Matthew Walsh

September 24, 2004

The application of process writing to the needs of L2 student-writers

1   Introduction

In this paper texts written in English from two groups of Japanese high school students will be examined and followed by an analysis of some of the problems they appear to be having and how they may be remedied by a process approach to L2 writing pedagogy. A process approach to L2 writing recreates the strategies used by successful writers into a set of classroom procedures proven to be effective at improving a students writing and helping them develop texts of their own origin and the message within. However, in order for a process approach to writing pedagogy to be of use to these learners, there are several issues that need to be taken into consideration within the various stages of process writing. While the aim of the process writing procedures is to help learners develop a text true to their intention, attention can be called to discourse conventions that will aid them in creating a more communicative text without forcing them to merely imitate such conventions.

2 The context

2.1 The context: the samples of writing chosen.

Five samples were chosen from two different groups, one in the tenth, and one in the eleventh grade. The samples were chosen with the aim of evenly representing common

approaches and problems in the more advanced learners as well as the less skilled ones within either group, but for both groups, bilingual learners who had the experience of living in an English speaking country for an extended period of time in their childhood were excluded from the samples because such learners were not seen as representative for the reason that their texts were far more advanced than the norm and were much closer to a text that would be expected from a NES of a similar age. For the 10th grader groups, all of the essays (133) were examined briefly and approaches and difficulties varied greatly but could roughly be put into three categories which I will explain later. For the 11th graders, a sample of 50 out of the total of 164 essays were examined and on the whole were found to be much more homogenous in terms of quality of text and the type of text produced very much resembled the more advanced learners in the 10th grader group.

2.2   The context: the learners' tasks

The first group, 133 tenth graders were working on an Internet research project investigating China (from here on labeled as 'Internet China Group'). The title of the class subject is 'International Awareness' and the aim of the content-based EFL class is to gain insight on other cultures and international issues through English and often incorporates group collaboration and the use of the Internet. The activity format for this class up to the writing assignment was based on the 'Subject Sampler' or 'Treasure Hunt' formats often used in such classes involving use of the Internet.

The 'Internet China Group' had, in groups, collaborated in gathering from the Internet a list of facts written in single sentence form about China. In groups of 4 or 5 students, each group had compiled a list of facts under 8 headings, (history, culture, clothing, ..etc.) Gathering the lists from the students, the instructor had corrected any mistakes and posted a whole-class list of facts about China on the course web page. This was the first time the students were able to see the facts that other groups in their class had created. They were told to combine a select number of these facts along with any general knowledge or impressions they had about China into a text with the intended reader being someone who knew nothing about China, or a student who hadn't taken this class and would not be familiar with the topics and issues covered so far. They were to give the reader a general impression of what kind of country China was. The facts

they choose to use would constitute a focus. They were told to create a piece of naturally flowing discourse, and the idea of a topic sentence and a conclusion were mentioned very briefly, however the main purpose of this activity was for the students to come into contact with, comprehend, and construct something from the new information and vocabulary items that had emerged from other groups in the internet research project. There was a time limit of 50 minutes, or one class period, so it was in this sense a fluency practice. Once writing had commenced, the instructor resisted giving comment concerning paragraph form such as a topic sentence or conclusion, however when the instructor saw a student with a successful approach, he mentioned it out loud so other learners might borrow it. Ex. " This student has chosen to go from macro to micro in a sense by first giving a historical background of China and then progressing to culture, language and then city life and pop-culture. That's a nice way of organizing it!"   Aside from this, learners were allowed to create the texts as they wished with guidance from the instructor only when requested.

The second group, 164 eleventh graders were trying out an online essay evaluation system offered as a service by ETS called *"Criterion"* (from here on labeled as: 'The Criterion Group'). Writers are given a topic and after a timed writing session (for the essays sampled, 30 minutes), student submit their writing online and receive a score of 1 to 6 accompanied by a detailed feedback analysis which highlights problem areas in several classifications that constitute the 'criterion' of their score. The samples were taken from the student's first attempt at using the software so they were oblivious to what the criterion would be in assessing their essays. The topic assigned by the software was;

> It has been said, "Not everything that is learned is contained in books." Compare and contrast knowledge gained from experience with knowledge gained from books. In your opinion, which source is more important? Why?

Again, the idea of paragraph construction, i.e. a topic sentence, supporting ideas, and a conclusion were mentioned very briefly, but the instructor purposefully did not interfere with the students once writing commenced. The students seemed to be very aware of the time limit imposed and were in a hurry to write as much as possible. Again, it was in effect a fluency practice.

3   The forest over the trees

Since the purpose of this paper is to discuss how a process approach to writing might help L2 student writers, I would like to focus my discussion of the sampled learner's errors and needs to those on a text level as opposed to sentence level syntax. Justification for this can be seen in the general focus that is placed on content and the writer's message in a process approach to writing. Brown (2001) states that in process writing "Learners… (are) seen as creators of language…(and) *are* allowed to focus on content and message… and… their intrinsic motives (are) put at the center of learning.". This "focus on content and message", often metaphorically expressed in terms of a focus on the forest over the individual trees, certainly means giving a lower priority to sentence level grammar. This prioritization can also be seen in process writing, especially during the first draft and revision stages, and as well as in teacher response and peer review; things I would like to talk about later.

4 Types of difficulties and pedagogic solutions from Process Writing.

4.1   The Internet China Group: Types of difficulties.

All 133 essays were briefly analyzed and perceived difficulties generally fell within one of three categories, which could be summed up as:

Type A: Paragraphs that are too short and cutoff midway, but contain sentences that are cohesively connected.

Type B: List-ups of one-sentence facts, or statements, similar to the lists of information gathered in the Internet research project; there is no paragraph or connected discourse.

Type C: Paragraphs that have a thesis or topic sentence, and conclusion, but show an underdevelopment of ideas or lack of clarity and/or focus. These were from the more advanced learners in the group.

I will limit my discussion to types A, and B, because type C in the group was very similar to the texts created by the 11th graders, 'The Criterion Group', and I will

examine the needs of such students in that section.

4.2   The Internet China Group: Difficulty type A:
Paragraphs that are too short and cutoff mid-way, but contain sentences that are cohesively connected. (See Appendix A: Jyoutaro I.)

It was evident that choices had been made in terms of what information to use, and considerable effort had been made to cohesively and topically connect the sentences in a related manner, but it was viewed by the instructor that the comparative shortness and often incompleteness of the essays, was a result of the students having gotten caught up in the meticulous process of connecting the sentences without having decided an initial focus or larger picture of what the finished text would be. For this reason they were not able to decide where to add in general info, opinions, or what to write next.

4.2.1   A planning stage
These students could have benefited from pre-writing activities that are a typical stage of process writing. One example of such an activity is a mind-map, or cluster creating stage where students first jot down their ideas and graphically organize them before first draft writing commences. In what is often considered the authoritative book on the subject, *Process Writing,* White and Arndt (1991) layout a thirteen-step composition process where six of the steps occur even before initial writing commences. Such pre-writing activities would have given these learners base for an image of a longer text (the forest) that they would be able to work towards, and at the same time freed them from apparently being trapped in a cycle worrying about accuracy and the soundness of the individual connections between sentences with no idea of how to proceed.

Justification for such pre-writing activities in process writing comes from research on successful NES English composition writers in the 1960's. More recently, L2 writing research along the same lines comes to a similar conclusion as is summed up in Richards and Lockhart(1996:65):

> "…Skilled writers tend to spend time thinking about tasks and
> planning….They gather and organize information; and they use note-

taking, lists, and brainstorming to help generate ideas. On the other hand, unskilled writers tend to spend little time on planning….."

4.2.2   A quick first draft for revision

Another key stage of process writing that would be useful to these learners is a first draft with a purposeful lack of focus or attention to detail. Nunan (1999:272) sums up this focus on fluency in process writing, especially in the first draft stage, when he says:

> "Here the focus…..is on quantity rather than quality, and writers are encouraged to get their ideas onto paper without worrying to much about formal correctness in the initial stages"

Content as well, does not deserve over-attention at this first draft stage: the more the better. After receiving feedback from their teacher or peers, students revise their text and write a second draft to make their message clearer. Nunan(1989:37) cites research from Zamel (1982) to the effect that in revision, less skilled writers tend to edit in more superficial ways, rarely making major shifts in content, whereas more skilled writers tend to change large chunks of discourse which result in a reordering of the whole. Brown (2001:335) lists "Plac(ing) a central importance on the process of revision" as an important characteristic of process writing. So, implied by Zamel is that for this revision process to be productive, writers developing these strategies need to be prepared to make drastic changes in their text.

It follows logically that less meticulous energy on both form and content should be invested into these first attempts to compile ideas and get them on paper, a strategy that students who were frustrated in the way that Jyoutaro was would have benefited from.

4.2.3   A process of discovery

Furthermore reason for learners like Jyoutaro to be less worried about accuracy at the early stages of writing is the realization that during the process the text may very well change in focus. It is through the process of writing that the learner actually discovers what they want to say. Early research into the strategies of skilled NES writers that led to a process approach to L1 writing pedagogy identifies a three-stage writing process as 'plan', 'write' and 'edit' (Rohman and Wleck, 1964). These stages are then later qualified as being non-linear or 'recursive' (Emig, 1971) implying that skilled writers

often go back and utilize the various strategies as the text shifts, develops and actually changes .

The realization that writers often end up with a different message than they started out with suggests that writing is actually a thinking process and that writers by definition don't know what they want to say until they go through these processes. Peter Elbow (1973) quoted in Brown (2001:336) says that writing is "not…a way to transmit a message, but…a way to grow and cook a message. Writing is a way to end up thinking something you couldn't have started out thinking," Tribble (1996:42) says the same thing when stating that learners in a process writing class "… see their development as writers, in terms of their development as thinkers."

With the understanding that the message is likely to change during the individual process of discovering and constructing it, learners like Jyoutaro are asked to set aside the feeling of permanence and accountability that writing something down imposes. They could benefit from this sense of transience of text and ideas present acutely   in the early stages of process writing. Because the meaning and text are bound to change along the way, efforts at the beginning stages, although necessary, can be seen as disposable and recyclable.

Nunan (1999:272) sums this up when he asserts:

> "Proponents of process writing recognize and accept the
> reality that there will never be a perfect text, but that one can
> get closer to perfection through producing, reflecting on,
> discussing, and reworking successive drafts of a text."

4.3   The 'Criterion' Group (China Internet Group Type C) : Perceived difficulties and pedagogic solutions from Process Writing.

Essays that showed evidence of a thesis, supporting ideas, and a conclusion, but on the whole showed a lack of clarity and/or focus. (See appendix B: The Criterion Group)

An underdeveloped message was to be expected because of the time factor (see 2.2 The context: the learners' tasks), this class being merely a test drive for the Criterion software, and the fact that it was known that there would be a rewrite later at some point. This was a first draft. What these students needed at this stage was something

substantial to base a revision on.

4.3.1 Reader feedback as a basis for revision.

While the Criterion software is able to detect areas of syntax and essay structure to a certain degree, and could be the basis for a rewrite, it is incapable of understanding meaning or clarity of message. While useful in the former areas, there is a danger that by merely focusing on grammar and mechanics during a rewrite, the writer will assume that the message they want to convey is clear barring these superficial problems, or worse even, never know. There needs to be contact between the writer and a reader and the writer needs comment on substance which Criterion cannot provide.

There are numerous styles of achieving this and engineering a feedback framework to be used as a basis for revision is very much a creative task for the instructor using process writing as a tool, but in order for such feedback to be of use to the Criterion Group there are several factors that need to be carefully considered. Such concerns could be: What type of feedback?, By whom?, and, When?

4.3.2 Teacher response: When?

Although teacher response is the traditional approach and students express a need to have feedback from the teacher (Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998), whoever provides the feedback, first and foremost is the issue of timing. Research has proven of the more traditional sequence, where the student hands in an essay and receives it back with a grade, comment, and errors marked in red, to be ineffective at helping students improve in their writing. Comments are too vague and error correction is often idiosyncratic and not fully processed by the learner before continuing on to the next writing assignment. Instead, teacher input is more effective if given at a pre-writing stage or during the development of the text as in between a first and second draft (Leki, 1990a).

4.3.3 Error correction verses comment on content

Next, the question of what kind of feedback is most effective needs to be considered. The often-debated issue of feedback on grammar verses feedback on content has been researched thoroughly, sometimes with seemingly contradictory results. Research that shows students express a preference for receiving feedback on grammar over content,

especially at a later stage of the composition process (Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994), is countered by research that proves it ineffective. Case in point, Kepner's (1991) study shows written error correction and rule reminders to be ineffective, while it finds that meaningful commentary to be more useful to learners as it provides correct L2 modeling related to the text and promotes critical thinking. On a similar note, Zamel's (1985) research shows that L2 writing teachers' comments on form are often arbitrary, inconsistent, and impose rules and standards that are too abstract to be of use to the learner. Furthermore, teachers often misread students' texts as they provide feedback on form. While she doesn't go as far as to suggest that error correction should never be done, she recommends that teachers avoid the mixing substantive comments with grammatical corrections on the same draft and "replace vague commentary and references to abstract rules and principles with text-specific strategies."   To further prove that feedback on the message of the text is a more effective tool for revision, a study by Fathman and Whally (1990) on feedback on content verses feedback on form shows that of three groups, one receiving grammar and error correction only, one receiving feedback on content only, and one receiving both, the group receiving feedback on content alone actually ended of with better end products in terms of *grammar* (and content) than the group that received explicit grammar correction alone. Perhaps this is proof of the view offered by the tradition of discourse analysis that sees higher ordered choices determining lower ordered ones (Nunan,1999:272). So, with focus placed firmly on meaning and message, grammar choices become more apparent and accuracy improves.

4.3.4 Ownership of text.

However, with feedback on content, there are dangers involved. The issue of appropriation of a student's text by the teacher has been brought up in this context on numerous occasions. Brannon and Knoblauch (1982) describe a teacher looking at a student's text, interpreting, or perhaps projecting what has been expressed, and then asserting their own agenda of how it should be improved without completely understanding what the student wanted to say. The student, through the revision process, then suffers a diminishing commitment to communicate ideas that vary from their original intention. Brannon and Knoblauch suggest to avoid this that a teacher should

act as a 'soundboard' by eliciting areas of difficulty from the student, acting as a listener more than a speaker and also offer the service of pointing out confusing areas in the text, elicit clarification from the student, and then provide some advice on how to clear up the message.

4.3.5 Criticism verses praise

In providing teacher response on substance as a basis for revision, there is also danger with pride and egos. Leki's (1990a) study finds an interesting phenomenon in a survey of L2 writers that finds they often disregard teacher comments, and sometimes actually feel hostile towards them. This brings the issue of criticism verses praise in teacher response. Praise, while motivating is not very useful as a base for a rewrite, but how much of an incentive to improve a text would pure criticism be? In a study by Cardelle and Corno (1981) a combination of praise and criticism was seen to be most effective over any other combination.

So, in conclusion, teacher response should be early; at a pre-writing stage or between drafts, based on content, text-specific, and loyal to the students intended meaning.

4.3.6   Peer review

As is the case with the Criterion group, the enormous amount of time it takes for a teacher to provide feedback for essays from large classes makes peer review often the only viable way of giving student writers a reader. Peer review is also an attractive alternative or complement to teacher response that fits well with process writing because it can take place at various stages of a developing text and frees the teacher up to concentrate more on imparting the knowledge of what consists of good writing (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998). Furthermore, it takes advantage of aspects of collaborative learning that creates a bond and allows students to develop critical skills while reading a fellow students work. This awareness can then be applied to their own work since they will be working on similar if not the same projects (Leki, 1990b). On the affective front, there is an element of low-risk exploratory talk that can exist between peers that gives them opportunity to test and revise their L2 hypotheses that is difficult to reach in an interaction with a teacher or in front of the whole class; lateral 'learner language' is

often more effective than 'teacher language' from above. The most basic motivating factor from the students' point of view that can be achieved by peer review is the simple fact that every student has an audience, something that is difficult to achieve by the teacher's efforts alone.

4.3.7   Peer review: Issues to be considered

The risks involved in peer review are similar to those of teacher response with the exception of a lack of formal schemata that may lead to misguided advice from the NNS peer. In the same sense, the peer may simply not know what to say. The instructor needs to carefully provide a framework for the students to follow as they review their peer's work. Creative solutions can be found in several process type course books. (Rooks, 1999, Silver, 1999, Singleton, 1998, et al.) If a certain aspect of discourse structure, or form has been targeted up to that point in the course, it can be examined by a peer with fair accuracy but often suggested is a check for writers overall intent that can point out success in having expressed that or a lack thereof.

Campbell (1998) describes a peer review framework that takes on a more writer-centered approach as areas of concern are actually provided by the writer. Student-writers are the ones that set the framework as they ask for advice on an aspect of their text that they choose themselves. Posted on the wall is the student-writers draft marked with questions in the margin requesting feedback. Below it is a blank sheet of paper for responses from anybody in the class that may have a suggestion.

Aside from its advantages in terms of collaboration, and student-centeredness its efficiency and flexibility to be used several times at any stages of the writing process makes peer review often the alternative no feedback at all.

4.4   The Internet China Group: Difficulty type B:

List-ups of the info, chosen and often paraphrased from the group's compiled Internet research sheets.   (See appendix C: Ayami N.)

These texts were longer and more creative than those that fell within difficulty type A, however they were not in a paragraph form, but rather a list of sentences. Some

generally known information, or opinions were often added to the newly discovered info chosen from the compiled fact list posted on the class web page (see 2.2   The context: the learners' tasks) as they created another, more expanded 'list of facts'. The info taken from the other group's lists were often re-worded into the individual student's language. They often used bullet points to separate sentences, one sentence per line and there were no words of transition or attempts to connect sentences. The ideas, however, were grouped, often going in a succession of macro to micro, i.e. history or politics first, then followed by culture such as language, religion, or fashion.

Students creating texts of this type seemed not to grasp that they were asked to transform the information lists into a continuing flow of discourse with a focus or theme. Nor did they understand that they were supposed to start the essay with a topic sentence, and end with a conclusion. This was understandable because while being mentioned briefly, there were no activities focusing on these ideas. As mentioned before, the actual goal of this writing exercise was not essay writing per se, but rather to give the students a chance to internalize, and put to use the large amount of new language gathered in their Internet search on China.

4.4.1   Knowledge of genre

Ayami needed to acquire an image of a one-paragraph expository essay, with a topic sentence and a conclusion, something that could be considered a specific genre of the English language. With genre in mind, I would like to discuss the relation of a genre-based approach to writing (somewhat of a product-based approach to writing) to process writing.

4.4.2   A genre-based approach to writing

While process writing places a focus on creativity and developing the writer's clarity of meaning and focus, criticism of process writing has pointed out that with a total lack of guidance young writers tend to repeatedly produce the same kinds of texts, namely recounts and narratives, and that these sorts of texts sometimes differ from a reader's expectation given the communicative function that the text is attempting to achieve. Ayami's list did this by differing from the reader's expectation of discourse in paragraph

form.

Somewhat in reaction to the overwhelming popularity of process writing, and to guide learners like Ayami, genre analysis used in writing pedagogy, or a genre-based approach to writing has developed as a 'reader-centered' approach juxtaposition to the 'writer-centered' procedures of process writing. Proponents of a genre-based approach to the teaching of writing recognize that language fits a communicative function, and based on that function, conventions are adhered to, grammar changes, and identifiable stages of discourse occur. What determines the rational of a given genre is, as Swales (1990:58) explains, is simply that " (they) are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community….", the readers and writers of that genre. These identifiable characteristics form a model and base for instruction.

Practical applications for a genre-based approach to writing pedagogy vary from the very specialized to the more pragmatic. An example of the former would be EAP (English for Academic Purposes) in a university setting where conventions and characteristics of specific types of academic texts are examined. An example of this found in Swales' book *Genre Analysis*, identifies something referred to as *Steps and Moves*, a certain order in which things are stated that in almost all research proposals. More pragmatic uses can be found in adult ESL where it has been used for some time in the AMEP (Adult Migrant Education Program), in Australia. Ann Burns (2001) in an essay describes one such series of tasks and classroom procedures very genre oriented aimed at the formation of a job application letter, something very pragmatic indeed.

4.4.3 The process/product debate

Mainstream formal writing instruction methodology preceding the popularity of process writing is often referred to as *a product approach,* or *a prose model approach* which "focuse(d) on producing different kinds or written products and which emphase(d) imitation of different kinds of model paragraphs or essays" (Richards, Platt, Platt, 1992). Such an approach has been largely discarded because of its lack of effectiveness. In light of the research of the methods of skilled writers that led to a process approach, it was sensed that mere imitation was not the best way to develop the learner's strategies in developing a text, or the learner's writing skills in general

4.4.4   Genre as product: the danger.

I would like to suggest that depending on the instructor's emphasis in classroom procedures, there can exist a 'strong version' of a genre-based approach, very similar to a product approach, to writing pedagogy that by "emphasizing imitation" has the danger of being too arbitrary, prescriptive, and normative. Furthermore, placing too much of an emphasis on discourse conventions and genre features puts the teacher in danger of aiming less at helping the writer to develop their own text that conveys the message they want, but rather forces the learners to conform to the targeted elements of the specified genre of discourse at the expense of leaving their true message undiscovered and underdeveloped. This would stifle creativity (Reid, 2001, Nunan,1999) and certainly go against the tenant of process writing as a thinking process that "let(s) students discover what they want to say as they write." (Brown, 2001).

The danger exists if the instructor forces learners to adhere to such discourse conventions without making apparent their communicative functions, and, at the cost of denying the value of the learner's own ways of expressing meaning.

Teachers embracing process writing as a tool to help learners would have difficulty pursuing a genre-based approach to writing in such a strong form because, as Tribble (1996:40) states: "A teacher working within such a paradigm will try to respect the learner's cultural background and avoid the imposition of ideas or language behavior which would deny the validity of his/her own experience." In this sense an exclusive focus on genre represents a shift back to a product oriented approach, with the main task at hand being for the writer to somehow make their possibly as of yet undiscovered meaning fit within the imposed constrictions.

4.4.5   The false dichotomy

However, there is also a 'weak version', which is not in conflict with process writing and as such it could be said that the often-cited process/product debate is actually a false dichotomy. Nunan (1999:287) illustrates this when he asserts that genre is a syllabus design issue: It is strong for selection of content, whereas process is a classroom action issue essentially useful for methodological decisions.

A certain genre of text and its features can be targeted in writing projects, but the classroom procedures leading to that end can be from the process camp of strategies. A simple example of this could be a project where students write an imaginary letter to

their grandmother about their summer vacation. Attention is called to conventions like starting with *Dear,…*, ending with *Love,* and perhaps the token enquiry about grandma's state of affairs, but in the classroom, the letter goes through a planning stage, a first draft, teacher response/peer-review, and a rewrite, stages of process writing that enable the learner to develop their own personal message.

To directly address the needs of student creating texts like Ayami, process type course books often do this by drawing attention to discourse conventions such as those found within a one-paragraph expository essay by placing reading activities centered on those features as a pre-writing activity. One example is *Writers at Work* (Singleton,1998:6). In order to focus on the idea of a topic sentence, learners are given the task of reading a one-paragraph essay, stating it's main idea and then underlining one of a choice of sentences that best states it (the topic sentence). In *Journeys Writing 3* (Silver,1999:74-76), a similar example of using exposure to a common feature of discourse as a precursor to having learners attempt to create a similar element can be found presenting the idea of using an introduction that incorporates a quotation for longer, multi-paragraph essays. Learners are given 3 examples of such a type of introduction and then asked to predict what the main body of the essays will be about. Later, they are given a list of quotations and asked to write an introduction using one of them along with other material the students had prepared as a pre-writing exercise. By placing a focus on genre and discourse conventions in such ways, process oriented writing methodology can and does help learners become aware of various features by exposing them to texts utilizing them and then guiding them through a series of tasks that has the learners use these tools to express their meaning in a way that will be recognizable and communicative to the reader. Therefore, attention is paid to 'product' within the 'process' and no dichotomy exists. A communicative product is the end, but it is a product of the writer's origin attained by using the proven writing strategies of real writers.

5   Conclusion

Process writing methodology offers a set of tools and strategies that addresses the difficulties and needs that the learners sampled had, while aiding them in creating a text that communicates what they, the learners, want to say. Through the procedures of

process writing learners not only discover more effective ways of communicating their message to the reader, but they also discover the message itself.

For process writing's procedures and strategies to be effective for these learners, an instructor must carefully engineer the various stages. Main areas for consideration could be as follows:

◆Pre-writing activities like mind-maps or brain-storming are for the exploration of ideas, the planning of an individual focus, and attaining a picture of a finished text.

◆Quantity is more important than quality in a first draft that will serve as a temporary stock of discourse that will later be chopped, re-arranged, and added to in a revision. It is disposable and should be considered so.

◆Teacher response, and/or peer review needs to happen at earlier stages for revision to be successful.

◆ Focus on content and meaning over form, as well as a mixture of praise and criticism makes feedback for revision more effective.

◆ For peer review to be successful, the instructor must provide a clear framework for the feedback.

◆ The purpose of feedback is to make the learner's message clearer and not to take it over.

◆ For revision to be effective, drastic changes produce better results.

◆ Although the process of developing a text true to the learner's intent is central and sub servitude to conventions should be avoided, pre-writing activities that focus on genre features and discourse conventions can show learners how those features can be useful in making a more communicative product that is true to their intention.

Works Cited:

Brannon, L. & C. H. Knoblauch, (1982) On students' rights to their own texts: A model of teacher response. *College Composition and Communication, 33*, pp.157-166

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles, An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* 2nd ed., New York, Longman

Burns, A.(2001) Genre-based approaches to writing and beginning adult ESL learners. IN: Candlin and Mercer. (Eds) *English Language Teaching in its Social Context.* London, Routledge, pp. 200-207

Campbell, C. (1998) *Teaching Second Language Writing: Interacting with Text.* Cambridge, MA., Heinle & Heinle

Cardell, M. & Corno, L. (1981) Effects on second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*, pp.251-261

Elbow, P. (1973) *Writing Without Teachers.* New York: Oxford University Press

Emig, J. (1971) *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders.* NCTE Research Report No. 13. Urbana: NCTE

Fathman, A., & Whally, E. (1990) Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form verses content. IN: B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights from the classroom* (pp.178-190). New York: CUP

Hedgecock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994), Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, pp.141-163*

Faigley, L. (1994) Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal IN: Sondra P (Ed.) *Landmark Essays on Writing Process*, Davis CA., Hermagoras Press

Ferris, D., & J. S. Hedgcock, (1998) Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, Process, And Practice, Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Kelly,, C., & A. Gargagliano (2001) *Writing from Within,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Kepner, C. G. (1991) An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, pp. 305-313.

Leki, I. (1990a) Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. IN: B. Kroll (Ed.) *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-59) New York: Cambridge University Press

Leki. I (1990b) Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal, 3*, pp.5-19

The New London Group, (1996) A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies. *Harvard Educational Review, Volume 66 Number 1*

Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Nunan, D. (1999) *Second Language Teaching & Learning.* Boston, Heinle & Heinle Publishers

Richards, J. C. Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992) *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* Essex, Longman

Richards, J. C., & C. Lockhart (1996) *Reflexive Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Reid, J. (2001) Writng. IN: R. Carter & D. Nunan (Ed.) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Rohman, D. G., & A. O. Wlecke. (1964) Pre-Writing: The Construction and Application of Models for Concept Formation in Writing. *U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Cooperative Research Project No. 2174*. East Lansing: Michigan State U.

Rooks, G. M. (1999) *Share your Paragraph,* Essex, Longman

Seow, A. (2002) The Writing Process, and Process Writing. IN: J. C. Richards and W. A.Renendya. (Ed.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Silver, R. (1999) *Journeys Writing 3,* Essex, Longman

Singleton, J. (1998) *Writers at Work*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Swales, J.M. (1990) *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Tribble, C. (1996) *Writing*. Oxford, Oxford University Press

White, R, and V. Ardnt. (1991) *Process Writing*. London, Longman

Zamel, V. (1982) Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16 (2)*, pp. 495-9

Zamel, V. (1985) Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, pp. 79-102

Appendix of sampled student's work.

Appendix A : Jyoutaro I.

> **China***
>
> China has 1284530000 people. Most of them belong to the kan ethic group. So many kinds of languages are spoken in each area. The areas have unique religion characteristics. For example Bukkyo, Dokyo, and Jyukyo.
>
> <div align="right">--Jyotaro I.</div>
>
> **=Title was provided by the instructor.*

Appendix B: The Criterion Group

Criterion Group

It is difficult for me to desid this Essay Assignment"Experience or books".

But I think that Experience is good for me.

Because I can understand everthing.

But Reading Books is not always bad.

I'm thought a lot of things by Books.

It is fun for me to reading interesting books.However I would think reading books is borind, if I read long and bad story.

To chose books which give us something to study is difficult for us.

The other hand,Experience is that we can chose in everthing.

So I think that Experience is better than Books.

------ Saori A.

I think that experience is more important. Because books contains auhtor's opinion.To hear other's opinion is good.But it do not become my opinion.I have own opinion. We earn intelligence in books,but it does not all receive! International sociation now need to having own opinion and speaking it.I think that to have own opinion is not less than to hear other's opinion.

----Kohsuke M.

I think that knowledge gained from experience is more important than gained from books.I like book and I read many books .It has many informaition .I learn many things from it.

But I learned many things from experience more than books.

Why? Becouse it is more impressive from experience more than books. More remember from experience more than books.

And I do not mremember content of books about I read several years ago.But I do often remember about I do several years ago.

Japanise culture has " Seeing is beliving" What do you think? Please think about this topis!

---Takahisa S.

Appendix C: Ayami N.

China*

☆ China has a lot of people and it is the most population in the world.

☆ China was built in the first day of October in 1949.

☆ Chinese period changed many times.

☆ The chinese culture has very strong "political" color. That is because the goevernmer official has monopolized culture.

☆ chinese women's famous fashion is chinese dress.

☆ It is almost spoken chinese in china.

☆ Chinese religeon are Buddhism, Confusiamism and Taoism.

--Ayami N.

*=Title was provided by the instructor