studies. This subsequent research has focused on identifying and dichotomizing the cognitive strategies and physical behaviors characteristic of the writing processes of skilled and unskilled writers. Mischel (1974), Metzger (1976), and Perl (1979), studied only unskilled NSWs. On the other hand, Hayes and Flower (1980) examined writing protocols of NSWs. In contrast to these studies, Stallard (1974),
Bechtel (1976), and Pianko (1979) compared both skilled and unskilled NSWs. Beach (1976), Sommers (1980), Bridwell (1980), and Faigley and Witte (1981) focused only on revision strategies of skilled and unskilled NSWs.

Case studies of NNSWs are fewer in number. Those consulted for the development of this curriculum include research on unskilled NNSWs by Gaskill (1983) and Heuring (1983). Zamel (1982, 1983) and Heuring (1984) compared the writing processes of both skilled and unskilled NNSWs. Both the Gaskill (1983) and Heuring (1984) studies focused on the revision phase of the writing process.

The research listed above consists primarily of small scale studies which are descriptive and based on "the systematic observation of writers engaged in the process of writing" (Perl 1979:317). Hypothesis testing is not a part of these studies. Instead, each study uses a variety of two or more research methods in order to develop a rich data base. These methods include:

1) making observations of writing behaviors using trained observers and/or video-taping. Metzger (1976), Perl (1979), Gaskill (1983), Zamel (1982, 1983) and Heuring (1984) were among those who used trained observers to first code and then record writing behaviors. This is
because the focus of their studies was a product analysis. Bechtel (1979), Pianko (1979), and Heuring (1984) were among those who videotaped.

2) interviewing subjects before and after writing in order to get information which might not appear through direct observation. Emig (1971), Perl (1979), and Bechtel (1979), used interviews to begin each writing session in order to determine the subjects' attitudes towards the assignment. Mischel (1974), Stallard (1974), Metzger (1976) Pianko (1979), Perl (1979), and Zamel (1982, 1983) used follow-up interviews to question the subjects about behaviors and strategies which took place during the writing process. Often these interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for detailed analysis.

3) employing composing aloud protocols in which writers' attempt to verbalize their writing processes. This informs the researcher what is happening cognitively during a writing behavior. Because a composing aloud protocol requires the subject to be well trained to perform this procedure, only a few studies used it. Emig (1971) was the first to use the technique in composition research. Hayes and Flower (1980) used the technique almost exclusively for their data gathering. In contrast, Mischel (1974), Bechtel (1976), Perl
(1979), Gaskill (1983), and Heuring (1983, 1984) used the procedure with mixed results noting that sometimes their subjects did not cooperate.

4) giving standardized tests in order to determine the level of ability of their subjects; e.g., Stallard (1974), Bechtel (1976), Beach (1976), Bridwell (1980), and Heuring (1984).

5) quantifying data from an analysis of the written products. This often involves counting the number of revision changes made during the writing of the second draft; e.g., Sommers (1980), Bridwell (1980), Faigley and Witte (1981), Gaskill (1983), and Heuring (1983, 1984).

With such a vast array of data collection techniques (Bechtel's 1976 ethnographic study used the largest array of data collection techniques), a wide range of findings has been amassed. Even with the many limitations upon these studies, including small numbers of subjects, artificial laboratory conditions, and the subjective nature of data analysis, researchers have been able to garner sufficient meaningful data in order to draw solid conclusions and make follow-up recommendations for classroom teaching.
1.3 **Strategies and Behaviors of Skilled and Unskilled Writers**

This section synthesizes the findings of the aforementioned research in a comparison of the cognitive strategies and writing behaviors of skilled and unskilled NSWs and NNSWs. The strategies and behaviors which have been identified by the L1 and L2 research are presented in a series of eleven tables. These tables have been dichotomized and grouped to correspond to the major phases, or components of phases of the writing process. In addition, several of these tables illustrate 1) ways the final products of skilled and unskilled writers differ; 2) how skilled and unskilled writers manipulate variables which constrain the writing process; and 3) how skilled and unskilled writers control the whole of the writing process. The cumulative effect of this tabular presentation is a detailed description of the nature of each phase of the writing process as it relates to the strategies and behaviors of skilled and unskilled writers. Such an organized description of the writing process is essential for development of the writing curriculum presented in Chapter 11.

In examining the tables of strategies and behaviors which follow, the reader is reminded that no one writer could possibly possess all the behaviors and strategies of either the skilled or unskilled writer. Each column actually represents a composite of observed behaviors of the many
subjects studied. Examining each of these subjects on an individual basis would reveal behaviors which would fit on both sides of the page. While it may be possible, it is not within the scope of this thesis to develop a basis for classifying any given writer as skilled or unskilled. Rather, the intention is to present opposite ends of a continuum of strategies and behaviors characteristic of skilled and unskilled writers. Identifying those behaviors distinctive of the skilled writer makes it easier to develop a curriculum and a pedagogy to assist unskilled writers to learn to control and direct their writing process.

Furthermore, all of the researchers had their own means for classifying writers as skilled or unskilled. It was usually done based on the analysis of a written product sample. Since there is no uniform measure of rating, ranking, and matching subjects between studies, this leaves open the possibility that the skilled subjects of one study are the unskilled subjects of another study. Even so, there appears to be remarkably little contradiction among the studies when it comes to determining which strategies and behaviors are classified as representative of skilled writers and which are representative of unskilled writers.

In order to classify and list writing strategies and behaviors characteristic of skilled and unskilled writers,
standard points of reference must be established. What follows is a definition of the writing process and its major parts.

The writing process refers to the entire situation encompassing the production of text beginning from the initial impulse to write something and ending when the writer has finished the work and no longer desires, needs, or is able to make further changes. In other words, it is everything from the origination [sic] to the completion of any form of written expression (Heuring 1984:17).

Initial pioneering research on the processes of NSW's examined the whole of the writing process. Out of this research has come the delineation of the writing process into an assortment of component parts or "elements, moments and stages...which can be distinguished and characterized in some detail" (Emig 1971:33). Emig chose to label the major components of the writing process, "dimensions". Each dimension consists of sets of observable writing behaviors and/or detectable cognitive strategies interacting with each other in a variety of characteristic ways.

The L1 and L2 research which followed Emig also breaks down the writing process into major and minor components. However, many of the researchers conceptualize and define elements of the writing process, with its various dimensions and component sets of writing behaviors, differently. For example, Hayes and Flower (1980) describe an
interactive writing process consisting of planning, translating, and reviewing. Similarly, Perl (1979) notes and describes an interactive writing process but uses different terms—prewriting, writing, and editing. Also, Perl's terms do not correspond to those of Hayes and Flower; e.g. Perl's prewriting does not correspond to Hayes and Flower's planning, etc. For the purposes of this curriculum, a definition of the writing process and its components as well as the standardized description of the writing behaviors of skilled and unskilled writers was developed through a synthesis of all of the cited L1 and L2 composition research. No single source can be cited for the explanation which follows. Terms which are defined in this document occur frequently in the cited composition research but will not always be used as they were in their original context.

The major components of the writing process which Emig (1971) calls "dimensions" will be known from here on as phases. Those phases which are important to the classification of strategies and behaviors of skilled and unskilled writers have been delineated and labeled as:

1) Prewriting
2) Composing
3) Revision
4) Post-writing
Each phase label is considered an umbrella term for a process consisting of an interactive set of cognitive and behavioral components. **Phase** is the most appropriate term because it denotes permeable boundaries. Certain components of each of the first three phases can seep through phase boundaries and interact recursively with components of other phases.

1.3.1 **Prewriting Strategies and Behaviors**

**Prewriting** is that phase of the writing process which includes "everything that precedes the first draft" (Murray 1978:86). Skilled writers use prewriting time to select a topic and accumulate topic-related information and ideas, develop insights, let ideas incubate, plan, and organize. At the same time, these writers may consider such matters as purpose, audience, organization, deadlines, and other factors which can influence and/or constrain the writing of a piece. It should be noted that skilled writers do not proceed through a precise linear series of steps during prewriting; e.g., 1) select a topic; 2) explore ideas; and 3) plan what to write. Koch and Brazil (1978:25) state that prewriting "is such an amorphous, unexplored domain that it is impossible to chart one course ..." Rather, prewriting strategies and behaviors take many forms depending upon
the writing situation, the individual's prior personal experience background, and, if a teacher is involved, the teacher's triggering stimulus.

The prewriting phase occurs only once during the writing process, but the composition research suggests that many of the activities begun during the prewriting phase continue on throughout other phases of the writing process. For example, planning begins during prewriting but doesn't stop once the composing phase is underway. Instead, planning occurs again and again throughout the writing process. The purpose of this renewed planning is to deal with any new information and insights generated in the process of getting all the words down on paper.

See Table 1 for examples of the differences between the prewriting strategies and behaviors of skilled and unskilled writers. It is a listing of those prewriting strategies and behaviors cited by the L1 and L2 composition research.

Table 1: Prewriting Strategies and Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) deliberately spend time in the prewriting phase. They spend more time in thinking about task requirements and making plans; e.g., Heuring's (1983) skilled writer spent nine out of eighty-one minutes in prewriting.</td>
<td>1) spend little time in the prewriting phase. They spend less time planning and getting started; e.g., Gaskill's (1983) unskilled subject spent less than one out of sixty minutes in prewriting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: **Prewriting** Strategies andBehaviors’s (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) know and use a variety of strategies to help think, gain insight, plan, deal with composing constraints, and get started. Such strategies may include:</td>
<td>2) know only a limited number of strategies to help think, plan, and get started. Such strategies primarily include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) mental prefiguring: purposefully responding to prewriting stimuli before deciding how to begin.</td>
<td>a) mental prefiguring: responding confusedly to prewriting stimuli before deciding how to begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) notetaking.</td>
<td>b) reading and rereading of the task instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) diagram/sketch making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) list making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) free-writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) observation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) formal outlining (albeit the practice is not widespread nor firmly adhered to).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) reading and rereading task instructions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) recollecting past experience from memory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) reading and rereading notes and information sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) talking to selves or to imaginary others about prewriting plans and decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) contemplating connections between gathered information and ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 **Composing Strategies**  
Behaviors

According to Pianko (1979:7) **composing** is "what occurs between the writing of the first word on paper and the final stopping of the writing." In her **analysis** of composing Emig
(1971:33) states that it "includes the selection and arrangement of elements—lexical, syntactic, imagaic..." and this "involves pausing or hesitating in order to project, formulate and reformulate" (1971:57). Heuring (1984:17) breaks composing into distinct cognitive and behavioral activities which "facilitate the generation of ideas from the brain, transfer of these ideas onto paper, and the subsequent improvement of these ideas" (revision).

For the purpose of dichotomizing and presenting the behaviors and strategies skilled and unskilled writers use during this phase of the writing process, the following categories of composing acts will be examined; 1) starting-up composing acts; 2) writing acts; 3) reviewing acts; and 4) in-process planning acts. Tables will present the strategies and behaviors associated with each type of act. Revision acts, also an integral part of composing, will be explained in a later section.

1.3.2.1 Starting-up Composing

Starting-up composing acts provide the transition between accumulating and organizing ideas and actually writing them down on paper. However, little L2 research and only a few of the L1 studies (Emig 1971), (Stallard 1974), and Fianko (1979) take into account variables which may influence the way skilled and unskilled writers get started
composing. Table 2 presents the different ways skilled and unskilled writers get started composing.

Table 2: Starting-up Composing Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) control the writing environment.</td>
<td>1) are unconcerned about their writing environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) permit incubation time of ideas and information which fosters discussion.</td>
<td>2) begin the task immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) use the information, ideas, and discoveries from prewriting to help trigger a beginning.</td>
<td>3) refer to the assignment instructions and topic title to trigger a beginning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2.2 Writing

Writing refers solely to the specific overt behavior of transcribing or encoding of words on paper. Writing is a component of composing and includes numerous other behaviors such as pausing and reading (reviewing), planning and decision making, and revision. In describing writing, Heuring (1984:24) states that the writing act begins with the cognitive activity of "assigning linguistic representations to mental concepts." Then the writer "takes...ideas and transforms them into written sentences."

For skilled writers, transcribing can become an unconscious automatic act permitting concentrated attention upon the other components of composing. Unskilled writers, on the other hand, are still so concerned with the mechanics and
conventions of writing that such acts as reviewing and planning are neglected. In order to attend to the assorted composing acts, the flow of transcribing must be interrupted so many times that the unskilled writers lose their sense of direction. Their writing takes on a shaky, halting style with many false starts and cross-outs. Table 3 summarizes the similarities and differences between skilled and unskilled writers during the writing/encoding/transcribing operation.

Table 3: Writing Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) transcribe fluently</td>
<td>1) transcribe fluently only during the outset of composing. They are quickly inhibited by a concern with stylistic details and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) possess sufficient linguistic competancy to unconsciously control the encoding process. As a result, skilled writers are able to concentrate on the other operations of composing.</td>
<td>2) lack control of the linguistic system. Therefore, fluency is inhibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2.3 Reviewing Acts

The third major component of composing consists of a series of interrelated acts working in juxtaposition with the writing component and has been labeled reviewing by...
Hayes and Flower (1980). As writing proceeds, content generation sometimes becomes difficult. There is a need for additional information, ideas, and planning. At this point, writers—be they skilled or unskilled—will review what they have written. They will pause, back track, read and then contemplate the written text in an attempt to fill in with ideas those information gaps which are making it hard to continue text production. Perl (1980) presents three examples of ways reviewing can occur.

1) Writers reread what has been written. There is back and forth interplay of encoding acts with rereading acts. What happens is that after writing a few phrases, sentences or chunks of information, the writer-composer will read little bits of discourse which are generally units which relate semantically.

2) Writers refer back to a key word or item related to the topic. This is in order to get their writing going again after getting stuck, to change what has been written to suit the topic, or to make an adjustment in the topic to suit what has been written.

3) Writers will pause and refer to a "felt sense" which includes those images, words, ideas, and vague fuzzy feelings that are anchored in the writer's body and called forth by the topic...[then], after a dawning
awareness that something has clicked...words will come which will allow them [the composers] to flesh out the sense they have (364).

Even though both skilled and unskilled writers review, the L1 and L2 studies have noted major differences between the ways these writers review. For example, skilled writers have a better understanding of reviewing and know how to use it advantageously. In her study of skilled and unskilled ESL writers Zamel (1983:173) observed that

the more skilled writers showed, much greater variability in their application of this understanding, sometimes reviewing one sentence or two, sometimes reconsidering an entire idea which usually transcended sentence boundaries, and frequently rereading whole paragraphs...The least skilled writer, however, paused so often between such short chunks of discourse, that the overall relationship between ideas seemed to suffer. She was obviously looking at her writing in such a "piecemeal" fashion that she was not able to develop a substantial thread of discourse very successfully.

Heuring (1984) also noted that his unskilled subjects did not know how to use reviewing to help continue the writing process. His subjects seldom reviewed the semantic units of discourse Perl (1980) observed her subjects doing. Table 4 describes general reviewing behaviors of skilled and unskilled writers.
Table 4: Reviewing Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) spend more time at reviewing (pausing to read and think about what to write next or to think about what to revise next) to promote text production so as to allow for the other subprocesses to continue.</td>
<td>1) spend little or no time reviewing produced text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) do most of their reviewing at the sentence or paragraph level.</td>
<td>2) review only short segments of text (words and phrases).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) know when to pause for review.</td>
<td>3) pause indiscriminately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) know how to use reviewing to solve composing problems.</td>
<td>4) don't use reviewing to solve composing problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) use reviewing primarily for planning and for revision purposes.</td>
<td>5) use reviewing primarily to a) help get the next few words written; b) to help trigger correction; and c) to help copy text word for word as a replacement for revision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2.4 In-process Planning Acts

As writers review what they have written in order to determine how closely their text fits their intended meaning, they develop new insights into what they want to say and how they want to say it. Zamel (1982:201) observed that reviewing "provides a means for discovering, creating, and giving form to ones' thoughts and ideas." This formation of new thoughts and ideas is part of the composing process.
labeled in-process planning. In-process planning involves
a) further idea generation; b) the synthesis of ideas and
discovery of insights; and c) further planning and decision
making. In-process planning is essential for continued text
production.

While skilled writers plan during prewriting, both
skilled and unskilled writers use in-process planning to
continue text production. Each time writers review written
text or make revisions upon that text new decisions must be
made about what to say next. Skilled writers make effective
use of reviewing and revision to make plans which help
generate new text. Unskilled writers do not. Table 5 pre-
sents the strategies and behaviors skilled and unskilled
writers exhibit during in-process planning.

Table 5: In-process Planning Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) use reviewing to trigger in-process planning.</td>
<td>1) plan in-process both indiscriminately and arbitrarily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) continually review pre-writing-planning data in order to maintain focus or to reorient to the topic so that the next segments of text can be produced.</td>
<td>2) do not have access to prewriting data. These writers have few systematic prewriting behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) synthesize insights from prewriting data and in-process planning to generate additional composing plans.</td>
<td>3) are unable to synthesize prewriting data and in-process planning for the creation of new insights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4: In-Process Planning Acts (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) are primarily concerned with meaning on the discourse level.</td>
<td>4) are concerned primarily with vocabulary choice, grammaticality, and mechanics on the sentential level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3 Revision

Emig (1971), Pianko (1979), Bechtel (1979), Perl (1979), Sommers (1980), and Flower and Hayes (1980) note that revision behaviors begin almost immediately after words appear on paper and take place as an integral part of composing. However, for the purposes of this thesis, revision will be isolated from composing. Revision, as a major phase of the writing process, begins with the end of the writing of the first draft. It is at this time that the primary purpose of composing is not just to get the meaning down but to make improvements in the meaning and the overall quality of the text. Those revision acts which occur during composing and alternate interactively with transcribing and reviewing will be known as in-process revision. Revision acts made near the end of the writing process in order to fine tune the final written form for a reader will be known as polishing. Making revisions is a crucial part of the writing process. Revision can lead to new ways of thinking and writing about the topic as well as to setting up additional portions of the text for further text change, continued text production and,
as is often the case, the extraction of a single idea from the rough text so that the writing can begin anew.

Dissonance triggers revision. Dissonance is that feeling of unease that writers get during writing or reviewing text that something is wrong. Sommers (1980:385) writes that dissonances are those "...incongruities [writers detect] between intention and execution." Perl (1979), Pianko (1979), Sommers (1980), Bridwell (1980), and Heuring (1984) observed that composing generally does not continue until the source of dissonance is detected and the revisions are made. The writers must stop, locate the problem by reviewing the written text, and then revise what has been written.

Both skilled and unskilled writers experience dissonance. However, the experiences for each are on two different planes. Skilled writers are able to detect dissonance both in terms of content presentation and matters of grammar and mechanics. Skilled writers are also more likely to be successful in detecting the problem creating the dissonance. When dissonance occurs, skilled writers will review the relevant text and make their revisions. On the other hand, unskilled writers are more likely to experience dissonance with vocabulary, grammar and the mechanics involved with the
transcribing. Long pauses are associated with their uncertainty and confusion about what to write next. These inexperienced writers are not always likely to detect the cause of their feelings of dissonance.

Sommers (1980) noted that experienced writers work in revision cycles. During the first cycle the writers are primarily concerned with exploring and narrowing their topic ideas and dealing with content. Revision is very much "internal" and concerned with the systematic reviewing of the text in order to make changes that help the writer either continue in the desired direction or to help the writer discover that direction. While this means that revision operations generally occur at the sentence level or higher, the surface editing or external revising is still an important part of the composing process at this point. Even so, this external revision does not take precedence over internal revision. On the other hand, less skilled writers are concerned with making external revisions from the inception of composing and seldom get involved with internal revision and the writing of more than a single draft, (Bridwell 1980, Faigely and Witte 1981).

One of the marks of skilled writers is their ability to revise both internally and externally throughout the writing process from the beginning until the end. Another mark of
skilled writers is their ability to employ conscious strategies to control and time the internal and external revision processes in order to have the greatest effect upon the quality of their writing. Unskilled writers, on the other hand, will seldom write more than one draft of a piece and when they do, they tend to copy rather than rewrite. Unskilled writers are also unaware of how and when to use revision to improve the quality of their written product.

Revisions are made in terms of major and minor changes in the content and substance of the text and in terms of changes in matters of form such as the correcting of usage errors. Bridwell (1980), Sommers (1980), Hayes and Flower (1980), and Faigley and Witte (1981) studied the effect of revision behavior on written products and identified the different kinds of revision changes NSWs make. Gaskill (1983) and Heuring (1984) used the findings of these L1 studies as their baseline data for research on revision behaviors of NNSWs. These studies conclude that skilled writers make all types of revisions and are capable of dealing with a variety of meaning and form related problems. Unskilled writers, who also revise, generally revise form rather than content. Presented next are the basic types of revision changes that these studies have identified as taking place during the writing process.
1) Surface changes minimally affect meaning. These include:

a) formal or copy-editing revisions (spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc.) and syntactical changes; for example, "Housing can be a problem too to other foreign student/students." (Heuring 1984:44, 110). In this example from Heuring, the singular "student" was changed to plural "students" with only a slight change in meaning.

b) meaning-preserving revisions which deal with improvements in the form of the text that do not significantly alter the meaning of what is written. These changes may be at the lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentential, or chunk level; for example, "I was worried because I didn't know where to go./ I begin to worry about finding a place to stay." (Heuring 1984:44, 110). In this case, a change in the form at the sentence level has been made but the meaning remains the same.

2) Text based changes affect the meaning. These involve:

a) revisions in the meaning of part or all of the written text which maintain the intended focus. However, these changes do not affect the overall gist or summary of the text. These changes may be at the lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentential, or chunk level; for example, "If
I had come as the wife of an American.../ a rich American..." (Heuring 1984:45, 110). In this example, a change has occurred at the phrase level which changes the meaning of the sentence significantly. However, this change does not affect the overall meaning of the piece of writing it was extracted from.

b) revisions in the text which change the intended focus thus affecting the overall meaning or gist of the text. These changes may be at the lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentential, or chunk level; for example, "You may say to yourself../I may say to myself." (Heuring 1984:45, 110). In this case, the changes made to the form are minor, but result in a radically different text.

3. All such changes can involve the following major manipulations of text.
   a) the addition of text
   b) the deletion of text
   c) the reordering of text

Table 6 describes the different ways skilled and unskilled writers are likely to revise in terms of the above classification scheme.
Table 6: Revision Acts

| Skilled Writers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Unskilled Writers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) make few formal changes at the surface level.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 1) make large numbers of formal changes at the surface level.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2) are able to make accurate revisions to clarify meaning.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2) make inaccurate revisions to clarify meaning.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 3) make effective text-based changes in meaning.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 3) make only text-based changes which do not affect the overall gist.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4) make effective revisions which change the direction and focus of the text.                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 4) usually make no text-based revisions which change meanings in a major way. Thus, these writers do not allow a change in the direction of the focus.                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 5) make a majority of their revisions at the lexical/phrasal level. Revise also at the higher clausal/sentential and discourse levels.                                                                                                                                                       | 5) are unable to effect revisions beyond lexical and phrasal levels.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 6) add, delete, substitute, and reorder when revising texts.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 6) do not make effective use of addition, deletion, substitution, and reordering when revising their texts.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 7) review and revise throughout.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 7) make a majority of revisions during the writing of the first draft.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 8) are concerned primarily with content and meaning when revising the first draft.                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 8) are primarily concerned with lexical selection and surface error during the writing of the first draft.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 9) reread the first draft with the intention of making meaning changes.                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 9) reread the first draft for copying purposes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) often pause for reviewing and additional in-process revision during the rewriting of the first draft.</td>
<td>10) do not pause for revision while copying the first draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) make additional revisions after the writing of the second draft. These include making meaning as well as surface revisions.</td>
<td>11) do not make further revisions on neatly copied drafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) are able to revise without affecting the progress, direction, and control of the writing process. Spend at least as much time in the writing and revising of subsequent drafts as with the writing of the first draft.</td>
<td>12) permit the revision process to interfere with the progress, direction and control of the writing process. These writers spend more composing time on the first draft than on subsequent copied drafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) use revision to clarify and create new meaning.</td>
<td>13) use revision to deal with surface error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) contemplate and evaluate the new plans and revision changes made as a result of reviewing activities. This helps the writer gain new insights and make decisions.</td>
<td>14) think extensively about what to write next, but are unable to contemplate and evaluate plans and revision changes derived from reviewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) are able to tolerate confusion during the revision process because they realize this confusion will be resolved through further revision.</td>
<td>15) are unable to tolerate the confusion associated with revision thus reducing the desire to revise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) are able to use the revision process to generate additional content and trigger further revision.</td>
<td>16) use revising primarily to correct grammar, spelling, punctuation and to get the meaning of the words right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.4. Post Writing

The *post* writing phase follows the completion of the writing task when writers no longer wish, feel the need, or are able to add text or revise it. The writers’ attention shifts towards viewing the writing as a completed product to be read and evaluated by themselves and a reader. Table 7 describes post writing strategies and behaviors. Table 8 describes characteristic of the final products most often associated with skilled and unskilled writers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Post Writing Strategies and Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skilled Writers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) are able to evaluate the extent to which the changes affected <em>are desirable.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) are willing to make positive and negative <em>evaluative</em> remarks about their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) see themselves as good writers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) willingly reread their compositions out of a sense of accomplishment, satisfaction and pride.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: The Final Products of Skilled and Unskilled Writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) present final products which demonstrate evidence of <strong>prewriting</strong> and in-process planning; <em>i.e.</em>, details and completeness.</td>
<td>1) present final products lacking detail. This indicates that little attention is being paid to planning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) present final products which are significantly different from the initial (first draft) writing and demonstrate evidence they have been revised.</td>
<td>2) present final products which are similar to the first draft demonstrating little evidence of revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) produce a lengthy text often exceeding minimal requirements.</td>
<td>3) produce short texts which do not meet minimal length requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) produce text of higher than average quality.</td>
<td>4) produce text of average or below average quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.5 **Constraints on the Writing Process**

There are a number of constraints related to any given writing task which must be taken into account at some point during the **writing process**. This is because these factors can affect the students' ability to control and direct the writing **process** and bring the writing task to a successful conclusion. Faigley and Witte (1981) suggest that these factors are so important that composing might be defined in part as the ability to respond to them. Flower and Hayes (1980:34) label these factors "**constraints**" upon composing and suggest that these constraints are capable of either determining or inhibiting what is said. "**What** a writer
chooses to say must, in principle, eventually conform to all of the constraints imposed from all of the areas or variables!! related to the writing task. Citing Jacobs¹ (1982) analysis of native and nonnative student writing as evidence, Zamel (1983:168) states that "the skill with which students write essays may be related more to the complexity of the assignment and their own misconceptions about how to meet the requirements of a particular task than to their linguistic backgrounds." What follows is a partial list of the constraints which can be an important influence upon the way writers control and direct their writing process.

a) subject matter and topic focus
b) purpose for the task
c) audience expected to read the writing
d) expected audience reaction to the writing
f) mode for the writing task
g) format for the writing task
h) register for the writing task
i) degree of mastery of the English linguistic system
j) degree of mastery of the written conventions of English
k) length, deadline and other task related requirements
l) amount and quality of assistance given
m) attitudes towards writing and motivation to complete the writing task
Skilled writers realize that understanding and controlling these factors can either assist or inhibit what is written. Indeed, skilled writers are able to manipulate these factors so that they do not inhibit the writing process. Unskilled writers, on the other hand, attempt to deal with many of these factors all at once. This inhibits the continuance of the writing process and explains many of the weaknesses in the final products of the unskilled writer.

Table 9 presents general strategies and behaviors skilled and unskilled writers use to manipulate the constraints upon the writing task. Table 10 provides examples of specific ways skilled and unskilled writers deal with several of the constraints selected from the list above.

| Table 9: Stratégies and Behaviors Used to Manage Constraints on the Writing Process |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Skilled Writers | Unskilled Writers |
| 1) use the constraints imposed by the writing task to help control and direct their writing process; e.g., knowledge of the intended audience. | 1) can not control the constraints so that their writing processes are efficient; e.g., permit the audience constraint to inhibit and interfere with recording meaning. |
| 2) have the ability to deal automatically or unconsciously with many of the task related constraints and written conventions of English during the writing process; e.g., content and grammar. | 2) do not possess the experience or ability to deal automatically with the demands of the assignment or the conventions of English. |

(continued)
Table 9: Strategies and Behaviors Used to Manage Constraints on the Writing Process (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) partition and prioritize the tasks of the writing process.</td>
<td>3) are unable to partition and prioritize the writing task so that the more pressing considerations are dealt with first. They deal with all of the constraints simultaneously or not at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Specific Task Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) consciously deal with subject matter development during the first draft and then with other constraining factors such as audience or format during other separate phases of the writing process; i.e., during prewriting or when writing a later draft.</td>
<td>1) deal with subject matter development and other constraining factors during the writing of the first draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) realize that knowing the purpose and the audience for the writing task is essential.</td>
<td>2) are concerned about purpose and a reader, but do not know how to deal with these constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) are able to employ both expository and narrative writing modes.</td>
<td>3) employ narrative writing mode ignoring modes more suitable for the writing task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) have mastered the linguistic code and written conventions of English so that transcribing can be smooth and uninterrupted.</td>
<td>4) have not achieved mastery of the linguistic code and written conventions of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) allow sufficient time for both topic exploration and revision.</td>
<td>5) do not allow sufficient time for topic exploration and revision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.6 Controlling the Writing Process

As skilled and unskilled writers write, review, plan, revise, develop insight, and deal with an assortment of constraints, they do not progress step by step through each of the phases and component acts of the writing process. According to Emig (1971:33) the writing process "is a recursive process comprised of actions or behaviors which occur, reoccur, and overlap in a blended and dense manner." Pianko (1979:5) agrees with Emig's characterization of composing by saying that it "is a multi-faceted activity with many of its elements functioning simultaneously, recursively, and/or in a linear fashion." Also in agreement with Emig, Perl (1979:334) noted that the various acts or operations of composing exhibited--in relationship with each other--"a preponderance of recursive behaviors--retrospective structuring, or the going back to the sense of one's meaning in order to go forward and discover more of what one has to say." In practice this means that during encoding, writers pause to review, revise, and plan. (Pausing is not always necessary. It is entirely possible that some writers may be able to review and/or contemplate during the actual act of encoding.) But the boundaries between encoding, reviewing, revising and planning are indistinct and the acts themselves are interrelated and interdependent.
All of the cited L1 and L2 research report this recursiveness and present narrations of composing which explain how the recursiveness causes the various components to interact. However, it is interesting to note that Pianko (1979:5) states that composing not only can operate in a recursive way but also in a "linear fashion". A reason for this paradox within the nature of composing is revealed when one re-examines the composing and revision strategies and behaviors associated with skilled and unskilled writers.

The interplay of encoding with pausing and reviewing is to a certain extent characteristic of both the skilled and unskilled writer. However, Perl (1979, 1980) noted that unskilled writers corrected their writing a great deal more when first starting to compose rather than saving such repair for later. Skilled writers not only repaired later in the composing process but often rewrote and/or revised whole chunks of written discourse before repairing. As a result, Perl (1979) concluded that the composing process of the unskilled writer is truncated and without some of the major macro-level elements or dimensions of composing—namely revision—which are possessed by the skilled writers.

Because the unskilled writers spend little or no time in revision, composing takes on a linear appearance. Once the writer has got a topic, the pen is put to the paper and
proceeds. On a lower level composing is still recursive due to the interplay of pausing, correcting, and encoding. But on the higher holistic level there is little or no interplay of planning and composing with revision.

In support of this observation, Beach (1976) reports a study of the revising processes of an intact group of trainee English teachers. One section of this group "conceived of revising as involving minor changes in form" (164). Such changes, made during the initial writing down, do give composing its recursive appearance. However, this same group also "conceived of their free writing as needing little further development" and seldom made changes for incorporation into a second draft. On the other hand, Beach's second section of this group revised extensively between drafts, making "substantive changes in content and form" (164). As a result, the composing process of these writers presented a greater degree of recursiveness. The composing of those who did not revise between drafts (the first section), however, took on the appearance of a greater degree of linearity. It is apparent that without revision between drafts, composing does not possess the same degree of recursiveness.

Zamel (1983:166) notes that skilled writers understand "that writing may be recursive, non-linear and convoluted." As a result, these writers are able to modify or throw away
plans and written text during the reviewing process. They can also reconsider purpose and form as they analyze what their readers expect. Understanding the recursive nature of the writing process enables the skilled writer to control and direct the writing process willfully. On the other hand, because unskilled writers do not experience writing as a cyclical process of generating ideas and revising text to meet intended meaning, they are largely unable to control and direct the writing process. In her observational studies of unskilled NSWs, Shaughnessy (1977) observed that unskilled writers believe good writers should know what they want to say beforehand. Zamel (1983) contends that unfortunately, a pedagogy which requires outlining, the analysis and imitation of written models, and a prescriptive step by step writing process, reinforces this notion rather than one which encourages free exploration of thoughts on paper.

Table 11 lists strategies used by skilled and unskilled writers to control the writing process as they attempt to complete a writing task. These strategies deal with the recursive writing process as a whole rather than any of its components such as reviewing or revision. In some cases, the strategies mentioned in this table for controlling the whole writing process can be applied to controlling one phase or a component of it.
Table 11: Controlling the Writing Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled Writers</th>
<th>Unskilled Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) monitor their own writing process.</td>
<td>1) are often unsuccessful at monitoring the writing process due to their limited understanding of the nature of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) employ recursive behaviors to manage and control their writing processes.</td>
<td>2) follow a linear pattern of composing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) often instruct themselves on what to do next; e.g., when to review, when to revise, when to do additional planning, how and when to deal with one of the constraints to composing, when to write, etc.</td>
<td>3) instruct themselves in word choice, error correction, and what to say next only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) can focus on one particular strategy or behavior e.g., reviewing, during a phase of the writing process.</td>
<td>4) often become confused as to which behavior or strategy should be used to solve a particular writing problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) strike a balance between transcribing or encoding and all other writing writing process behaviors.</td>
<td>5) do not balance the various phases of the writing process. Pay little attention to the prewriting and revision phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) do not show concern for details and minor problems which can interfere with the writing process.</td>
<td>6) show considerable concern for detail and the minor problems of composing. This concern interferes with the writing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) use the whole of the writing process to help discover additional ideas for synthesis and development in order to continue the production of text.</td>
<td>7) are unable to make full use of the writing process to help discover additional ideas for synthesis and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This literature review with accompanying tables demonstrates that it is the process that skilled and unskilled writers adopt that may result in a qualitatively better product. Skilled writers' ability to plan, review, and revise recursively is seen as a key to controlling the writing process so that the quality of the written product improves. In working to achieve mastery of these components of the writing process, the research implies that students must assume much of the responsibility of the learning. As a result, the teachers' role must become a facilitating one—intervening and negotiating with students as to which procedures and activities will be most helpful for prewriting, composing, revision, and publication. Chapter II presents a curriculum which helps students gain control over their writing process. It is a curriculum which will assist teachers facilitate the development of strategies and behaviors which are similar to those that the cited research attributes to skilled writers.
II. A Curriculum Proposal

Chapter II suggests a writing curriculum for international students requiring remediation prior to entering a university freshman writing class. It is based on the research analysis of the writing process presented in Chapter I. The first section of the curriculum presents the aims and objectives. Subsequent sections describe a methodology for teaching the strategies and behaviors appropriate to skilled writers. These sections contain descriptions of 1) the role of the teacher; 2) the role of the student; 3) suggestions for activities which facilitate the learning of the targeted strategies and behaviors, and 4) the role and, design of process oriented materials. The final portion of this curriculum (Chapter III) suggests ways for evaluating the student's ability to control the writing process, as well as a means for evaluating student products.

Product-focused language curricula have traditionally specified their learning outcomes in terms of a carefully selected repertoire of objectives and micro-skills. For example, Fehd and Brown (1983:2) developed a product oriented writing curriculum for a freshman writing course for international students (ESL 100) at the University of Hawai'i. Objectives and micro-skills from their curriculum specify product elements to be learned. A sample objective
from this curriculum reads that students will be "able to produce a short report on a given topic, including elements of introduction, topic statement, supporting details, and conclusion." A sample micro-skill from this same curriculum specifies that students will achieve the ability to "state the central idea of a passage."

In contrast, for a behavioral objective to be relevant to a process-focused curriculum, it must state the learning in terms of the means for achievement rather than achievement outcomes e.g., the ability to perform an act, apply a strategy, or use a process. In process-oriented curricula "an emphatic concern with capacity for communication rather than a repertoire of communication, with means for learning rather than ends of learning, and with the activity of learning language in a classroom as something as important as the language itself, indicates a priority of process over content" (Breen 1983:4). An example of a process-oriented objective is: students will be able to formulate tentative plans which indicate content and composing direction. A sample micro-skill specification states that students will pick-write on the subject matter and/or topic without rupting the flow of ideas.
2.1 **Curricular Aims and Objectives**

The main aim of pre-freshman writing courses is to prepare students for entry into freshman composition courses. The research cited in Chapter II, Emig (1971), Pianko (1979), Faigley and Witte (1981), Hayes and Flower (1980), Zamel (1982, 1983), and Heuring (1984), implies that skilled writers have developed the ability to control and direct the writing process. Therefore, before gaining entry into freshman level writing courses, it is important that unskilled ESL writers progress toward developing this ability. The aim which follows specifies those strategies and behaviors the research indicates good writers use to control and direct their writing processes and which the unskilled ESL writer needs to acquire.

2.1.1 **Curricular**

In order to produce the written products expected at the entry level of university freshman composition courses, the main aim of this curriculum is that students acquire the following strategies and behaviors which control and direct the writing process:

a) allocate sufficient time to composing. Considerable time and effort must be expended in order to produce a quality piece of writing.
b) manipulate the components of the writing process in ways which permit these components to interact recursively.

c) use a lengthy period of prewriting and planning to help focus, get started, and compose purposefully.

d) use the first task of composing to get information and ideas down on paper as quickly as possible without worrying about order, form, accuracy, purpose and audience.

e) ignore periods of confusion which frequently occur throughout composing and pay little attention to the detail and the minor problems of composing which help create this confusion. To do so would hinder the full continuance of the writing process.

f) reorder written text, achieving accuracy, clarifying purpose, and seeing to the needs of the audience. This takes place over the span of writing and revising several drafts.

g) revise the whole or major part of a draft and make the subject matter or topic focus substantially different from the original.

h) use revision to trigger insight for further revision and planning.
i) plan, review, and revise throughout the whole of the writing process and not just during certain designated phases.

j) pause periodically throughout the writing process to read and reread written text in order to continue planning and revision activity.

k) use as much time, and perhaps even more time, revising subsequent drafts as was spent in the writing of the first draft.

l) use self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and teacher evaluation to help both with generating ideas for writing and for revising writing to make it suitable for reading.

2.1.2 Curricular Objectives

The means for achieving this many-faceted aim is expressed in terms of objectives stated at three levels of specificity. On the first level are the major course objectives. The secondary, supporting objectives occupy the second level, and on the third level are the micro-skill objectives. All of the main objectives are supported with secondaries. However, micro-skill objectives have not always been specified for each secondary objective.
1.0 Use **prewriting** as a stimulus for the composing process.

1.1 Formulate tentative plans which indicate both content and direction.

1.1.1 Consult the following sources for information and ideas:
- a) Teacher-given task instructions, handouts, films, and other materials.
- b) Outside sources of research and observation.
- c) Past personal experiences.

1.1.2 Brainstorm (list, sketch, diagram) ideas and information for later use during composing.

1.1.3 Quick-write on the subject matter and/or topic without disrupting the flow of ideas.

1.1.4 Organize ideas and information into a tentative guide to composing.

1.1.5 Discuss with others the assigned task, sources of information and ideas, and tentative plans in order to achieve insights on content and direction.
1.2 combine the outcomes of planning and discussion in order to trigger a beginning to the composing process.

1.3 select and focus topic matter.

1.4 specify a purpose and a tentative audience in order to provide a loose and adaptable context for composing.

2.0 perform the interactive cognitive and physical activities of composing while at the same time manipulating the variables which inhibit that process.

2.1 select those constraints which must be dealt with during composing and delay attention to others.

2.2 transcribe fluently in a smooth uninterrupted encoding rhythm in order to suspend reviewing and planning.

2.3 pause and review text in order to discover new ideas which will help with continued planning and text production.

2.4 identify insights from prewriting planning and in-process discovery in order to help generate new planning and text production.

3.0 revise text for form and meaning both during and after the initial composing phase.

3.1 recognize that dissonance exists.
3.2 respond to dissonance by pausing to review and evaluate text in order to determine the problem and decide on the appropriate edit.

3.3 adjust text in terms of content and form to suit a clarified understanding of audience and purpose.

3.4 adjust the tentative mode, format, and register to suit the complete development of content and clarified understanding of audience and purpose.

3.5 change spelling, punctuation, capitalization and grammaticality when necessary so as to conform to conventions of written English.

3.6 revise in the following ways (as necessary) by:
   a) adding text
   b) deleting text
   c) reordering text

3.6.1 add details and examples to the text where necessary.

3.6.2 pare away extraneous subject matter and narrow the topic focus.

3.3.3 reorder text to improve coherence.
3.7 revise at all of the following levels of text:
   a) word
   b) phrasal
   c) clausal
   d) sentential
   e) chunk and whole draft

3.8 order the revision process so that
   a) changes in meaning and focus at the chunk and whole draft level take precedence.
   b) changes in order and form are given attention once content has been recorded.
   c) attention to surface structure changes (accuracy of grammar and mechanics) is given after major revisions are completed.

3.9 review insights from planning and revision in order to continue composing, revision, and text production.

3.10 discuss and evaluate both the process and product with others in order to continue composing, revision, and text production.

4.0 prepare writing for presentation and/or publication (polish and edit).
4.1 evaluate the extent to which plans and revisions have actually been carried out and the extent to which the final product meets the terms and conditions of the assigned task.

4.2 fulfill such task related requirements as length, deadline, typing, etc.

With any list of objectives, it is not realistic to expect that all learners will achieve each of the specified outcomes to the greatest extent possible. Nichols (1978:44) states that "most objectives are not really points which pupils reach but rather lines along which they are moving." As the learners move along this line working to achieve these objectives they will gain control over the writing process. The learners will gradually reach an understanding of the tasks, strategies and procedures which are required to produce a piece of writing.

2.2 The Role of the Student

In order to understand the writing process and learn to control and direct it, learners must become intricately involved in that process. This is because "when students are actively engaged in the writing process, they learn how writers behave; they become designers and builders. They create and shape papers from ideas they have generated for themselves" (Hughey 1983:52). If a prerequisite to learning to write is active involvement in the writing process, then
it must be assumed that the primary role of the learners in a process-oriented classroom is that of a writer. It is as writers, learning to write through writing, that the learners achieve the aims and objectives of this process-oriented writing curriculum.

Actively involving themselves in the writing process requires the learners to share and sometimes even exchange roles with the teachers. For example, sharing and in some cases completely assuming the teacher's role of activity director places the students in control of selecting and organizing classroom tasks and activities. In this way, learners gain valuable experience controlling and directing their own writing processes.

Another role students must assume in the process-oriented writing classroom is that of collaborator, both with fellow classmates and with the teacher. The classroom tasks and activities presented within this curriculum to facilitate the learners' writing processes require that the students and the teachers work together collaboratively. Of course, getting the writing process started, and then continuing it through rewriting and polishing, can be done as a series of solitary acts. But without the benefit of outside input through an exchange of ideas and advice, it is difficult to advance the learners' abilities to deal with the writing process. "...Writing improvement does not occur in
isolation...because writing is related to speaking, listening, reading, and all the other avenues of communication available for processing information' (Beaven 1977:138). Making all the avenues of communication available to students requires participatory interaction among and between the learners and the teacher.

Learners and teachers collaborating together as writers means that everyone can help each other generate ideas, make plans, draft ideas, revise, polish, and evaluate. In effect, producing a piece of writing becomes a matter for joint authorship both with classmates and the teacher. This removes a great deal of pressure from having to perform these activities correctly alone. The learners can then take time to acquire such behaviors and strategies as facilitate the performance of all phases of the writing process.

As students and teachers collaborate with each other, numerous other subroles learners assume come to the foreground. The students themselves are very valuable resource persons. They possess information which is the result of many years of language studies and other schooling and life experiences within a variety of sociocultural and sociolinguistic contexts. Students who integrate this inherent knowledge with information collaboratively gathered from other outside sources improve their prewriting capabilities. This improvement is achieved by tapping into each others'
fairly moderate levels of linguistic competence in order to revise and polish written work more effectively. As resource persons, collaborating with the teacher as catalyst, the students can truly help each other learn to write.

During the collaborating process, the students often find themselves in the role of negotiators with each other and with the teacher. Students are keenly aware of their own interests and shortcomings. Negotiation between co-learners and the teacher leads to the selection of classroom tasks and activities which work to meet students' immediate needs and interests. Sample instruments for the negotiating process are presented in the first section of Appendix A.

Another collaborative role of students in the process classroom is that of reader/evaluator/advisor. The learners and the teacher read each other's written pieces several times throughout the writing process. This enables learners to evaluate each other's writing and react to it as a reader in order to help content development, revision and polishing. After the written work has been completed, it is published so that the learners can again become readers. As a result, the learners have the opportunity to evaluate the end product and examine and learn those elements which solid well-written products require.
As the term progresses and the students gain mastery of these varying roles, they learn to search for and recognize problems which may inhibit the writing process. They also learn to apply those strategies which will effectively solve composing problems and maintain the progress of the writing process. A cautionary note must be issued, however. The active, participatory, collaborative, co-equal role of the student in the process-oriented writing classroom is not an easy one for students with backgrounds in teacher-centered classrooms. Students must be trained for their roles by teachers who often, themselves, model the expected behaviors. This takes time and patience and is the result of a gradual process over a period of several weeks from the beginning of the term. Suggestions are presented in Appendices A and B of this curriculum which inform the teacher how to adapt the activities and procedures so that the students can slowly assume their new roles in the process-oriented writing classroom.

2.3 The Role of the Teacher

Since students assume much of the responsibility of the learning in the process-oriented classroom, teachers need not be the central, dominant figures they are in the traditional teacher-centered classroom. Instead, teaching the writing process "requires a totally new orientation on the
part of teachers, and a willingness to jettison teaching habits that may have been built up in the course of much of a professional lifetime (Freedman et al. 1983:183).

The focus of this new orientation is on students in their roles as writers learning to write through writing. Teachers concerned with their students' writing processes no longer emphasize what to write (product and content elements) but monitor their students' work and intervene in the writing process with offers to help solve composing problems. This interventionist, facilitating role, over time, fosters the acquisition of the writing strategies and behaviors specified by the objectives of this curriculum.

In order to intervene and facilitate, teachers need to create opportunities to confer with their students during the writing process. Teachers need to ask questions which will get to the source of their students' composing problems. As teachers learn more about the abilities and writing processes of their students, the variability of students' needs, interests, and goals will become apparent. With this knowledge teachers can work to select tasks and activities and to organize procedures which foster the practice and acquisition of the targeted strategies and behaviors.

The task of selecting and organizing the classroom activities and procedures suggests that one of the major roles of process-oriented writing teachers is that of activity
Activity directors must select the activities and procedures which provide students with focused practice on those parts of the writing process which are most troublesome. Additionally, the many assorted variables which constrain the writing process must be arranged so that students can deal with them in an orderly fashion.

As activity directors, teachers must also ensure that the students know how to engage in the suggested activity and how to perform the targeted task. With experience, teachers will soon learn to anticipate many of the problems which will arise and which activities and procedures to select in advance. Teachers will also be able to restructure the tasks and activities to cope with the more specific abilities of the learners. Suggestions for a variety of classroom tasks, activities, procedures, and their guidelines for selection are presented in Appendix A of this curriculum.

In order to become completely familiar with the abilities, problems, writing processes, goals, and interests of the learners, teachers assume the role of researcher. Through observation of students' writing processes and participation in classroom activities along with the learners, teachers are able to collect information about the students' abilities and shortcomings. Making use of student/teacher conferences, teacher-directed writing assignments, and the
occasional feedback questionnaire, teachers receive data regarding the goals, interests and attitudes of the students. The gathered information informs teachers of student successes and failures and which activities appear to help and which don't. This allows teachers to individualize attention to the learner and select those activities and procedures best suited to help with particular composing problems. The information can also be used to make changes in the program when and where necessary. Since experimental research on the writing process is minimal, exactly which classroom activities, tasks, procedures, conditions and environments foster skilled writing behaviors is still a matter of good guesswork. However, some possibilities for related research will be presented in the concluding chapter.

In addition to gathering information, teachers dispense it in the role of resource person. In the process-oriented classroom, "The teacher is the major source of the knowledge needed to achieve the objectives...[and is] the medium for communicating this knowledge" (Cervantes 1983:15). In this role, teachers are always available to discuss the writing process with the students, show the students how to perform strategic writing acts, and help the students find answers to questions regarding writing problems of every sort.
A second task for resource persons is to direct learners to consult outside resources before and during the writing process. Such resources can include stories and articles; movies, plays, music and TV programs; cassette recordings of the same; guest lecturers and interviewees; assorted library resources; and grammars, dictionaries and writing handbooks. These resources help generate ideas and provide content for development. Some also contain help and advice which learners can use during the revision and final editing phases of composing. Teachers as resource persons, either make such resources directly available to the learners or set up tasks in which students search out information from these resources.

An additional task for teachers as resource persons is to develop materials for use with the writing process. These materials may contain limited amounts of content information to help students generate ideas, but more importantly should help the teacher in his role of activity director. As such, the materials would contain guidelines activities, and procedures which would help the students get started composing and move through each phase of the writing process. Section 2.5 of this curriculum describes such materials and instructs teachers in their development and use.

Perhaps the most exciting and unique role assumed by process-oriented teachers is that of collaborator with the
learners. In this role, teachers take part, as far as possible, as co-participants in the writing classroom. Once the writing process begins, teachers get every bit as involved in the work as the students do. They take part in the idea generating activities; they write when the students write; they collaborate on revision; and they present their writing to the students to be read. The major benefit of this equal participation is that teachers have the opportunity to model the different behaviors associated with each phase of the writing process. This allows the students to see first hand how to perform throughout each phase of the writing process. It helps to clarify what the learners are expected to achieve. This kind of participation offers an indirect means for teachers to train students in procedures which facilitate the writing process. Of course, tackling the writing task of a student is relatively easy for teachers. Because they do not experience the same writing and composing problems as the students, the teachers' writing processes would not necessarily be similar and/or believable to the students. Therefore the idea of writing along with the students does not necessarily mean that teachers must complete the same writing tasks. Because it is the process that teachers wish to model, teachers may wish to share their own writing experiences with the students.
Another facet of this role is that, as collaborators, teachers and students work together negotiating the writing assignments. Rather than fixing the program before the term, teachers wait to meet their students. Then the teachers work to develop a program of assignments that meets students' individualized interests and goals as well as deal with any shortcomings. Collaboration and negotiation can occur in just about any area of the curriculum; e.g., determining the extent of teacher and student roles; selecting the learning objectives; providing resources and sources of information; choosing or developing the materials that will be used to facilitate the writing process; and reading and evaluating each others' writing.

Of course, reading and evaluating students' writing have always been part of the writing teacher's traditional role as reader-judge. In the process-focused writing classroom, however? teachers? in their role as reader? do not wait to receive the final product before reading and evaluating it. Because teachers and students are collaborating, teachers are reading students' writing throughout the development of a written piece. As readers of writing in process, teachers develop an interest and personal involvement in the writing, its development, and successful completion. Therefore, the evaluative feedback and assistance which is provided the learners become similar to that given by joint
authors rather than the kind given by reader-judges. Reader-judges are interested in looking at the final product to find out what is wrong and what is correct with the writing in order to give it a grade. On the other hand, joint authors are interested in providing each other with both the information and the motivation needed to help the writing improve.

In conclusion, the role of teachers in a process-oriented classroom is essentially that of a low-keyed facilitator. However, at times, teachers must assume the higher profile presence of activity director/researcher/resource persons. At other times, teachers slip into a co-equal role with students as collaborator/joint author. Very seldom do teachers take over the classroom in the traditional sense in order to present content, lead discussions, or directly control activities. This point gives rise to a final cautionary note. Many international students come from teacher-centered classrooms and therefore experience difficulty accepting teachers who assume many of the roles described above. Acceptance may take the first few weeks of the term and not be complete until the students are fully acquainted with the nature of the writing process, totally familiar with classroom procedure, and completely relaxed with their teachers as individuals. After assessing the situation, teachers will want to assume a more dominant role in the
beginning. Then they can work carefully to gradually relinquish responsibility to the students and to move into the role of collaborator/joint author.

2.4 Classroom Tasks, Activities, and Procedures Which Facilitate the Writing Process

This part of the curriculum will suggest the type of pedagogically oriented tasks, activities, and procedures which have been developed to become the means for achieving aims and objectives of a process-based curriculum. The actual tasks, activities, and procedures are presented in Appendix A so teachers can examine them more carefully in order to learn to manage a process oriented writing classroom.

The term activity is used here broadly to mean a task or series of tasks, and a procedure or set of procedures, which are performed by a learner or group of learners to achieve some specified purpose. The purposes for such tasks, activities, and procedures are embodied within the objectives of this curriculum. Task is more often thought of as being a smaller unit of activity with some more specific purpose assigned to it such as working to develop micro-skill areas. An activity may be comprised of many different tasks.

Two types of heuristics will be referred to. The first type has been labeled directional procedures and this consists of a series of steps which explain how the task or
activity is to be performed by the learners. These procedures may link a series of tasks within an activity together or link a series of activity sets together and guide the learners through the performance of the task or activity. Most of the tasks and activities described in Appendix A employ directional procedures to explain how to do the task or activity.

The second type of heuristic is a guide to inquiry. Inquiry heuristics involve a series of steps which, when taken, will result in the discovery of new information, ideas, insights, strategies, and the solution of problems. Any given task or activity consisting of a series of questions which work together and lead to discovery and insight is an inquiry heuristic. It is possible for a whole series of tasks, activities, directional procedures and heuristics to work together, as they do in the writing cycle, as a single inquiry heuristic.

In order to involve the students in their writing process, it is important that all tasks, activities and procedures be learner-centered. A major criterion for learner-centered tasks, activities, and procedures, whether they be performed individually, in pairs, or in groups, is that the teacher take part as resource person and collaborator.

Another characteristic of this mix of activities and procedures is that outcomes will be different for each
student and group of students participating. This is because the tasks and activities can often be performed in a variety of ways. Both directional and inquiry heuristic procedures which are associated with these tasks and activities can be varied either by the teacher in setting them up or by the students in performing them. As a result, teachers and their students, whether individually or collaboratively, have considerable opportunities to make decisions as to how to proceed. This enables singles and groups of students to engage in the activities differently from others and strive for outcomes more in tune with their needs and interests. This is a particularly desirable feature for activities which support the writing process. Learners with differing degrees of ability and backgrounds can still collaborate and contribute within the context of the same activity and receive help according to their need and/or give it according to their abilities. It also means that ten students will not present ten similar or identical written products at the end of the writing process.

It is important to note that the tasks and activities presented in Appendix A can operate independently of the materials and provide students with a greater range of choice and flexibility. The format of the materials (See Appendix C) provides a topic and organizes a framework for the activities and procedures which guide the learner
through the different phases of the writing process. After
the students become familiar with the pedagogical devices
used to explore topic and ideas, develop content, and revise
written work, the framework materials can be jettisoned
altogether in favor of learner-determined topics, activities
and procedures and resources.

Activities and procedures are available which help the
students meet the objectives for controlling each phase of
the writing process; i.e., prewriting, composing, revision,
and publication. Some of these activities and procedures are
only suitable for a single phase like that of prewriting.
Other activities and procedures can be used, with varia-
tions, to promote processing in two or more phases. The
next sections (2.4.1-2.4.4) present a general description of
the more important key activities associated with each phase
of the writing process. These activities are those for which
proto-type supporting materials have been developed. For a
detailed listing of the activities and procedures, see
Appendix A.

Presented in Appendix B is a description of how these
activities can be slotted into the pedagogical device la-
beled "The Writing Cycle" (Cramer 1982). The writing cycle
is actually a heuristic framework which arranges the as-
sorted tasks and activities together in a way that guides
students through the writing process. It is a flexible
framework because different tasks and activities can be fit into the cycle according to the needs and interests of any given group of students. But also it is important to remember that not all of the activities suggested in this section can or should be employed during the progress of any single writing cycle.

2.4.1 Activities Which Facilitate Prewriting

There is an abundance of suggestions for activities which generate information and ideas for composing, help with planning, and provide both a context and stimulus for composing. Elbow (1981), Koch and Brazil (1978), Gunther (1978), Moberg (1983), and Murray (1984) are but a few of the L1 sources for prewriting activities. Raimes (1978), Cramer (1981, 1983), Hughey (1983), and Kupper-Herr (1983), present comprehensive collections of prewriting activities for the L2 context. The categories of activities which specifically meet the objectives proffered within this curriculum include brainstorming, data gathering, and peer group discussions. Because international students have seldom had experience taking part in these kinds of activities, there are also suggested procedures teachers can use for training purposes. See Section One of Appendix A for a detailed listing and discussion of the activities available for use during prewriting.
2.4.2 **Activities Which Facilitate Composing**

Activities which facilitate the composing phase of the writing process are not as numerous as those which can be used to provide **prewriting** stimuli. Part of the reason for this is because composing, unlike prewriting, involves a singularly focused activity, the putting of words on paper. As a result, **Hairston (1982)** and **Young (1978)** report that there have been some teachers who believe that this phase of the writing process cannot be directly taught. But research on the composing process has removed the mystery from this "mysterious creative activity that cannot be categorized or analyzed" (Hairston 1982:78). Also, the research reported in Chapter II demonstrates that composing can be categorized and analyzed as an especially complex series of acts which interact with each other. The research made the additional point that there are big differences between those who can compose effectively and those who can not. The most important difference is that the composing processes of unskilled writers are inefficient.

The purpose of a few of the composing activities described in Section Two of Appendix A is to help the writer learn to manipulate the various interactive parts of composing (transcribing, reviewing, discovery and planning), as well as to make this interaction both more efficient and more effective. Quickwriting and loopwriting are suggested
for this purpose. Other activities do not involve the composing act directly but instead consist of procedures which support the drafting process. These activities include collaborative drafting, and modeling. All of the activities will help the learner to control and direct the composing process and permit it to develop. Also, note that many of these activities and suggestions can be used, with variation, for prewriting and for revising. However, guidelines and comments will be confined to the relevance of the activity for composing.

2.4.3 Activities Which Facilitate Revising

Composing and revising are difficult to separate. Composing begins with the intention to put ideas in the form of words onto paper. Revising begins with the intention to refine, clarify, cut, add to, and reorder the words and ideas. In the real process both occur concurrently and the writing process takes on its most notable characteristic feature, recursiveness. But also, there is a point when writers have got most of their ideas on paper and the major task ahead is to revise them into a form suitable for the reader. It is this phase of the process that the activities which follow are most concerned with.

The research reviewed in Chapter II revealed the need to emphasize the revision phase in the writing processes of both first and second language students. Skilled writers
quickly perceive the need to revise. They spend more time on revision than do unskilled writers. When skilled writers decide to revise they set priorities. The first concern is the meaning of what is to be communicated to their reader and whether there is enough information (or in some cases, too much) to support that meaning. The next concern for the skilled writer is for order. Do the various sections support the main point and appear when the reader needs them? Finally, and no sooner, the skilled writer is concerned about the language and the conventions of written English. In handling the assorted change operations associated with revision, skilled writers are able to manipulate text in a variety of ways that result in a product that is not only radically different from the original but qualitatively better. Skilled writers are able to use the revision process and the results of that process to gain additional insight which helps both continued text development and additional revision.

The pedagogy of revision can be divided into two types of tasks, activities, and procedures; 1) those which support the revision process and prepare students to engage in revision; and 2) those which give students practice and experience in revising. Both types of activities will familiarize the writers with the potential of revision to make
qualitative changes to text as well as to suggest timing and methodological strategies for making revision changes.

The circumstances surrounding the need to revise vary according to writing topic, purpose, audience, the degree of the writer's linguistic competence and the extent to which composing performance can deal with textual dissonance, to name only a few variables. As a result, the procedures for classroom revision tasks and activities must be fluid and flexible to allow for a variety of ways to deal with all of this variation. The proposed tasks and activities in Section Three of Appendix A suggest such a variety of ways adaptable to almost any writer and composing/revision situation.

Generally each of the suggested tasks and activities are guided by a heuristic. This heuristic consists of a set of questions, the answers to which suggest what does and does not need to be revised. There are three major kinds of revision tasks and activities which help prepare students to revise zero (exploratory) and rough draft material. These are 1) self feedback activities; 2) collaborative or peer feedback activities; and 3) teacher feedback activities. In Section Three of Appendix A different types of activities are explained, followed by a separate brief section presenting selected activities which give students experience and practice in the revision process itself.
2.4.4 *Activities Which Facilitate Presentation and Publication*

Many professional authors revise extensively before writing is ready to be considered for publication. Because student writers' motivation and tolerance for revision can be lower, it is suggested that students' revision of a piece of writing occur at least twice, and, unless students insist, no more than three times for any given assignment. Then after two or three revisions which are chiefly concerned with fixing content, development, and order, writers may be ready to have their work polished for readers. The readers are, in this case, the teacher and the writers' classmates.

Earlier revisions focus on changing and manipulating large chunks of text with little or no one for one correspondence. However, revising for publication is a slow, careful, line-by-line editing of the text to make sure that it is ready for a final proofreading...The writer cuts, adds, and reorders paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, word by word (Murray 1984:167). Whereas the chief concern in early revision is development, the chief concern in the final revision is fixing sentence boundaries, inflections, and mechanics (Moberg 1983:149).

There is an important reason this kind of editing—or polishing, as it will be referred to from here on—has been separated from other revision activities. As reported in
Chapter I, unskilled writers become overly concerned about editing during the earlier composing phase. On the other hand, because final editing for a reader is so distinct from the rest of the writing process, skilled writers save much of this work until the very end.

Unfortunately, many international students will enter the writing program believing that the editing activity involved in this phase of the writing process is what writing is all about. Teachers will find that one of their most important tasks is to keep the unskilled student writer from editing tasks until the piece of writing is ready for it. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers skip final editing activities until students have become thoroughly acquainted with their classmates, understand how to revise for both meaning and order without being overly concerned about error, and have written three or four different compositions.

A second problem associated with editing for international students is that both students and teachers believe that editing is an impossible task, that they simply do not have the abilities and skills to self-edit a text to the perfection demanded by a reader. This also may be true of the native speaker. In fact, many native-speaking professional writers will pay to have the polishing done, or their book publishers will do it for them.
Fortunately, university professors teaching at the undergraduate level do not require the perfection of the book publisher. And the product quality demanded of entry level freshman writers is not beyond the scope of the international writer who has, in many cases, had many prior years of English language study. Working collaboratively, with classmates, the teacher, and perhaps even a tutor, international students can learn to polish their writing to the point it will be acceptable for the readership of their classmates and their university professors. The activities proposed in Section Four of Appendix A help teachers and international students prepare their writing for such a readership. These activities include self feedback and peer feedback collaboration in order to proofread and evaluate text.

Publication is the culminating activity of the classroom writing process. Once students are satisfied with their compositions, the writing is turned over to the teacher for reading. Then several compositions, or parts of compositions, are selected which present desired examples of idea development, organizational format, and writing style. These examples are xeroxed or dittoed as published writing. It is then read, appreciated, and discussed in class. Through such class discussions students come to understand what does and does not constitute a good final product.
These class discussions also focus on what and how the writing can be revised to bring about its improvement. In this way, students gain the valuable experience necessary for doing self and peer feedback.

2.5 The Role and Design of Instructional Materials

Because it is a process and not a product which is being taught, it is not appropriate for the accompanying materials to have the same content matter as materials used to teach written products. On the other hand, this curriculum does specify, in terms of aims, understandings and objectives, what students need to know and what they need to do in order to control and direct their writing process. As a result, the obvious role for the materials is that of informant. In such a traditional role the materials would present content matter in the form of a definition of the writing process and explanations of the cognitive strategies and performance behaviors skilled writers use. However, reverting to this traditional informational role must be avoided. Explaining how to prewrite, compose, and prepare writing for publication, is perhaps useful information to help increase learner awareness. But it can not substitute for actual involvement in the writing process and gaining the experience of learning to control and direct it. Therefore, the major role of the instructional materials in a process-oriented curriculum is not to inform. It is to
facilitate support involvement in the writing process so that student writers can learn to control and direct that process.

In the prior discussions of the roles of the student, the teacher, and the classroom activities, the point was made that involvement in the writing process could be facilitated through teacher-to-student and student-to-student collaboration. Therefore, an important role of the instructional materials is to further facilitate this involvement in the writing process by serving as a guide through the various phases of the writing process. In order to do this, the materials must select and group the classroom tasks and activities together in an organizational framework which would do the following:

1) enable the learners to select from a wide variety of topic, assignment, and activity choices;
2) help students generate information and ideas on a topic, focus and organize the writing task, and get started;
3) encourage the learners to consult a variety of outside resources for information and ideas;
4) help the learners examine and evaluate the drafts and finished products of classmates in order to understand which processes and elements result in a quality product;
5) help students undertake the revision and polishing of writing prior to presentation to an audience;
6) enable the learners to achieve outcomes which may differ from those of their classmates;
7) enable the learners to work and collaborate independently of the teacher;
8) enable the learners to eventually abandon the materials completely in favor of a self or group directed means of facilitating the writing process.

A third important role, applicable to any set of writing materials, is to suggest topics, or provide a means for their selection, and then set up the writing assignments. In traditional materials, topic and assignment suggestions are prescribed according to rhetorical formats being taught or language usage being studied. However, in process-oriented materials, topic selection is primarily a matter of negotiation between teachers and students.

Topic negotiation is crucial. The research cited in Chapter I suggests that composing is easier for unskilled writers when personal experience can be used as a source of information and ideas and the writing can be done in the narrative mode. On the other hand, expository writing is more difficult for the unskilled writer. The composition research also suggests that the writing processes of all student writers are truncated, and viscous if topics and topic formats are unfamiliar.
In order to assist the smooth flow of the writing process, the materials would be divided into separate units, each based on a general subject to which international students are likely to have had exposure; e.g., problems facing international students, difficult neighbors, friendships, funeral customs, marriage customs, etc. Such topics not only permit writers to call on past experience, but are open to a variety of narrative, expository, and data-based academic treatments.

Each materials unit would begin the negotiating process by presenting a set or sets of heuristics which would help a the students explore, generate ideas, gather information, and discuss the ideas and information with others. Once students have been exposed to a wide range of ideas and information, a writing focus and approach can be negotiated through conferencing with classmates and the teacher. Section One of Appendix A suggests procedures for this negotiation process. Appendix C presents a sample unit of materials which illustrates how such heuristics would appear.

It is apparent that one of the roles of the instructional materials is to provide a means for locating and generating, information from available resources on a topic so that it can be written about. However, these materials should not, at any time, present content in the same manner as a textbook or other secondary source material. Such
presentations shift the emphasis away from the writing process and back to a product focus. Any informational content which is needed should be obtained from the following sources:

1) the teachers and the students, who possess a cornucopia of "experiences, perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings which can be used to formulate ideas about which to write" (Hughey 1983:61);

2) the observations, interviews, and discussions, from people and events outside the classroom;

3) the assortment of textbooks, dictionaries, grammars, encyclopedias, newspapers, and journals which students and teachers consult for information during prewriting or for advice during revision.

Once students begin to deal with topics requiring various expository and academic formats, it must be made clear that the materials still will not present and teach formats. Part of learning to control and direct the writing process is learning to select the format and form appropriate to the topic focus, the purpose of the writing task, and the intended audience. Such formats are usually discovered during composing or through collaboration with the teacher and other students while discussing how to further develop or revise a piece of writing.
In addition to topic-focused units of materials which support and facilitate the writer during the prewriting process, instructional materials can be used to support and facilitate the revision and polishing phases of composing. The body of these materials would consist of collaborative tasks, activities, and procedures to help writers react to and evaluate each others' writing during the revision process.

Instructional materials which assist the writer with revision and polishing are not presented as appendages to each topic-focused unit. Instead, revision-focused materials are selected and sequenced prior to class time. Selection is based on what teachers perceive are the immediate revision problems their students need to solve. Section Three of Appendix A presents lists of such revision heuristics from which Teachers can create the guidelines students can follow in order to give each other advice on what and how to revise. Teachers recreate new materials each time students work to help each other with revision in order to ensure that attention is given to students' perceived lacks and needs. The materials in Appendix C demonstrate how heuristic guidelines for revision can be written and/or selected.

Up to this point, the discussion has dealt with two forms the instructional materials for this process-oriented curriculum take. The first materials component consists of a
loosely connected series of topic-focused units which help the students during **prewriting**. The second materials component consists of an even more informal collection of procedures and heuristic sets which teachers present in the form of handouts for students to use during collaborative feedback sessions for revision. The third component of these instructional materials consists of the written products of the students. These products are used almost continuously for one purpose or another throughout the term of a writing course.

The **students'** written products are the focus materials during collaborative feedback for revision. The students examine and work on their own and **others'** written products during various **phases** of the revision process. This enables them to see the effects of different processing strategies. In addition to submitting products in the draft stage for feedback, students can work on these products in order to practice revision operations. Suggestions for such practice activities can be found in Section Four of Appendix A.

Another use for the written product is for the class, as a whole, to focus on common problems found in the text and discourse structure of the writing. Examples of such problems can be reproduced from student writing and used as the material for a task or activity.
The most important and effective use of student writing, however, comes when it is published. This occurs when the writing has been revised and rewritten several times and then presented to the teacher. The teacher reproduces this writing for the class to read, evaluate, and enjoy. Following these reading sessions, groups of students, or the class as a whole, examine and evaluate the writing for several purposes. One purpose is for the teacher to spend time giving the author of the writing positive and constructive feedback. This modeling demonstrates the type of feedback students are expected to give each other during future collaborative sessions.

A second purpose for publication is to give learners the opportunity to examine and discuss models of good, effective writing to be emulated. Students soon realize that having their writing selected for such a session is the highest of compliments. Admittedly, it may be difficult to find such examples early on in the course. This difficulty is easily solved if the teacher co-authors or edits the writing before presenting it to the class. Then, as students learn to revise, the quality of the final written products will improve and the problem becomes a matter of having too much student writing to publish. However, it is better to publish too much than too little. Even if all of it does not get discussed, most of it will be read.
A final purpose for publication is to provide an effective vehicle for the analysis and discussion of those product elements which characterize good writing. Students find it far more meaningful to deal with the concepts of thesis, support, relevance, coherence, and detail using their own writing than using a textbook.

Successful use of such a loose association of materials derived from so many different sources depends a great deal upon several factors. First, teachers must have an intimate knowledge of the writing process so that collaborative pre-writing and revision heuristics and procedures can be written and/or organized. Second, teachers must have the ability to organize and manage a wide variety of resources to be used by the students throughout the writing process. Finally, this knowledge and management ability must be passed on to the students. Just as it is the aim of the teachers to phase out of an active leadership role, it is the aim of the materials to become unnecessary. When the students can function without the direct assistance of the teacher and the support of the materials, they will have become independent self-directed writers. Even though the materials have been designed to achieve this purpose, a great deal depends upon the abilities and motivation of the teacher and the students to follow through.
2.6 Evaluating Student Work and Progress

A process-oriented curriculum is always in a state of flux. It possesses the ability to change and adapt to meet the continuing needs and goals of the international students it is designed for. This curriculum presents a flexible way of teaching the writing process because of the numerous activity and procedural options presented. Teachers and students can determine the length of each writing cycle. They can select their own writing topics or projects. They can choose the specific activities and strategies to develop their writing. They can choose their own ways of giving feedback and even of evaluating their own and each other's writing.

Because of this wide variety of options available, evaluation of student work and progress must also be flexible and varied. This evaluation should be both formative and summative and include 1) the analysis of the students' ability to control the writing process, and 2) the analysis of the students' written products.

2.6.1 Evaluating Students' Writing Processes

Both formative and summative evaluation of students' ability to control and direct their writing processes would focus on the achievement of the curricular objectives. The
students' abilities to make plans, implement them, write fluently, revise in prioritized ways, edit, and present polished written products are objectives to be evaluated.

Because there is no formal test instrument to analyze the writing process, formative evaluation of students' writing processes would be based on informal student and teacher observations and take the form of the feedback activities described in Appendix A. As students are working through a writing cycle, there are numerous opportunities for students to confer among themselves and with teachers. The subject of these conferences would be the ways students deal with the various prewriting, composing, revising, and polishing tasks. For example, in order to evaluate a student's revision process, a conference between student and teacher could involve an analysis of students' revision plans as shown in table 12. Groups of students could also use these heuristics to evaluate each others' revision plans and give advice on how to revise more efficiently.

Table 12: Analysis of Revision Plans

1. What did you write about in your first draft?

2. What changes do you plan to make in terms of
   a. content
   b. organization
   c. grammar, spelling, and mechanics.

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

.............................................................
A formal summative evaluation of the students' ability to control and direct the writing process would be similar to formative evaluation. It would also involve the analysis of the writing process for the achievement of the curricular objectives. However, this evaluation would fall at the end of the term and include the writing processes involved with the whole of a writing cycle. Students would be asked to write a composition using the writing cycle procedures. After each step in the writing cycle, the teacher would query the students on what they intend to do—what strategies they intend to use during the next step. While the logistics of such an evaluation exercise might seem daunting, it must be remembered that the writing cycle normally takes two weeks. It may be that the instructor would want to shorten this to one week. Even within the time frame of a week, it would be possible to analyze the major aspects of the writing processes of from fifteen to twenty students.

2.6.2 Analyzing Students' Written Products

The second important part of the evaluation process includes examination of the students' written products. In the traditional product-focused curriculum, product analysis is the sole means of evaluation. However, in this process-based curriculum, the evaluation of student products is only part of the evaluation of student work. Even so, it is a very important part.
As with the evaluation of students' writing processes, both formative and summative product analysis is part of the evaluation process. In the traditional product analysis, the sole focus is on rating the quality of ideas and determining the correctness of rhetorical structures, syntactic constructions, conventions of written English, and vocabulary items. In this writing curriculum these factors comprise only a part of the product evaluation. Additionally, the product is to be analyzed for indicators of 1) fluency (Shaw (1980) counted the number of words); 2) planning (presence of brainstorming lists, notes of sources, and tentative plans); and 3) revision (number of drafts, number of revision changes in content, format, and form).

Formative evaluation of written products would take place as part of peer/teacher feedback activities described in Section Three of Appendix A. After students have completed the writing of a draft, these drafts become the products of the evaluation process during feedback sessions with the teacher or with the students. These conferences examine the product with the intention of identifying those elements which need to be changed. The heuristic presented in Table 12 above is suitable for this purpose. After the student has made the actual changes in the draft, then the final products can be analyzed for improvements in the
original text. Table 13 presents a heuristic which demonstrates how the final product can be analyzed for revision changes.

Table 13: Analysis of Product Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What did you write about in your first draft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How would you describe the amount of change you made from your first to your second draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Many changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Some changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Few changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Point out the way ideas changed from your first to your final draft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Point out the way your organization changed from your first to your final draft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Point out five changes you made in grammar, spelling, or punctuation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If you were given the chance to revise this draft one more time, what changes would you make?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the ways the writers handled the revision tasks can lead to suggestions for making the whole operation of the writing process more efficient.

Formal summative evaluation of the written product would be similar to the formative evaluation. It would involve the analysis of the final written product for the quality of content, and attention to form. But it would also include analysis of the planning process, the writers' fluency, and the quantity and quality of change.
As part of a **summative** evaluation of students' written products, all writing the students had done would be presented to the teacher. This would include all planning notes, quickwrites, rough drafts, and final presentation copies. (It is assumed that the student work would be properly maintained in an organized file.) The teacher can leaf through the work, make a few notes and comments according to certain predetermined criteria; e.g., number of completed assignments published, increased number of words written during quickwriting, and other elements found in the products which indicate students' writing process abilities.
111. Suggestions for Curricular Evaluation and Further Research

The strength of this curriculum is its empirical research base. The objectives, suggested roles for teachers and students, methods, and materials have been pieced together from a methodical, albeit subjective, analysis of the case study research of the writing processes of skilled and unskilled native and nonnative writers. However, an evaluation of the effectiveness of this curriculum to achieve the stated aims and objectives has yet to be made.

Once this curriculum is in use, both formative and summative evaluations would be in order. One formative evaluation exercise would involve measuring students' attitudes towards writing and their writing program. This could be done a few times during the course of the term. Alternatively, short surveys could be taken to measure attitudes towards a particular procedure, task, or heuristic such as that done by Lane and Perrin (1983b) to measure student attitudes towards quickwriting. The results of such questionnaires indicate the students' own perceptions of their control of the writing process and how well various factors such as assignments, activities, and teacher roles, help students gain control of their process.

A second formative evaluation exercise could be less formal than a questionnaire measuring attitude changes. It
would use quickwriting as the measuring instrument. Teachers could ask students to quickwrite their reactions to a single given activity or exercise as an informal means of identifying how students perceive its effectiveness. Students' own roles, teachers' roles, the activities and procedures, and materials could be subjects for periodic quickwrite evaluations. Even though an informal and subjective measure, quickwriting would 1) help keep the teacher informed of students' attitudes towards the various components of the curriculum; and 2) would enable teachers to question how well students believe their writing to be improving.

A summative evaluation exercise of the curriculum, also done by students, would be performed as a final writing assignment. An entire writing cycle of activities would be devoted to preparing the students to evaluate the curriculum and present this evaluation as a written report. Students would interview the teacher and each other, discuss writing and how they were learning to write, and then finally write what they liked and disliked about the writing program. Appendix D contains the prewriting section from a materials unit which would set-up this summative evaluation exercise for students.

Teachers must also become involved in formative and summative evaluation of the curriculum. Questionnaires
regarding teachers' attitudes and handling of roles, procedures, and materials can be given periodically as well as at the end of the term. General discussion of the questionnaire results would help smooth out pedagogical problems.

It is recommended that an empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of this curriculum be conducted comparing it to a traditionally oriented writing program. The principles for writing courses taught according to this "current traditional paradigm" are described in Young (1978) and Hairston (1982). But conducting such a study would involve setting up a complex experimental research design. Clifford (1981) designed a study which compared experimental groups of native writers learning to write via a process-oriented curriculum with matched control groups learning in traditionally oriented writing classes. Clifford hypothesized that an instructional method that divided the composing process into discrete stages in a collaborative environment would help writers improve their writing performance more than a traditional method.

Clifford's experimental groups were provided with a program of activities similar to that presented in Appendix A of this thesis. The teachers' roles were facilitative and
collaborative. Students were encouraged to assume responsibility and collaborate. On the other hand, Clifford's control group listened to teachers lecture on grammar and mechanics. Vocabulary exercises were important. Students read model essays written by professional writers. The teacher and student roles were distinct, with the role of the teacher being dominant. At the end of the study Clifford observed that the experimental group had significantly greater gains on a holistically scored writing sample. (Both pre- and post-tests were given.) However, there was no significant difference between groups in mechanical knowledge or performance even though the control group was directly taught these elements every class.

Because the Clifford study involved NSW subjects, it needs replication with NNSW subjects. In such an experimental study the curriculum proposed in Chapter II of this thesis would serve as the source for an invariant sequence of activities to be used by the matched experimental groups. A second curriculum which presented a second invariant sequence of activities would focus on the direct teaching of writing. Grammar and rhetoric would be directly taught to a matched control group. The role of the teachers teaching the experimental groups would be facilitative and collaborative, as would be the role of the students. Teachers teaching the
control groups would control and dominate the learning activities. Students would be passive learners. The materials used by the experimental group would be similar to those presented in Appendix C. The control group would use texts teaching grammar, rhetoric and other product elements. The same numbers of writing assignments would be given to each group. Only the experimental group would be trained to revise and the control group would not be so trained. I hypothesize that the results from such a study of separate ESL writing curricula would be similar to Clifford's findings. At the end of the experiment, the written products of the experimental groups would be judged holistically better than those of the control groups.

In addition to such large scale experimental research, more modest case study undertakings are needed. For the most part, the case studies cited in Chapter I, and which form the basis of the Chapter II curriculum, involve small numbers of subjects. The writing was done in laboratory conditions under circumstances unlike that in the real world. Future case studies are needed which examine the writing processes of skilled and unskilled ESL writers as they write in nonexperimental situations rather than under contrived conditions. Researchers could observe the writing process as ESL students write for their university classes. Also, case studies need to be undertaken which observe subjects writing
over a broader period of time than just the one semester periods used by Zamel (1982, 1983) or the two-hour sessions of Heuring (1984). This is so that more of the developmental variables which affect the writing process can be identified.

Case studies are also needed which examine and compare the writing processes of ESL students in their native language as well as in English. In a pilot study, Heuring (1983) examined the composing processes of a Thai student writing in both Thai and in English. Heuring observed that the writer's composing process was fluid and fluent when writing in the expository mode in Thai but halting and less fluid when doing expository writing in English. Only when the writer wrote in the English narrative mode did the writing process in English resemble that in Thai. Other case studies which identify differences between composing in a first and second language are needed.

Either case study or experimental research needs to be employed to observe the positive or negative influence of translation upon the writing process. Does the translation process hinder or assist the development of students' writing processes? Does the use of translation during the writing process improve the final product or create distractions through an abundance of idiomatic error? Should translation
be encouraged or discouraged? These and other questions about the place of translation in the writing process need to be examined.

In still other case studies skilled and unskilled ESL writers would be studied as they composed using a computer word processing program. "The computer alters the process of writing just as a typewriter alters that process when compared to the process of writing with a pen" (Stevens 1982:3). As the subjects composed, the computer would time, record, and classify every writing act and every revision change the subjects made. However, there are a few minor drawbacks inherent in such a research design. The first would be the computer's inability to identify what writers do during pausing; for example, or to provide reasons for decisions to revise. Video taping the subjects' faces and asking them to compose aloud might shed some light onto the cognitive process. But such writing protocols have always been suspect because these procedures tend to change or otherwise break up the natural flow of the writing process. Another drawback would be that the subjects must be able to manipulate a word processing program as easily as they would a pen and paper or a typewriter. The process of writing must not be inhibited by the obtrusiveness of the computer or the word processing program.
Stevens (1982) used Apple Writer word processing software and an Apple II+ microcomputer in a limited pilot study of the writing processes of two skilled native speakers of English. One of the subjects was himself. After working out a system for saving each change made in a given piece of writing, Stevens was able to print out, identify and then analyze all the changes made in producing a given text. Stevens' data supports Murray's (1978) claim for two stages of revision in writing, internal and external, as discussed above in section 1.3.3. As a result of his findings, Stevens believes his study is not extremely revealing as to the composing process of native speakers of English (1982:8) due to imperfections in the data gathering techniques and newness of the computer as a research tool. On the other hand, Stevens' research easily demonstrates the great potential for using the computer to gather and quantify data on the writing process.

In addition to replicating Clifford's (1981) ambitious experimental study or conducting innovative case studies with computers, further more modest experimental research is needed. This research would measure the effect of various instructional treatments, procedures and activities, teacher and student roles, and materials upon the acquisition of behaviors and strategies which denote the skilled writer. For example, quickwriting is a key activity the Chapter II
curriculum suggests in order to help students develop and control their writing process. Quickwrites are recommended to help students generate ideas, get started composing, write fluently, and learn to self-evaluate writing prior to revision (See Appendix A). Because studies by Briere (1966) and Shaw (1981) conclude that timed freewriting helps students write at greater length without an accompanying deterioration in its quality, this curriculum makes extensive use of quickwriting. However, as yet, no studies have been undertaken which measure quickwriting's influence upon helping unskilled writers acquire strategies and abilities to control and direct various phases of the writing process. Because quickwriting is considered so useful and important within the context of this curriculum, studies are needed which put this importance and usefulness to the test. Research questions might include: 1) Do writers find composing easier if one or more quickwrites have been completed first as zero draft material? 2) Does quickwriting help writers generate new and useful material for rewriting purposes? 3) Would extensive quickwriting practice help writers write at greater length, spend less actual time at composing, and improve the quality of the final product to a greater extent than if no quickwriting were done? These are but a few of the research questions that could focus on the simple but highly recommended quickwriting activity.
Research designs which manipulate the elements and phases of the writing process are needed. For example, different types of prewriting activities can be tested against each other (e.g., problem solving versus free discussion) in order to determine which types produce more fluent writing. Another research design might compare the quality of products from 1) groups of writers who prewrite but do not revise; 2) groups of writers who revise but do not prewrite; 3) groups of writers who do both prewriting and revision; and 4) groups of writers not allowed to do either activity. Questions which might be answered include: 1) How useful is prewriting in triggering composing? and 2) What effect does prewriting have on the final product in comparison to revision?

Other experimental designs could examine the relationship between the length of time spent in each phase of the writing process with the quality of the final product; e.g., how much does the amount of time spent in revision affect the quantity and quality of the final product? Or, to what extent does the amount of reviewing affect the quantity and quality of revision and/or the quality of the final product?

Experimental research having direct implications for a process-oriented curriculum would also focus on the role of the teacher and the student. For example, is direct, prescribed teacher feedback more effective in teaching writers
to self-evaluate and revise both internally and externally than the collaborative feedback of fellow student writers? Two studies, Partridge (1981) and Chaudron (1982), have already examined the usefulness of teacher feedback compared to peer feedback in helping students improve the quality of first draft writing. However, these studies primarily examined students' abilities to proof and edit at the surface level rather than make content--meaning level--changes. Also, these studies only analyzed written products for changes which improved the correctness of the final product. These researchers did not attempt to measure whether their subjects had made revisions which, in effect, lowered the quality of the written text. Such revisions, even though they lowered the quality of the text, would indicate the ability to perceive dissonance. The ability to perceive dissonance is crucial if any revision is to be done at all.

As can be seen, the variety and amount of research which needs to be done in relation to the study of the writing process and its associated pedagogy is almost limitless. Even though there have been numerous case studies and much experimental research with NSW's, many of these studies need to be replicated with NNSW's, as in Clifford's (1981) study. Also, there is a need to experimentally compare techniques, roles, methods, and materials which appear in traditionally
designed curricula to those which appear in the process-oriented curricula. Finally, within the process-oriented curriculum itself, there is a need to find the activities and procedures, teacher and student roles, and materials which will help students make the most dramatic progress towards controlling and directing their own writing process.
Appendix A: Handbook of Procedures and Activities for the Process-Oriented Writing Classroom

1. **Prewriting Activities:**

This section presents activities which generate information and ideas for composing, help with planning, and provide both a context and stimulus for composing.

1.1 **Brainstorming Activities**

Brainstorming activities are excellent ways for learners to find out what they already know on a subject. They are activities that can be done verbally or on paper. Students can brainstorm independently, in groups, or as a class. Brainstorming begins with a topic or an idea and then participants in this activity say or write whatever they think of. All ideas are considered. No quality judgments are made. Hughey (1983:70) states that "the rapid exchange allows for exploration, clarification, interpretation, explanation, and insight into different opinions." Whatever else it does, it provides the writers with many related pieces of information which can trigger a beginning and then be referred to as a source of ideas during composing.

1.1.1 **The Amoeba Game,** also known as a brain pattern or mapping, is a brainstorming activity in which learners quickly say or write out single words and phrases freely associated to a central idea. These words and phrases take on a patterned, amoeba-like shape which grows and changes as more words and phrases are written down. This activity is a good way to introduce the learner to the writing potential of a subject or topic. In addition, it is a start in getting students to make rough notes. Incidentally, it generates a great deal of useful related vocabulary. The amoeba game also provides a quick trigger for in-class freewriting.

1.1.2 Listing is a slightly more controlled way to brainstorm. It appeals to those who like to see things linearly. It is also a good follow up to other brainstorming activities because it allows writers to reorganize and reassociate words and phrases into connected groups. First, students play an amoeba game which generates words and phrases associated with a general subject area. Then those key words and phrases which can serve as topic descriptors of the broader subject area are identified and isolated in the form of key points or subtopics. Beneath these key points or subtopics
students vertically organize lists of the related key words and phrases taken from the earlier amoeba game. At the same time as this listing progresses, new and more specifically related key words and phrases will come to mind to be added to the list.

1.1.3 Quickwriting is also known as freewriting, automatic writing, or stream of consciousness writing. It is a form of brainstorming on paper. "Quickwriting is writing for a set period of time without stopping. There is no pausing, erasing, crossing out, or reading what’s already been written—just writing" (Lane and Perrin 1984a:1). Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and neatness should not worry the writers. If they can not think of anything to write, then the writers should write, "I can’t think of anything to say. I can’t think..." Writing continuously without stopping is particularly important because unskilled ESL writers are overly concerned about using English correctly. Pausing to correct too frequently inhibits the ability to generate ideas.

Quickwriting may be focused on a topic or it may be unfocused, thereby giving the students the opportunity to write just anything down. Elbow (1981:13) claims that "free-writing is the easiest way to get words on paper and the best all-around practice in writing I know." The major benefit of quickwriting is in helping the student generate ideas and get started talking or composing.

Through quickwriting learners discover that it is possible to quickly produce quantities of written text while thinking in the second language. It is not unreasonable to expect that ESL learners double the number of words they are able to write over the course of a school term. In Shaw's (1981) first study, his experimental group did six-minute quickwrites daily for one term. Based on pretest and postest results, the experimental group doubled the number of words they wrote.

Quickwriting can be used to advantage both before and after other brainstorming activities. Playing an amoeba game before quickwriting and then following it up with group discussion tasks is one effective way to arrange prewriting brainstorming activities. Quickwriting is also useful during other phases of the writing process, and these uses will be explained later.

1.1.4 "Loop writing" (Elbow 1981:59) is a variation of quickwriting. It too requires students to produce a quantity of written text in short time periods. But then, after the first quickwrite is completed, the writer reads what has
been written and locates a main point to be used as the starting point for the next quickwrite. Then the writer repeats this procedure as many times as wanted or needed. Loop writing is particularly effective in training students to find a focus for writing a first draft, to review their writing, and to locate main points. Therefore, loop writing makes a useful activity both during prewriting and for composing.

1.2 Data Gathering Activities:

While brainstorming is crucial if writers are to discover what they already know, data gathering activities are essential ways for learners to examine and accumulate information from outside resources. However, the writers for which this curriculum is designed are not yet ready for full-scale academic research activities. Therefore, the activities and tasks suggested in this section should be regarded only as introductory practice for such work.

1.2.1 Thought collecting is a profitable activity for accumulating personal ideas and observations for use with prewriting activities. Random or focused thoughts, observations made of events or activities, and snatches of conversation are entered into a log. Each entry should have a record of the date, time, and place of the recorded idea, observation, or conversation. If learners are involved in descriptive or narrative writing based on personal experience, then entries could be in the style of diary writing. However, with expository writing the log becomes a series of short bits and notes of thoughts, observations, quotations, and information. There may be recorded questions, words and phrases, titles, and notes from interviews and, depending upon the level, library research. The student may even want to enter zero (exploratory) drafts in the log.

In particular, the thought collecting should involve several regular log entries on a topic or subject which is under current consideration for writing. If students are working with materials focused on "Money", regular data log entries could be thoughts and observations about money made over a period of several days. These notes might include plans for money, desires for money, and any other ideas on the subject. The observations could be those which come to the student at the bus stop or on the beach. On the other hand, students could seek out information in other ways such as through interview or the use of various library resources. There is considerable value to collecting thoughts and maintaining a data log. Notetaking skills are
developed. Information and ideas are accumulated. A written record is available both for future consultation and for later sharing with others.

1.2.2 The guided research task is a second means for accumulating content information and ideas. These tasks are predetermined by the teacher or the student who are after specific information related to a given topic or theme. The learners consult such sources of information as each other, outside authorities, and library resources. However, the data collection activity is formatted so that the gathered information can be easily tabulated and compared with the information accumulated by other classmates.

Cramer (1981) suggests many guided research tasks useful for prewriting activity. For example, in dealing with the subject "euthanasia", students are asked to xerox copies of living wills, write a living will of their own, and bring both to class for use as data in additional prewriting activities. In dealing with the issue of cheating on college campuses, students devise a questionnaire for both students and faculty. The results are then compiled and compared during additional prewriting sessions. A third research task involves searches of the Readers Guide to Periodical Literature to locate journal articles about dangerous pasttimes. This gathered information is also brought back into class for sorting and synthesis activities before written work begins. Because the students for which this curriculum is designed have had little research experience, it is important to keep the data collection task easy to complete. The task itself should be organized in such a way that information can easily be shared and analyzed.

1.3 Peer Group Discussion Activities

Discussion of the results from the brainstorming/quickwriting and data gathering activities is itself a major prewriting activity. These discussions can take place in dyads, triads, small groups, or as an entire class. While any of the above mentioned brainstorming or data collection activities are optional, it is crucial that students experience at least one discussion session before beginning a composing task. Discussion groups can be formed for many different purposes and tasks. Various ways of setting up and using these discussion sessions for prewriting purposes are described below.

1.3.1 The quickwrite discussion follows quickwriting. Students meet in pairs or small groups and tell each other what they wrote about. Before this exchange takes place, however,
authors should read their own writing and bracket or under- 
line words and phrases which they like. After telling each 
other what they wrote about, they could take turns sug-
gest to one another a selected phrase or sentence which 
could be the beginning of a new quickwriting. Thus a quick-
write discussion would be turned into a loopwrite discus-
sion. One warning must be issued. Because of the raw nature 
of quickwriting, it is not advisable to request learners to 
read the quickwriting of their peers or to read their own 
quicks writes aloud. When students think that such writing is 
to be read by others, the 'monitor' turns on and the writing 
is no longer free and uninhibited.

1.3.2 A brainstorming discussion can follow a quick-
write/loopwrite in order to search for a topic, share ideas, 
and find a starting point for writing. Following such a 
discussion session a final quickwrite can take place in 
order to incorporate ideas and information discussed. More 
time can be alloted to this quickwrite session so that the 
writing turns into a zero draft (exploratory raw material) 
to be used for the composing of a rough draft. For many 
classes these quickwrite discussion sessions are all that 
are ever needed as a stimulus for writing.

1.3.3 General topic discussion occurs when learners need 
only look to themselves and each other for sources of ideas 
and information during prewriting (not all writing needs to 
work with hard or focused research data). But instead of 
engaging in wide ranging and uncontrolled discussions and 
quicks writing/brainstorming sessions such as those described 
in sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2, more focused discussions are 
desired. For focused discussion, teachers will want to con-
struct a heuristic that will guide learners to discover what 
they know on the topic as well as to familiarize them with 
the topic's ramifications. Below is a sample heuristic (Lapp 
et. al. 1983) for general discussion on the topic "Money". 
It was developed to elicit ideas and information shared by 
group members.

Directions: You are encouraged to discuss the 
questions below openly and frankly. However, 
please be aware that many of these questions 
would offend native English speakers living in 
the United States.

1) How old were you when you first had your 
own money to spend?
2) What did you spend it on?
3) What are your sources of income at present?
4) What do you do with your money these days?
5) What was the largest amount of money you ever received?
6) What did you do with it?
7) Do you have to budget your money carefully these days? Why or why not?
8) If you won one million dollars, what would you do with it? How would your life change?
9) How do people feel about money in your country?
10) Is making a lot of money an important part of life?
11) What sacrifices do people make who earn a lot of money?
12) What privileges come with a lot of money?

Once students have dealt with these questions through general free discussion, the learners continue with another task which may include additional brainstorming, quick-writing, and/or the writing of a zero draft. A focusing conference, described below, is also recommended.

1.3.4 Data sharing discussion occurs when groups meet to compare and analyze what has been written in the data logs. When students have collected information for a guided research task, this data becomes the focus for the discussion. With an advanced group of students guidelines for dealing with this gathered information might not be necessary. However, the unskilled writer will need some sort of focused task in which the group uses this information for some purpose. Usually, the task helps the writer to sort and organize the information so as to see relationships and gain insights. Once this activity has been completed, the organization and relationships of the data will have been clarified. Then it is relatively easy to begin a writing assignment which involves presenting the information, synthesizing it in some way, and drawing conclusions.

In order for these data sharing discussion groups to function smoothly and be of assistance to the learner, a discussion heuristic is advisable. This consists of a set of questions and/or procedures which help the learners deal with the data, draw conclusions, and gain insights. In the case of Cramer's living will assignment mentioned above learners were instructed to:

1) present the xeroxed living wills for analysis and draw up a list of characteristic features.
2) read their living wills to each other and discuss them.
3) suggest to each other what missing points need to be added.
4) discuss the reasons for making a living will as well as those against doing so.
5) discuss whether living wills should be made part of the legal code.
6) discuss whether group members have changed their opinions about and attitudes towards living wills.

Following the discussion directed by this heuristic, students use another heuristic device which helps them organize the shared information and determine how to get started writing. This heuristic procedure asks students to make a simple statement saying which discussion question (issue) was most interesting. Then the learners continue by telling each other what they are going to write about. At this point everyone stops and quickwrites a beginning or a zero draft. A focusing conference (described in section 1.4) can take place if necessary.

1.3.5 The problem solving discussion provides an interesting and productive prewriting stimulus. This heuristic involves a discussion which is more focused than the others and is without the open-ended outcome characteristic of the other discussions. Also, the design of such problem solving heuristics often involves reaching a consensus, clarification of values, role playing* and simulation. Because the outcomes of these discussion activities are more focused* the form the writing can take is more clearly suggested. An example of this discussion activity from Lapp et al. (1983) is given below.

You are a member of the government of a small island country in the South Pacific. Up to now the economy has been very simple. The people of your country have very little money and exchange most of their goods and services by trading with each other and helping each other. Most of the people in your country are either farmers* fishermen* or craftsmen. Your government has an important decision to make concerning your island. A group of investors wants to develop a tourist industry on your island. For the first time the people would have money. Some people would become wealthy by leasing land; others would be hired to build hotels and work in them. On the other hand* consider what this will do to the life-style of your island. Will people still want to grow their own food? Will they still be willing to help each other if they know they can pay someone to help them? What will happen if there
are rich and poor people on the island? In order to reach a group decision on what you will tell the group of investors:

1) discuss the contributions that a tourist industry would make to the nation. (List them.)

2) discuss the liabilities that a tourist industry would create. (List them.)

3) decide what the government should tell the group of investors. (Reach agreement with others in your discussion group based on a comparison of the contributions with the liabilities.) What are the reasons for your decision?

4) quickwrite any aspect of your discussion or decision.

5) discuss (brainstorm) possible writing tasks with group members.

1.4 The Focusing Conference

The focusing conference is an activity that wraps up the prewriting preparation for the composing phase of the writing process. In the focusing conference students collaborate with each other and/or the teacher in order to sift through the mass of information and ideas gathered during prewriting.

If an adequate amount of time has been spent engaging in several of the activities described above, then ideally, the learners will have been exposed to and gathered too much information. According to Murray (1984:46), this is a good situation to be in. "Strong pieces of writing come from an abundance of information". However, for most writers too much information can be confusing and almost as frightening as too little. Experienced writers understand this, but inexperienced writers do not.

The purpose of the focusing conference is to help the students make sense of the great quantity of information and ideas which has just been assembled. This will help the writers discover and decide what to write about as well as what direction and form the writing might take. More importantly, focusing helps the writers get the rough draft started.
It has always seemed to be a part of the ESL writing teachers' role to determine topics for the students. Going beyond that, many teachers even help to shape that topic for the student by providing detailed guidelines, outlines for writing and in some cases, thesis sentences. The materials which accompany this curriculum also provide a suggested list of writing focuses with many choices offered. However, these focuses are intended as examples only to suggest ways that writing may take shape. They can be the starting points for the focusing conference. During the conference the collaborators should use the focuses to trigger other more meaningful focuses for the learner.

More explicitly detailed writing assignments are not learner oriented but curriculum developer or teacher oriented. Telling students what to write about would be depriving them of the opportunity to decide this for themselves. Most of the prewriting activities of this curriculum are open-ended with outcomes individualized. It is not possible for either the curriculum developer or even the teacher to anticipate each learner's experience and reaction to these activities so that writing assignments can be more suitably tailored. But it is possible for this curriculum to suggest a way to train the students to determine a more focused topic with a way to take into account purpose and readerhip.

The focusing conference is called at the completion of a prewriting activity or series of prewriting tasks. It starts with the pairs or small groups of participants reviewing their notes, handouts, and other materials. Writing focuses suggested by the materials or the teacher can be examined and discussed. Then the focusing heuristic below can be followed: (It is not necessary to answer all of the questions.)

1) What do you really want to write about? What is your goal?
2) What is your attitude towards this task? Why?
3) What have you learned about your topic?
4) What don't you know but you want to find out?
5) What seems very interesting to you?
6) What seems very surprising?
7) What ideas seem to fit together?
8) What ideas don't belong with this topic?
9) What is the most important thing to know about the topic?
10) Write down one sentence that tells what you are going to write about.
11) (Optional) What might make a good title for this paper? Brainstorm a whole list of titles if you want to.

12) (Optional) Who might want to read something about this topic? Why? What is it that would interest them? What would not interest them.

13) Imagine that you're actually sitting down to start writing the rough draft. You have a title. Quickwrite your opening (lead) by writing as much as you can.

The conference concludes when the conferees have decided what they will begin to write about. There must still be the realization that such plans are tentative and subject to change as the writing continues and as others read what has been written.

1.5 Learner-Training Activities:

As presented in the section "Role of the teacher..." the instructor's primary role is that of a low-keyed facilitator. Activities are organized and managed with little direct teaching taking place. But this does not mean that teachers have few responsibilities. On the contrary, for many of the tasks, activities, and procedures to work teachers must be involved in providing the guidance to get the activity started. Some activities require that students get practice and accumulate experience before they begin to work well. This requires teachers to direct the students' participation. As a result, teachers will find themselves busier than if they were the focus of classroom activity. Below is a description of some of those activities that teachers must organize to train the students to become better participants in classroom tasks, activities, and procedures.

1.5.1 Modeling is one of the most useful activities for training the learners in the procedures associated with various activities used not only with prewriting but with every phase of the writing process. In modeling the teacher plays a student performing the targeted task or activity. As a result, learners see immediately what is expected of them in a given activity.

A better alternative to the teacher modeling an activity is for former students or other instructors to enter the classroom as models. This leaves the instructor free to manage the modeling session, deal with questions, and instigate discussion. Still another alternative is to videotape others modeling all of the major targeted behaviors,
activities, and procedures associated with the writing process. These tapes can then be made available for viewing by the students at appropriate moments without having to search for models.

1.5.2 The walk-through is another training activity. Rather than immediately placing students in large collaborative groups for a given activity, the students are paired up. Then the teacher directs the students, either individually or in pairs, to perform a single task which has been segmented from the targeted activity. For example, in the case of the loop-write, the teacher provides the initial topic, sets up the activity, and instructs the students each step of the way. First, the teacher tells the student to begin writing. Then the teacher calls time and asks the learners to reread their completed texts. Once students have completed that task, the teacher directs the students to tell their pair-partner what they have written about. After that the students write one sentence at the top of their next page which repeats what had been told to the pair-partner. Finally, the teacher indicates that students are to begin writing again with that sentence as their first sentence. Once students are very familiar with this activity, then such detailed teacher guidance is not necessary.

The walk-through helps train students to deal with discussion and problem solving heuristics. Refer back to section 1.3.4 and the set of questions guiding the group discussion on "Money" (Lapp et. al.:1983). Rather than present these questions to groups for collaborative discussion, the teacher directs the learners to form pairs. Then the teacher asks one question of the class and requests that students jot down a quick answer. Next the students share their answers with their partners, verbally, without reading. This continues until all of the questions or tasks have been completed. As a result, students will accumulate a great deal of written information in note form and are ready to participate in a focusing conference.

Walk-throughs are particularly useful at the beginning of the term or with groups who are reluctant to discuss for whatever reason.

1.5.3 The wrap-up discussion is an activity which takes place at the end of other collaborative activities for the purpose of summing up the business conducted. Wrap-ups can also give the learner an often needed sense of completion otherwise unattainable in open-ended discussions. In the wrap-up the teacher assumes the role of discussion leader. The focus of the discussion can be a brief report of any
findings, insights, and conclusions by each pair or group. These reports can then be followed with group discussions. The wrap-ups can also operate as a question and answer session prior to or following the focusing conference.

Once the teacher has modeled an activity for students during a training session, it is important that the teacher resume the low-keyed role and stand back to let the students do the activity on their own. Hovering over pairs and groups and listening in to what is happening can become a great inhibitor. It is best to let students muddle along for a while until they feel comfortable with what they are doing. It will take time before students get the procedures down pat. When they do, and as they become more comfortable in collaborative activities, the teacher can circulate and begin asking and answering questions. As more time passes and the students get more relaxed and familiar with the teacher, the role of a co-participating collaborator becomes a possibility.

2. Composing Activities

Activities which are associated with the composing phase of the writing process can be separated into two groups: 1) quickwriting activities which generate text as part of the composing process; and 2) activities which facilitate the composing process. Both types of activities are described below.

2.1 Composing through Quickwriting

Quickwriting is the most effective way to train the writer to transfer thoughts to the page. Quickwriting is done frequently during the prewriting phase to generate ideas for further writing. But, continued practice at quickwriting helps the writer develop the smooth uninterrupted composing rhythm desired for drafting. Quickwriting also helps the writer to release subconscious insight by revealing thoughts the writer was not aware of until they appear on the page. For both reasons, quickwriting is an activity that can be used to train the learner to compose. The products of quickwriting can form a part of the zero and first drafts and are the necessary stuff for development and revision. The quickwriting activities described below facilitate the writing of the first draft as well as to train writers for composing.

2.1.1 Learners quickwrite three or more different beginnings for their chosen topic (five minutes on each one). Spending half a period to a period doing this is exhausting but
rewarding. These beginnings can be a sentence or two, a paragraph even three paragraphs. They attract the reader's interest tell what the writing will be about, tell what will be included and tell what will be left out.

2.1.2 Learners quickwrite different ends for their piece. Sometimes the beginnings make good ends. This is because the ends contain most of the same elements listed above for good beginnings.

2.1.3 Learners quickwrite a plan for the draft that they will be writing out at home. They try to mention the three or four things that seem most important about the topic.

2.1.4 Learners quickwrite the zero or discovery draft. Giving themselves a time limit (one, one and a half, or two hours) or a length limit (one, three, or five pages). The students write to fill the time or the number of pages. Students are not to worry about the whole piece and its final quality, but just deal with the chunk of writing time or the number of assigned pages. This zero or discovery draft material becomes the basis for writing a first draft.

2.1.5 This quickwriting plus activity helps the learners integrate quickwriting into their drafting process. Students bring to class rough drafts of a piece of writing. The teacher directs the students to begin reading their draft. After a short period (students need not have read their entire draft), the teacher asks the students to stop reading. Then the teacher has the students quickwrite about what they have just read, and what they would like to say but have not. This can be done several times until the draft has been completely read. At the end of this activity the student has additional material that can be used for rewriting the draft.

2.1.6 Loop-writing a version of quickwriting and described earlier with prewriting activities is useful because it is an activity that mirrors the composing behaviors of skilled writers. Loop writing forces the writer to review text which has just been written in order for discovery and planning to take place. An extended period of loopwriting produces a zero draft.
2.2 Activities Which Support Composing

2.2.1 Investigating the composing process is one activity for learners to help achieve a greater awareness of the nature of the writing process. To do this, students take notes and record thoughts in their data log about what is happening as they compose. It is essential that a heuristic be set up to help students make relevant observations. The teacher can prepare a data collecting form for this purpose. Then, these observations are brought to class for use with a prewriting discussion activity which has been designed by the teacher or is presented in the materials. A writing assignment grows out of this investigation. An alternative variation of this assignment would be for writers to interview classmates regarding their writing process. The purpose for this is to find out how others get started and how they direct their composing process.

In gathering data for either one of these assignments, information which might be collected could include:

1) the date and time the draft was begun.
2) the place the draft was written.
3) the type of writing implements.
4) the length of time it took to write the draft.
5) the number of words.
6) whether the draft was written with or without notes.
7) the amount of planning done beforehand.
8) whether something was read before starting to write.

2.2.2 Collaborative drafting is an activity which involves students in the composing process and also gives them the opportunity to see how it works. Students form pairs or groups and select one of their members to act as secretary. Working as a group the students choose a topic, generate ideas, and focus. Instead of each student writing a separate draft, each group would be responsible for a collaboratively written single draft which would be dictated to the secretary. At the end of the drafting session, a wrap-up could be held to analyze what happened. Another follow-up session could be held for revision purposes.

2.2.3 Modeling the writing of a draft is a particularly useful activity for the students to see. (Modeling as an activity is explained in section 1.5.1 of the prewriting activities.) During the modeling procedure, the teacher should think aloud while writing. Before and during the drafting the modeler will want to discuss the nature of the task, determine the reader, note the ideas and arrange them into a "coherent network" (Hayes and Flower 1980:28). As
the modeler writes, reasons for choices and changes should be mentioned. The writing can be done on the board, on an overhead, or on newsprint hung on the walls. If the session is tape-recorded, then the tape can be replayed and stopped for discussion purposes. Once the draft has been completed, it should be saved for later modeling sessions which focus on revision or preparation of the writing for publication.

2.2.4 **Thinking aloud** for the teacher or for a classmate during quickwriting or the composing of a draft is another way for students to become aware of their own writing processes. Think aloud sessions should be conducted much in the same way that the teacher models the drafting activity described above. These sessions are recommended only after think-aloud procedures have been modeled by the teacher.

3. **Feedback and Revision Activities**

Sections 3.1 through 3.4 present feedback activities which facilitate revising. These include: 1) feedback writers give themselves in order to revise; 2) feedback readers give writers in order to revise; and 3) feedback teachers give to student writers. Section 3.5 suggests heuristics to be used to train students to revise. Sections 3.6 and 3.7 present exercises which provide controlled revision practice.

3.1 **Self Feedback** tasks and activities can be arranged for the students to help them prepare for the revision task. Ultimately, students need to be skilled at giving themselves self feedback in order to be independent writers.

3.1.1 A **self** questioning activity can help students generate information which can lead to revision. The sets of questions (heuristics) which follow are presented as examples of the types of questions which students can ask themselves to prepare for revision. The questions from set A work together to set the student up for revision. Many of the questions listed with set B can be used independently.

**Question Set A:**

1) Read the draft once through.
2) What parts are really good?
3) What was learned in writing this draft?
4) **What** did you want to include in writing this draft but did not seem able to do?
5) If you were to rewrite this draft, would it be rewritten differently? Do you want to change the topic?
Question set B: (from Whitlock 1984:3)

1) In composing your draft, what was the biggest problem you experienced?
2) If the teacher were to read your paper right now, what would the first comment be?
3) If the teacher were going to say something really nice about your draft, what would it be?
4) Write a criticism of your draft. For example, imagine that your draft is in the hands of a critical English teacher. What would that teacher write?
5) On the basis of the comments you have already received from your teacher, or your classmates, what changes do you intend to make when rewriting?
6) List three important details in your paper.
7) Look at your opening sentence. On a scale of from one to ten, ten being high, what score would you give that sentence?
8) If you had to add something to this paper, what would it be?
9) If you had to cut something, what would it be?
10) What do you need to do to your paper between now and the day it is due? How long will that take?

Both heuristics can be used by the learners at home. Or, with the assistance of the teacher, these questions can be answered in class. during "walk-through" exercises.

3.1.2 A quickwrite can help learners prepare themselves to revise when the subject of the quickwriting is the perceived strengths and weaknesses of their own papers. This quickwriting activity can also be used to set up other collaborative revision activities. In this case the students would quickwrite about the kind of help which is wanted during the feedback session.

3.1.3 A quicksearch is a third way to prepare for revision or for collaborative help with revision. Students read through their original drafts and pinpoint spots thought to have problems which must be dealt with. In preparing for collaborative help, the writer can underline problem points and write questions at the end of the paper for collaborators to answer; e.g., "Do you think the second paragraph has enough details?! or "Can you understand what I mean in the fifth sentence?"

3.2 In Collaborative or peer feedback activities students work together with other students and/or teachers to suggest ways that a draft can be revised. In working collaboratively
students can compare strategies for making changes which will improve their writing. Several orderly ways in which peer feedback can work are explained below.

3.2.1 **Group feedback** is one way to set students up for feedback. The students get into groups of three or four and give copies of their drafts to others in the group. One copy is also given to the teacher. Then the students decide which paper to read first, and everyone (including the author) reads that paper silently. Alternatively, the author could choose to read the paper aloud. However it is done, written comments can be made on the paper during the reading. Also, readers can bracket interesting words, phrases, sentences and sections while reading. Then each group member should take a turn talking about the paper. Pre-arranged heuristic guidelines are available in the materials to help at this point. (See 3.1.1 above or the "Feedback and Revise" section of Appendix C for examples.) Writers remain silent while the reader is giving feedback. The paper need not be defended because it is not under attack. The writer listens and tries to understand the reader's point of view. If two or three readers make the same points then that is an indication to the writer where work is needed. The writer can and should, however, point out areas of weakness and ask for advice if feedback from the group is not forthcoming. The teacher, can, if the group wishes, become a co-participant.

3.2.2 **Pair feedback** is a variation of the above procedure for peer feedback. The learners exchange rough drafts and read each other's writing. Then they take turns talking about the papers usually following a prearranged heuristic guideline. (See 3.1.1 above or 3.5.3 below.) Again the writer does not defend the paper but asks relevant questions that will help to redevelop the writing. After giving feedback to each other the pairs should continue to switch partners throughout the time allotted until at least three people have read the paper. During this time, the teacher can also read the learners' papers.

3.2.3 **Quickwriting** can be used by the learners to give each other feedback. In pairs or groups, students read each others' drafts. Next, each student writes out a brief critique according to some planned format. Alternatively, the reader simply states the main point and summarizes what the
original author had written. This lets each writer know if the focus and main points of the composition are clear enough to be understood.

3.3 Wrap-ups to peer feedback sessions help set the writer up for revision and redrafting. Several are listed below.

3.3.1 Quickwriting can be used to help students react to peers' suggestions for revision. Also during these quick-writing sessions students can comment upon the quality of help received. The following questions can be answered:

1) How were the suggestions helpful?
2) Were they sufficient?
3) In what areas do you still feel the need for help?

3.3.2 Quickwriting can be used to help students plan the changes they are about to make. Alternatively, a checklist of potential changes can be filled out.

3.3.3 A wrap-up class discussion can take place in which students tell each other the changes they plan to make when they rewrite.

3.3.4 A wrap-up group session can take place just before the second peer feedback session begins. Students point out the differences between the first and second drafts and discuss the changes which were made.

3.4 Teacher feedback is an important activity which prepares students to revise. Such feedback is normally thought appropriate at the end of the writing process, and so it is. But feedback on the final written product does little to help students revise. The teacher needs to intervene during the writing process and give advice for revision in order to be helpful. To do this the teacher can 1) take part collaboratively in peer feedback groups; 2) conference individually with the students while peer feedback groups are in session; or 3) collect and quickly read and react to students' rough drafts while peer feedback groups are in session. These rough drafts should be returned to the students after their peer feedback sessions. The danger of this third procedure is that the students will become too reliant on teacher feedback when peer feedback should be stressed. As a result, teacher feedback must be used judiciously and the teacher should offer only a few major suggestions. The most important value of teacher feedback is that it can serve as a model for the type of feedback students give each other. Modeling of feedback is discussed in 3.5.1.
Teacher feedback on the final written product, if that product is not to be revised, should be sparse and largely complimentary. Assigning grades to products as a form of feedback is generally incompatible with a process orientation. A high grade indicates to the student that writing has stopped for that piece. Actually, this well-written paper needs further revision because it has the potential for becoming an outstanding paper and is suitable for publication. (See section 4.3.) On the other hand, a low grade serves only to discourage the desire to write. If a letter or credit/no credit grade must be assigned, wait until the end of the term. Then, both the teacher and the students can evaluate the total amount of work done and progress and improvement made.

3.5 Training activities prepare students to self-evaluate, to give feedback to each other, and to select or devise heuristics for feedback.

3.5.1 Modeling appropriate peer feedback group behavior is an important means of training students to give valuable feedback. A team of three or four teachers (or former students) get together and set up a role play of an efficient peer feedback group in session. One of the group members can play the author and the others play the author's peers. Following the modeling, the classroom teacher, the feedback participants, and the student-observers analyze what took place during the feedback process. Finally, the classroom teacher can walk the students through the feedback heuristics using a practice paper.

An alternative to the live classroom modeling of peer feedback is a video-tape of groups modeling this activity. The advantage of using such tapes is that teachers need not depend upon others to help with the procedure.

3.5.2 The quickwrite can also be used to acclimate students to peer feedback. Before doing peer feedback for real, students can get practice by reading and reacting to each other's quick writing. (Normally quick writing is a private activity but an exception is made in this case. Students are warned in advance.) Following a ten minute quick write on a topic, students exchange papers. Readers bracket interesting words, phrases, sentences, and sections they like. Then the readers mention these good points to the writer. Bracketing for good points eases students into making more critical and relevant criticisms later.
3.5.3 Pair or group brainstorming sessions prior to peer feedback can devise sets of heuristics for feedback. Learning to specify the kind of feedback that is desired is crucial in learning how to self-evaluate and follow through with revision. Initially, the teacher is responsible for this task because of the complexities involved. But in a short time students will become more familiar with the revision process, the possible range of heuristics, and the ways these heuristics can solve composing problems. Then students work collaboratively with other students and the teacher to write sets of heuristics for peer feedback sessions.

Feedback heuristics fall into three categories: 1) heuristics which help the writers revise for meaning; 2) heuristics which help the writers revise for order (rhetorical form); and 3) heuristics which help the writers edit for language usage and language conventions. When peer feedback guidelines are devised the different types of heuristics should be separated.

1) Below is just a sample of the kinds of questions that can be included in a heuristic which would help writers redevelop and revise their writing for meaning.

a) What did you (the reader) learn from reading this paper?
b) What was funny, sad, exciting, or surprising about the composition?
c) What parts of the paper did you particularly like?
d) What is the composition about? Summarize this in one sentence.
e) What parts of the paper seem unclear? What parts seem very clearly written?
f) What would you like to know more about? Is more information needed? Point out the places in the paper where you feel further details are needed to express the point well.

2) Below is a sample of the kinds of questions that can be included in a heuristic which would help writers redevelop and revise the organization of their writing.

a) What was really very effective in the way the writing was organized?
b) What is the main idea of the paper? Is there one? Did you know what it was right from the start of the paper, or were you confused until you got to the end? If you are not sure of the main idea, help the writer establish one. Then, discuss the possible changes that will have to be made in order to make the main idea clearer.
c) Look at the introduction. Does it clearly express the main idea? If the main idea is not written in a thesis sentence in the introduction, help the writer write one.

d) Look at each paragraph. What is each paragraph about? Can you tell the writer what it is? Are there any paragraphs that should go together, or that should be split into two? If so, why?

e) Do all the ideas seem to be in the right place? Can you think of any changes or rearrangements you would make?

f) Do some points need additional details and examples?

g) Look at the conclusion. Does it echo the introduction and give you, the reader, a sense of completion?

h) Choose a title together that reflects the main idea of the paper.

Revising for meaning and revising for order should be done separately. One possibility would be to have students revise the first draft in order to make meaning changes and then to revise the second draft in order to make organizational changes.

Heuristics which help the writer revise for language usage and conventions will be mentioned in the section of activities dealing with preparing the writing for publication. This is done to emphasize that such editing should be consciously done at the end.

3.6 Revision practice activities are suggested below. It is not possible nor is it intended that students do all of them within a single period. The instructor and/or the students should select those useful for the moment. The instructor can walk the students through these revision operations or the students can do them together in groups.

Students bring to class the final draft of a composition written earlier in the term. The paper should be on a topic based on personal experience. Students perform some of the following operations on their own papers. Alternatively, the students can exchange papers and perform one or two of these revision exercises on a classmate's paper. If this happens, the pseudo authors are to treat the composition as if it were their own.

1) Read the entire text of the composition. Without referring to the former introduction, quickwrite a new beginning, and then a second. New beginning.

2) Read the composition one more time and locate at least two sections which need expansion. Quickwrite two expansions.
3) Take the main idea from one of the body paragraphs and use it for the focus of a quickwrite. Compare the quickwrite with the original paragraph. Rewrite the original, incorporating new ideas from the quickwrite.

4) Cut seventy-five percent of the text of the original composition without eliminating the main ideas.

5) Take scissors and cut the composition into single paragraphs. Reorder the paragraphs. If necessary, rewrite the paragraphs and then add transitions so that the paragraphs fit smoothly and snugly together.

6) Isolate one of the lengthier body paragraphs, read it carefully, and then rewrite it. Do not refer back to the original during the writing. Try to keep the meaning the same. Compare the two paragraphs.

7) Locate the main points of the composition and and use them as the basis for rewriting the paper. Do not refer to the original.

8) Read one of the body paragraphs. Next select one sentence from within that paragraph. Rewrite it without looking again at the sentence or the paragraph. Try to keep the meaning the same.

9) Quickwrite two new paragraphs to be added to the composition. Rewrite them one more time making changes and additions to make them fit.

10) Read the end of the composition. Use it as the beginning and start again writing a new composition. Do not refer to the original.

11) Extract one of the paragraphs from the original. Use it as the basis for a completely new composition. Don't refer to the original while writing.

3.6 Referencing (Cervantes 1982) is an activity in which students extract information from their peers' writing to incorporate into their own and then cite it. This not only provides practice in revision (text additions) but is an important first step in learning to write academic discourse. It works this way. The class is divided into groups of three or four and they read each others' second or third drafts on the same or similar topic. After the students have read a classmate's draft, one or two pieces of information are extracted and placed on an index card. What goes onto the card is: a) the name of the author; b) the date of
the text; and c) the data segment. Writers incorporate these collected quotations into their compositions during the next rewriting cycle. An example of a reference notation from Cervantes (1982:9) follows:

Cervantes, Raoul; 11/9/82

The method I use to manage my money is to ignore it as much as I can. I don't keep records of the checks I write. I don't keep a bank book, and I don't even carry a wallet. I just check my bank balance once a month to see if I have any money left.

Revising is a skill which does not come easily to the students. Those students with backgrounds in teacher-centered classrooms will have the same difficulties with these revision preparation activities as they had with collaborative prewriting activities. The key is to train the students carefully in the selected activities and then give students the opportunity to try them out.

4. Presentation and Publication Activities

This section contains suggested tasks and activities to facilitate polishing and publication.

4.1 Self feedback and peer feedback collaboration are the two major activity types concerned with facilitating the final editing or polishing phase of the writing process. Using self feedback and/or peer feedback for polishing, the teachers and the students have the option of a) working on their papers alone; b) working on each others' papers in groups of three; or c) working in pairs and then switching partners as the activity progresses. Also, similar to self and peer feedback activities for revision, pre-arranged heuristics guide the students through this polishing process. Below are some examples of polishing activities with accompanying heuristics.

4.1.1 The proofing activity suggested below is from Moberg (1983:153). Students are not asked to look for specific kinds of errors or a limited number of errors. This exercise is for those who want to attempt to find all their errors.

1) Voice the text slowly and aloud to yourself. Listen to what you hear yourself read as you see what you read and compare the two. As discrepancies are noticed mistakes can be corrected.
2) Voice the text slowly and aloud to yourself, backwards, sentence by sentence.

3) Pair up with the teacher or a classmate. Read the text aloud again while two of you look for error. (When working with the teacher, you may find that clues to error rather than the error itself are pointed out.)

4) Do a final edit alone—aloud.

5) Record prominent errors on a self-editing chart. Use this chart for later editing activity.

4.1.2 Targeted editing is a second approach to polishing. It specifies the kinds of problems and errors the students are to look for. Self-editing and peer collaboration procedures are also involved. Three slightly different approaches are presented below.

4.1.2.1 Murray (1984:181) recommends that the teacher draw up a short checklist of errors based on student writing. The teacher uses this checklist to devise a heuristic to guide students through the polishing of their writing. Students work alone or in pairs with this polishing heuristic. Prior to the polishing session, the teacher might lead a brief discussion on what students are looking for. A few practice examples' can be taken from prior student writing and dittoed off for the class. Below is a polishing heuristic of the type Murray recommends.

1) Is the sentence length varied, with short sentences being used to emphasize?
2) Are tenses consistent?
3) Has the verb "to be" been cut whenever possible?
4) Is there sexist or racist language that should be cut or changed?
5) Have cliches been replaced?

4.1.2.2 Murray (1984) also suggests that students begin polishing by reading aloud line by line and that they learn and use a set of marks editors commonly use when helping an author polish the final draft. However, such a set should remain limited—from five to ten such symbols. Normally, these symbols are used exclusively by the teacher. Students can make easy use of such symbols if the symbols are tied to a physical revision act rather than to the correction of a specific grammatical error. The following symbols, for example, only refer to adding, deleting, replacing, or reordering of text.
4.1.2.3 Cramer (in press) also recommends that students search for a specific kind of error. Examples of right and wrong usage are provided beforehand in a guide. The advantage of the guide to error correction is that students are not locked into looking for the same kind of error that everyone else is.

Student writing should be edited by as many different peers as possible. However, students should limit themselves to two categories of error from a checklist that contains twenty different ones. Examples include:

1) lack of agreement between subject and verb
2) omission of a -d or -ed ending
3) wrong tense
4) incorrect word order
5) sentence fragment

The above mentioned polishing heuristics help train students to find error. The teacher and the students can negotiate to find the heuristic that works best for them. If the teacher is wary of using peer collaboration with these checklists, doing walk-throughs before easing into a collaborative approach is recommended.

4.2 Contemplation and evaluation activities are part of the final phase of the classroom writing process. Once students have completed the revision and editing of their writing, the authors should be given time to contemplate what they have written and be given a chance to evaluate their work themselves. Research indicates that L1 skilled writers do this whereas the less skilled writers appear to want to present their work to the teacher without reading and polishing it. The following activities focus on the students self-evaluation of their final work.

4.2.1 An evaluative quickwrite is done just before the final draft and is handed over to the teacher for publication.
First, the students read their writing once through. Then the students quickwrite how much the feedback helped improve the quality of their final products. The learners can answer such focused questions as: How were suggestions for improvement helpful? At what stage of drafting was peer feedback or teacher conferencing helpful? What improvements were made as a result of feedback?

4.2.2 Quickwrites related to the writing process can be done. Students can quickwrite about the effectiveness of prewriting activities or about the special problems which were experienced during the writing of the composition.

4.2.3 Quickwrites about the strengths and weaknesses of the paper can be done. Or, quickwrites can state what changes would be made if the paper could be written one more time.

4.2.4 The students read and examine all of the drafts of their writing assignments and describe in groups (or quickwrite) the kinds of changes that were made from draft to draft.

4.2.5 The evaluation group discussion such as the one suggested from Whitlock (1984) involves collaboratively dealing with the following heuristic. The teacher also can walk the students through the heuristic giving pairs of students time to discuss each question.

1) Read your best paragraph aloud to your group or discussion partner. What makes it good—better than any other in the paper?
2) What was the biggest problem you had in writing this paper? Describe it. Did you solve it? How? If you did not, what happened?
3) If you had twenty-four more hours to work on your paper, what—if anything—would you do with it?
4) What did you learn about _______ in writing this paper?
5) What did you learn but could not get into the paper?
6) What surprised you as you wrote your paper?
7) What did you learn about yourself as you wrote the paper?

4.3 Publication usually necessitates typing, xeroxing, and/or dittoing. One method is to ask students to type their final copies directly onto a ditto. With a class of fifteen it does not really take long to run enough copies off for everyone. However, some teachers may want to publish everyone's writing only from time to time. In place of total publication, three or four compositions can be selected for reproduction. (A committee of students could do this after
class or the teacher can do it.) These published papers are then brought to class and read, appreciated, and talked about. Below are some suggested activities students can use with published writing.

4.3.1 The peer feedback activity is used to examine published writing. Peer feedback groups examine the writing according to a predetermined heuristic which focuses on praising the writing, locating problems still present, and suggesting changes the author could make if rewriting took place one more time.

4.3.2 The wrap-up session can examine the strengths and weaknesses of published writing.

4.3.3 The editing practice session organizes groups of students to work on manipulating sentences, words, and paragraphs. It is then rewritten for the author.

4.3.4 Modeling is done again as the teacher presents the writing in mini-lectures and discussions of usage and mechanical problems.

4.3.5 Group discussions about the processes of the writer who wrote the published piece help students achieve a greater understanding of the writing process. A student's published piece is presented to the class by the author. This student then describes what happened during prewriting, how the composing got started, what problems were experienced during the writing process, which changes were made in the early drafts before the final copy, and what help and suggestions were made by the peer feedback groups. The student might even want to ditto off earlier drafts to illustrate the changes that took place.

There are numerous possibilities for activities in connection with publication. However, it must never be forgotten that the most important purpose of these activities is to provide students the opportunity to read each others polished writing and praise the author.
Appendix B: The Writing Cycle: The Pedagogical Framework for Teaching the Writing Process

The pedagogical device which links together the activities and procedures facilitating the learning of the writing process is the "writing cycle" (Cramer 1982). The writing cycle is presented to the students as a carefully planned system of procedures which correspond to the four major phases of the writing process. If the procedures of the writing cycle are followed as presented, then students are guided through the whole writing process from prewriting to the presentation and publication of the finished written product. The different procedures organize and present teacher/student selected tasks and activities from Appendix A. The tasks and activities which are slotted into the procedures of the writing cycle should be chosen to suit the needs and interests of the given student or group of students in the writing class. This is the chief advantage of the writing cycle. But also it is important to remember that not all of the suggested activities can or should be employed during the progress of any given writing cycle. It is this writing cycle which makes what skilled writers do during the writing process a learnable system of acts.

1.1 Steps in the Writing Cycle

The "Steps in the Writing Cycle" found in table 14 outline the series of procedures which comprise the writing cycle. These steps match the major phases of the composing process. Adjacent to the steps of the writing cycle is a summary of the activities which facilitate each phase of the writing process. They have been matched up with the various steps in the writing cycle. It must be pointed out, however, that the writing cycle, as a series of cyclically repeating steps, is not a model of the recursive, interactive writing process. Rather the writing cycle is a way of compartmentalizing the writing process. This partitioning is necessary so that the student writer and the teacher can intervene and learn to control and direct the whole of the writing process and its parts.
Table 14: Steps in the Writing Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps:</th>
<th>Activities that facilitate the Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting Activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Getting started:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Amoeba Game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Gathering:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought collecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group Discussions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickwrite discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sharing discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General topic discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving discussions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reaching a consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification of values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Focusing Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Training:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-throughs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap-ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing Activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Drafting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loopwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Investigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking aloud protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 14: Steps in the Writing Cycle (Continued)

Revision Support Activities:

3. Feedback:

Self-feedback

**Self-questioning**

Quickwriting feedback
Quick searching

Peer feedback:
  - group feedback
  - pair feedback
  - quickwriting wrap-ups
  - checklist wrap-ups
  - discussion wrap-ups

Teacher feedback

Feedback Training:
  - modeling
  - quickwriting
  - brainstorming heuristics

Revision Support Activities
(See also revision support above)

4. Revision and Redrafting

Revision practice exercises

Referencing

**Redrafting** activities
(See also Composing activities)

Revision Support Activities
(See also revision support above)

5. Feedback for additional revision and redrafting

(See sections 3 and 4 above.)

(continued)
Table 14: Steps in the Writing Cycle (Continued)

Presentation Activities:
6. Polishing
   Self-feedback
   Peer feedback:
      proofing
      targeted editing
   Contemplation:
      evaluation quickwriting
      evaluation discussions

Publication Activities:
7. Publication
   Peer feedback
   Wrap ups
   Editing practice
   Modeling
   Group discussions

Below is an explanation of each step of the writing cycle with a set of selected activities taken from Appendix A slotted into it. In this plan the writing cycle would last for two weeks. In many ESL pre-freshman writing courses at the University of Hawaii this means that ten fifty-minute sessions are available for activities in each writing cycle. Regardless of the number of sessions available per week, it is recommended that no more than two weeks within a single writing cycle be spent working on drafting, revising, and other support activities. Cramer's (1982) original writing cycle repeated itself every two days. Cycles lasting from two days to ten days are possible.

Steps of the Writing Cycle (prototype)

1. Getting Started--The writing cycle begins with topic exploration, information gathering and idea generation activities. These are listed next to "Getting Started" in Table 14. At least one general group discussion of the topic or problem solving discussion is recommended. Learners do several quickwrites at various times during this step. Writing an exploratory or zero draft can help the learner get started. This zero draft can be taken into a focusing conference which wraps up prewriting. Spending from two to three class periods in this step is recommended.
2. **Drafting**—Students can write an exploratory *draft*, if it has not yet been done. Otherwise, students should write a first draft after having read their exploratory draft. The draft should not be consulted during the writing of the rough draft. Students may want to permit at least one day's lapse between *prewriting* activities and rough draft writing. Following the completion of the rough *draft*, students *xerox* several copies to bring to class for peer feedback.

3. **Feedback**—Students begin the feedback session with a quickwrite about the kinds of advice they would like to receive from their peers. Then students gather for peer feedback for content revisions. The feedback sessions are normally student directed and are helped with *teacher-derived* feedback procedures. The teacher may collaborate with the students in the feedback groups, conference with individual students, or collect copies of the student drafts in order to give teacher feedback. The feedback session can end with a quickwrite suggesting the kinds of changes the writer wants to make. Feedback at this level may take one or two periods.

4. **Revision and Redrafting**—Students work on first drafts and take into account the revision advice which was given. These drafts are expected to be highly revised versions of the first drafts.

5. **Feedback for Additional Revision and Redrafting**—Students can begin this session by quickwriting about the kind of help they would like to receive. The feedback during these sessions focuses on ordering and fine-tuning meaning. The teacher either collaborates with the feedback groups or spends time giving the drafts written feedback. Two or three sessions can be spent in revision and redrafting but at least one redrafting period should separate the feedback sessions.

6. **Polishing**—With feedback for meaning and order completed, the students will focus on proofreading for minor grammatical and mechanical matters. One session is generally enough for this activity.

7. **Publication**—Students submit their final products to the teacher for reading and publication. The teacher selects whole writings and pieces of writing to publish for the students to read and evaluate. Usually, one session is enough for publication activities.
1.2 Adapting the Writing Cycle

The writing cycle as it is presented above is recommended for use during most of the term. However, there is a certain brief introductory period in which the instructor will want to train the students. During the training period modeling of each chosen activity may occur. Also, teachers may want to walk the students through the discussion heuristics associated with some of the major activities, e.g., prewriting discussions and peer feedback. Two writing cycles, each two weeks in duration, should constitute a sufficient training period.

Once it appears that the students have the writing cycle under control, the students no longer need to take direction from instructors. Instructors should gradually assume the role of co-participant. At the point of the instructor's full participation in the assorted activities, groups of students will be determining their own writing topics, selecting their own prewriting activities, and directing feedback and polishing sessions using heuristics of their own devising. The major role of the teacher is to fix deadlines for publication dates. Obviously every class of students will be different. Some classes will obtain this freedom earlier than others. Other classes will never reach it.

After students are relatively proficient, they should move on to complete independence from both the materials and the teacher as manager. Students self-select their own writing groups and then choose their own topics. Next the students draft, develop, polish and publish completely on their own. Probably only the deadlines would have to be negotiated. The amount of time remaining in the term, along with the ability and ambition of the students, would determine the number of additional writings which would be published.

The final two weeks of this writing program can be spent in the evaluation exercise presented in the evaluation section of this curriculum.
Appendix C: Sample Materials Module

The materials module that follows consists of heuristics which can be prepared in handout form to accompany the steps of the writing cycle. Please note that not all activities suggested in Appendix A should be included in each materials module. Teachers should select activities and procedures suitable for their group of students and develop heuristics accordingly. This materials module is a prototype only.

General Topic or Theme: Problems of International Students

Getting Started:

1) Thought Collecting:

When you arrived on your American university campus you experienced many adjustment problems. List as many of these problems as you can think of. Place a plus (+) beside those problems you expected. Place a minus (-) beside those problems you did not expect to experience.

2) Quickwriting:

International students are faced with many problems when they enroll in a university which is new to them. Besides dealing with the problems that all students encounter, international students must cope with the stress of living in a different culture. The university and the surrounding community need to be made aware of these problems. Only you, the international student, know what these problems are. In this quickwrite, simply report what problems you have experienced in adjusting to your new life at this university.

3) Questions for General Discussion:

1. What are the most difficult problems international students have when first entering the university?

2. What problems do international students have getting settled in their new environment?

3. What surprises you most about your university? How is it different from the schools you have attended in your home country?

4. Do you think the university is sometimes unfair to international students? How?
5. How has coming to the university and a new country changed your routine?

6. How are the ways you study different?

7. What adjustments have you had to make that have made your life easier or better?

8. What adjustments have you had to make that have made your life more difficult?

9. Do you believe you should have to make adjustments when you move to a new place? Why?

10. Problems are sometimes easier to deal with when you have friends or family to turn to. Who would you go to for help in your home country? Who do you go to for help now?

11. Are there times when you feel helpless or handicapped? Are there times you feel like a small child and have to learn everything over again?

12. Imagine that you have a friend who is arriving here next week to attend the university. What would you tell that person which might make his/her life easier?

4) Discussion Activity:

You have been hired by the university to propose solutions and remedies for the problems international students have adjusting to their new environment. You must first clearly define the problem, state what you think causes the problem, state what effect the problem has on the student's life, and finally offer a solution.

Example

Problem: The student has difficulty taking notes in a lecture.

Cause: The student has difficulty in listening and the teacher speaks too fast.

Effect: The student does not understand the lecture and has no notes to study. This leads to her doing poorly on exams.
Solution: Have the student take ESL classes. Have the student tape record the lectures. Have the student team up with a friend and share notes.

5) Finding focus

Conference with classmates and/or the teacher and discuss what you would like to write about. Below is a list of suggestions for writing which can be discussed.

a. File a report with the university on the most serious problems facing international students adjusting to their new environment. After stating the cause(s) of the problem and the effects it has on the international student's life, offer a solution.

b. Write a letter to the campus newspaper telling of a problem you and other international students are facing.

c. You are a news reporter who has just interviewed a campus advisor for international students. Write a feature news article on the major problems these students have.

d. Write a letter home to a friend telling of your university life here compared to what it might have been if you had attended the university near your home.

e. Write a letter to the campus newspaper advice columnist seeking help with a problem you are having.

f. Recall a problem that you experienced when you first arrived on campus. Write a short story in which this problem is the major focus. Use dialog where appropriate. All or parts of the story need not be true.

Drafting

1) Based on the conclusion of the focusing conference, write a first draft. Then conference with your classmates on the points listed below.

or

Based on the conclusion of the focusing conference, quickwrite/loopwrite a zero draft. Then conference with your classmates on the points below.
a. What is the purpose of this writing task?
b. Who is the prospective audience?
c. What are the format possibilities?
d. What language usage or style problems might one anticipate?
e. What did you write about?
f. What points were made which can be used when writing a rough draft.

Redraft and Revise

Bring xerox copies of redrafted writing to class for further feedback.

A Suggested Feedback Activity for Writing about Problems of International Students (The teacher will want to construct feedback activities suitable for the needs and writing topics of the students.)

1. Read your draft through at least once.
2. Place a star beside those paragraphs which explain problems.
3. Exchange papers with a classmate and read each others' work.
4. Tell the writer which problem was most interesting and relevant to you as a reader.
5. Tell the writer which problem was not clearly explained. What needs to be done to improve the explanation of this problem? Should the cause be explained? Should the effect on the reader be explained?
6. Discuss with the author changes to be made in the draft during the redrafting step.

Redraft

Redraft your paper making use of the advice obtained from your discussion with your classmates.

Polishing

1. Exchange papers with a partner.
2. Read your partner's paper and look for errors in spelling and punctuation.
Appendix D: Class Evaluation Report

Quickwrite:

What do you honestly think of the way you are learning to write? Do the quickwrites, group discussions, and focusing conferences help you get ideas and begin your writing? Are you able to improve your writing by doing peer feedback, rewriting, talking about model compositions, and completing polishing exercises? Does teacher feedback help you?

What do you think of the topics and the amount of work you must do? Is the grading policy fair? Do you really like the teacher's attitude and classroom manner? Do you enjoy the class as it is being taught? Or would you rather the class be conducted in a different kind of way?

The answers to these and other questions will let your teacher know if changes need to be made in the way you are learning. Your teacher's first concern is that you improve your writing. Whatever is necessary to help you must be done. Therefore, please write honestly about everything you like and dislike regarding this writing class.

Class Discussion:

1) Share ideas from your quick write. Mention everything you like and dislike about your writing class.

2) Discuss with your classmates your honest opinion of the effectiveness of the following:

   a) the writing topics
   b) quickwriting
   c) small group discussion of the topics
   d) focusing conferences
   e) peer feedback discussions
   f) teacher feedback
   g) the teacher's attitude and classroom manner
   h) reading and discussing model compositions
   i) polishing activities
   j) grading policy (should the teacher assign grades or marks for each composition)
   k) the number of assignments
   l) others (list them):

3) Do you think your writing is improving? Why/why not? In order to improve your writing further, what do you think you will have to do?
4) If you were the teacher, how would you organize the learning in this class? (What changes would you make so that the learning would be better?)

5) Is this class preparing you so that you will be able to do writing assignments for other university classes? If not, what kinds of assignments do you need to do?


7) How do former English classes and teachers compare with the English classes and teacher you are now taking?

8) What are the characteristics of a good writing class? A good writing teacher?

Focused Discussion Activity

Look again at question two on the first page. Which activities on the list seem to help you with your writing the most? The least?

Working to achieve a group consensus, choose five activities that seem to help with your writing the most. Give reasons. Then choose five activities that do not seem to be helping. Also, give reasons.

A. Activities that help me with the writing process:

#1

Reasons:

#2

Reasons:
B. Activities that are least helpful with the writing process: (You may want to recommend ways these activities could be made useful.

#1

Reasons:

#2

Reasons:
#3
Reasons:

#4
Reasons:

#5
Reasons:

Finding Focus:

Conference with classmates and/or the teacher and discuss what you would like to write about. Below is a list of suggestions for writing which can be discussed during this conference.

1. Perhaps you entered this class without much confidence in your ability to write well in English. But after several weeks in the class you see yourself beginning to improve, though perhaps slowly. Write about the classroom activities that are helping you improve.

2. There may be many reasons you enjoy being in your writing class. However, there are several activities you believe to be a waste of time. Suggest ways these activities could be improved.

3. You are a member of a committee reorganizing the requirements and procedures of the class. Submit a report to the teacher detailing the committee's recommendations.
4. Compare the writing assignments you have been doing in this class with those you have done for other English classes that you may have had in the past. Which do you prefer? Why?

5. Write a letter to an old schoolmate in your hometown telling about your writing class at the university. Mention how it is similar to/Unlike a writing class you had before.

6. Based on what you have discussed in class write a report of the activities helping you/not helping you improve your writing process.
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