Writing as a Process

Marva A. Barnett, University of Virginia

Traditional Approaches to Writing

Research on first and second language writing is documenting what we already know as teachers: students are frustrated by seeing compositions marked up, and they rarely incorporate all our suggestions or corrections even when we ask them to rewrite (or is it recopy?) their papers (Dvorak; Osterholm; Zamel 1985; Raimes 1983). No matter how we correct student work, succeeding compositions do not seem appreciably better. Meager results after so much time spent correcting frustrates us, too. Recent work on teacher approaches to both first and second language writing indicates that much of our shared disappointment and sense of futility may well result from our view of writing. This paper examines traditional teacher expectations of and reactions to writing, considers writing as the mental process it involves, and explores one method of getting out students involved in editing their own work, even as early as elementary and intermediate French courses. As used here, the terms "composition" and "writing" refer to written discourse intended for communication and to the diverse activities involved in putting thoughts on paper.

Writing as Product

As we know, most teachers faced with student writing reach for the red (or green or purple) pen and begin correcting errors in form: spelling, agreement, word order, verb endings, and so forth. Second language teachers seem to be even more prone to such corrections than first language teachers, perhaps because, as Zamel (1985:86) notes, we view ourselves as "language" rather than as "writing" teachers (although one may question why we cannot aspire to the latter). Even those teachers who have learned to allow students some spoken errors so as not to miss the intended meaning often cannot do the same with a written message (Chastain 1980:70). Perhaps, in correcting grammar, we are taking the easy way out. Consider the ease with which a fluent teacher can circle, underline, or correct surface-level errors in form compared to the expertise and discernment that a reader needs to counsel a writer about a confused presentation of ideas of a convoluted organization. But we look at what the student writer has produced and treat it as a final draft; it is, of course, only at this last stage that the mechanics of form and language usage must be polished. In writing this paper, for example, I did not worry about spelling or exact vocabulary until well into the rewriting phase. Yet do our students not hand in a "final" version of a composition, even though it is usually their first draft? Indeed, here we are beginning to turn in a vicious circle:

Each year the Northeast Conference awards the Stephen A. Freeman Award for the best published article on teaching techniques to have appeared in the previous calendar year. We are pleased to reprint, with permission, the 1991 award-winning article by Marva A. Barnett of the University of Virginia, that appeared in *The French Review*, 1989, Vol. 63, No. 1, 31-44.

students submit frankly unpolished papers which teachers treat as final products, encouraging them to offer similar work the next time and to focus most of their attention on surface-level fine tuning rather than on communicating a message coherently. It is possibly ironic that in emphasizing grammar we have perpetuated a system in which form seems to be all that matters. Teachers have written themselves out of the writing process by accepting these first-and-final drafts; students think of a paper turned in as a paper done, a paper needing no more attention from them. This mental attitude rarely changes even then we require "rewrites."

If all our efforts in fixing students' errors led to more nearly accurate compositions, current correction practices might make sense, even with frustration evident on the students' part. Research in both first and second language writing, however, generally show the contrary (Semke 200-201; Osterholm 137-38; Dvorak 151-52). Although Lalande's study in 1982 found that students' mechanical precision in writing German improved when their teachers coded errors for student correction and the students kept an ongoing list of their own errors, the fact that all composition writing and correcting took place in class time makes his model unattractive for many of us; it also colors his results. Neither did his experiment question affective factors: how students feel about writing or about the effect of considering content.

In a later study, Semke (1984) worked with students of German at the same level but used a different experimental design to examine four different approaches to correction: commenting on content rather than correcting; correcting all errors; combining comments and corrections; and coding errors for student correction. She found that only commenting without correction increased writing fluency and language proficiency. None of the methods had a significant impact on writing accuracy; the least effective method in terms of both achievement and attitude toward writing was student correction of errors. Moreover, in the results of a survey of student attitudes, most negative comments came from students who received some kind of correction; the students who received comments on the content and no corrections commented most positively. Other studies on both first and second language writing indicate, too, that many writers have a "task overload," that is, interference between what they are trying to say, how to say it, and the accuracy of the form (Dvorak 155). Zamel's (1983) study of six ESL students found that this interference especially inhibited

the least skilled writers. Logically, considering form and accuracy too soon obstructs the mental activity necessary to generate and communicate ideas. Writing follows a natural order: ideas demand a structure which must finally be polished. When teachers correct everything, students may be faced with too many changes to absorb and incorporate.

Given the lack of progress in student writing, we must look at how we respond to compositions. In her striking study of the responding styles of fifteen ESL teachers, Zamel (1985) surveyed teacher comments (referring to content) and corrections (noting errors in form) on 105 student compositions. She describes a distressing state of affairs:

> ESL writing teachers misread student texts, are inconsistent in their reactions, make arbitrary corrections, write contradictory comments, provide vague prescriptions, impose abstract rules and standards, respond to texts as fixed and final products, and rarely make content-specific comments or offer specific strategies for revising the text. (86)

If her summary seems too harsh, reflect on typical comments on French students' compositions: *pas clair! je ne comprends pas, révisez, phrase incomplète, Où est votre conclusion?* Such comments may hang in the margin without a clear referent. In addition, recommendations about sentence fragments or conclusions will not be understood unless students know what these terms mean (which often is manifestly not the case). Teachers can also be bound too tightly by their sense of having "covered" material the students "should" control; yet work on natural order in language acquisition (Krashen 1982) and the concepts of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines argue that explaining grammar points does not always lead to student ability to use them or to comprehension.

Not only vague suggestions but also the interplay of comments relating to grammar or vocabulary and those advising major structural or ideological changes too often confuse students. As Zamel (1985:93) points out, teachers frequently suggest both correction of local errors and significant revisions that would eliminate the need for the local correction. Here is an example from French:

If this student were to make the structural revisions suggested here (e.g., a rewrite of the second sentence), many of the stylistic and grammatical errors now present would disappear, giving opportunity, no doubt, for different ones. What then is the point of repairing what may well not appear in the final composition? How is the student to know which type of comments/corrections is more important? According to Cohen, who scrutinized student reactions to teacher correction of compositions, students are more interested in comments on content and organization, yet teachers are more concerned with accuracy and form (67). In fact, even those teachers who demand rewritten compositions seem content to see only the surface-level errors corrected. Zamel cites one teacher's reaction to a rewrite in which the student incorporated the teacher's grammatical corrections but ignored clear suggestions for development of one paragraph: "Good! Almost error-free! Very good in organization and development!" (1985: 93). How much of what we see in compositions is colored by what we want or expect to see?

Clearly, many teachers present students with a confusing response to their work. On one hand, we treat their writing as though it were in its final form; on the other, we make suggestions more appropriate to a rough draft. As evidenced by our corrections and comments, we are much more interested in grammar and spelling than in the message or in how communication is attempted, even though we assign topics designed to elicit analysis, interpretation, or self-expression. The irony is obvious: correction is pointless if not directed toward improvement, but the written product is usually seen as a *fait accompli*, with no direct sequel in which suggestions could be implemented and improvements measured.

Writing as Process

What happens if we look at each piece of writing as one version in a progression toward the expression of the student's ideas? To do so is to regard writing as an expression of the mental process it entails and as a means of communication. This view sees successful composition as an interaction between the writer, the text, and the

Par exemple, il y a toujours la menace des collisions des avions.

Je ne comprends pas très bien.

voc. voc.
Mais c'est difficile de croire que c'est possible qu'il pourrait te

temps ?
passer. Si j'apprendrais qu'il il y avait une collision de deux

avions à 500 kilomètres de chez moi qui venait de tuer 185 personnes.) *phrase incomplète*

Ces idées sont assez différentes. Pourquoi les mettre dans la même phrase?

temps voc
Cette collision m'aurait fait peur parce que c'était prêt de chez

familier voc
moi, mais principalement parce que ça me ferait douteuse de la

?
sécurité des avions et je pourrais voir les résultats, les cadavres,

le sang et tripes. *Que voulez-vous dire?*

reader (Osterholm 119). The reader/teacher thus becomes a facilitator rather than a judge, and the writer who cares to write better has as assistant in the demanding job of transferring ideas to paper to be interpreted by someone else. Looking at writing as a process also implies understanding writing as a series of drafts and considering the endeavor of writing in its entirety: prewriting, writing, and rewriting (Rohman).

At the prewriting stage, writers find ideas and begin to organize them. As we all know from our own writing, ideas generally do not go onto paper in a coherent or elegant fashion the first time we try to express them. As Flower and Hayes explain and model it, writing is a complex, recursive cognitive process. Three components interact with and influence each other constantly and intricately as one composes: the writer's long-term memory where knowledge of topic, audience, and writing plans are stored; the task environment, including the rhetorical problem and the text produced so far; and writing processes such as goal setting, organizing, reviewing, evaluating, and revising. A hierarchical network of goals created while people compose directs the writer through the process. Evidently, the writing process is quite cognitively complex as writers move their thoughts back and forth between components, always returning to and redefining their higher goals. Using more immediate terms, Cooper (113) notes these steps in the composing process: (1) prewriting gestation (from a few minutes to months or years); (2) planning the particular piece (with or without notes or outline); (3) getting the composition started; (4) making ongoing decisions about word choice, syntax, rhetorical style, and organization; (5) reviewing what has been written and anticipating and rehearsing what comes next; (6) tinkering and reformulating, (7) stopping; (8) contemplating the finished piece; (9) revising. Undoubtedly, this complex process must vary from one individual to another but, nevertheless, exists.

Most language teachers have not been trained to think of classroom composition in this light. Yet what do we really want to teach students: to get all the grammar and vocabulary right or to develop intellectually and refine their capabilities at the cognitive level? How we treat their written work defines in great measure what they will give us. Zamel (1985) urges setting priorities in our comments and suggestions for revision and encouraging our students to address meaning-level concerns before others (96). In fact, commenting on what a student is saying is interesting, challenging, and finally satisfying: .

Student Paragraph
Je crois que les journaux forment nos opinions. Ils voient les articles travers ses yeux. Pour exemple, si le papier est *le New York Times* il amie beaucoup les Mets. Beaucoup de journaux sont partials.

Teacher Comments
L'exemple de la partialité est bon. Mais pouvez-vous préciser le rapport entre la partialité et nos opinions?

The writing process approach suggested here does fit into a busy schedule.

We should strengthen students' compositions skills, as English departments attempt to do, as Gaudiani (1979: 232) suggested nearly a decade ago, and as Magnan (118-19) reiterates. Some researchers have begun to explore the differences between the writing processes of skilled and unskilled writers. Krashen (1984) cites studies showing that good first and second language writers do more planning, rescanning, and revising than do poor writers. In Zamel's (1983) study, better second language writers treated writing as a process, investigating and explaining their ideas before worrying about grammatical accuracy; the less skilled writers were overly concerned about following an outline and about having correct grammar and vocabulary from the beginning. How can we encourage our students to act like skilled writers?

We need to begin teaching writing early; learning how to write takes time, whether in a first or second language. Yet how can we include writing as a process in a four-skills course at the elementary or intermediate level where we are more or less equally committed to teaching speaking, listening, reading, writing, and culture and when many of us had no training in teaching writing (Magnan 132-33)? The writing-process approach suggested here does fit into such a busy schedule: it assigns the responsibility for a coherent composition to the students, does not demand class time as does peer editing, and requires no more grading time than a traditional grammar-correction method, even as it stressed the meaning expressed in their writing.[1] With this technique, students are more likely to follow an effective composing sequence such as that offered by Cooper, learning to analyze, organize, and focus their thoughts.

Prewriting activities help students start their papers: they involve students with a composition topic, let them realize what might be included in their papers, help them work out rhetorical problems, or review or provide useful vocabulary. Rohman views prewriting as an invention device and argues that students must learn the "structures of thinking that lead to writing" (107). Chastain (1988: 254) emphasizes the importance of prewriting activities in motivating students to write. The popular first language prewriting techniques noted by Osterholm (132) are equally viable for second language writers: journal writing, meditating, analogy making, and freewriting (brainstorming on paper). Staton explains a more precise use of journals for meaningful dialogue between students and teachers. Magnan (125-27) relates her recommendations to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and proposes using tasks associated with lower proficiency levels as excellent prewriting steps for tasks at the next higher level; for example, students list objects in their rooms (novice-level) to prepare to describe their rooms (intermediate level). Herman suggests using French literary texts accessible to advanced students as a skeletal model

for their own compositions, the passage retold from a different narrator's point of view. This notion of writing as influenced by quality reading parallels Krashen's (1984) belief, based mostly on first language data, that competent writing can be attained through extensive reading accompanied by writing.

Once the composition topic and/or organization has been introduced, the students begin writing their first drafts. In both my intensive and regular intermediate-level university courses, this draft-writing process follows a procedure explained on the direction sheet "Comment écrire une composition" (reproduced in Appendix A). This sheet summarizes the necessary thinking and writing process and suggests how to organize ideas and present a paper in final form.[2] The directions given here are specifically for students writing in response to reading they have done; they can easily be modified to lead into other types of compositions. They might also be offered in English to elementary French students. The teacher needs relatively little class time to discuss these instructions and explain, for instance, the importance of accepting a less-than-perfect formulation of an idea or phrase in order to get on with the composing process (section I, part 5), what Flower calls "satisficing." As Chastain (1988) and Butler carefully point out, improving students' attitudes toward writing is vitally important. Although students may show some initial surprise and hesitation at this new approach to the old horror of writing, the teacher's supportive comments on their papers can eventually change their perceptions.

Research shows that better writers believe that writing drafts is important (Dvorak 151-52). This self-editing approach requires all students to write a first draft, which should be revised into a better, but not perfect, composition before the teacher sees it. Experience with this system has shown, not surprisingly, that many students at first submit as their second versions little more than recopied rough drafts, whether because of previous training, laziness or misunderstanding. Still, the vigilant teacher can prevent some of this mere duplication by defining just what is involved in the revising, re-editing, and rewriting explained in section I, part 7; or by distributing a good example of student writing in the first and second draft form; or by emphasizing that recopied first drafts will not be accepted as second drafts.

How you use "Comment écrire une composition" depends both on teacher objectives and on students' needs and motivations. In Intensive Intermediate French, where the students are relatively advanced and motivated, the sheet as it appears in Figure 2 is effective. Students make notes and write both drafts before submitting their work to the teacher. The teacher then has the option of grading the second draft (noting improvements from the first version) or of offering suggestions and requiring another draft. In either case, teacher comments are text-specific, taking into account the writer's intent and audience (Zamel 1985: 95). Normally, what these students submit is better for their having gone through the first draft stage.

In a standard elementary or intermediate course (college first and second years or high school first through

---

Many compositions are actually fun to read, especially when we learn to ignore for a while some details of form.

---

third years), it is useful to collect students' notes and first drafts for comments and recommendations before students write second drafts. In this way, the teacher can help each student with the revising process and can indicate more clearly how a second draft should differ from the first. In making these first draft comments, I concentrate on what the student is trying to say, respond positively wherever possible, note confusing segments, and suggest improvements; recurrent grammar or vocabulary problems are simply noted as general (see sample in Appendix B). Correcting or marking all form errors at this point takes too long, discourages students who were trying to say something, and encourages others to depend on teacher correction rather than taking responsibility for accuracy. Indicating the existence of major errors reminds students that form matters in the final draft. On the other hand, some teachers may prefer to ignore the errors in form at this stage, leading students to confine work on this aspect of writing to their final draft. This method of checking the first draft takes from five to eight minutes per paper; for 25 one-page compositions, between two and three hours, less than the time needed to mark all grammar errors. Moreover, the teacher learns more about the students' ideas and helps them develop organizational and analytical skills.

As can be seen on the college-level intermediate French sample in Appendix B, the majority of the teacher's comments pertain to content and organization. Positive comments are indispensable; comments on problem areas must point toward possible solutions. Students who have questions or difficulties responding to comments should be able to discuss these with the teacher. Of course, many students have little experience writing and revising and will not manage to incorporate effectively all the teacher's suggestions. The teacher grades according to the quality of the changes made and the new draft in general. The second draft submitted by our sample student appears in Appendix C. Clearly, this student has attempted to apply teacher suggestions, and she has produced an improved draft, both in content and form. Yet she has not restructured her paper, again presenting two paragraphs with two separate, although related, ideas. As we know from our own writing, second drafts are often not final drafts. In a writing course, having this student submit a third draft might be useful; in a four-skills course, evaluating this second draft, noting improvements and remaining problems, allows class time for work on speaking, listening and, reading.

The need to grade the last draft presents some difficulties. For details about different types of composition grading, see Chastain (1978, 1988), Gaudiani (1981),

---

Hendrickson, Lalande, Omaggio (236-69, 298-304), Perkins, and Semke. Since the process approach presented here stresses writing as communication, we must at least rate our students on how clearly and coherently they communicated; hence, as noted on the direction sheet, the grade is based on both *fond* and *forme*, with the grades finally being averaged. Or a holistic grade, integrating both content and form, is possible. In either case, I believe one of the most useful and intelligent responses to form is that proposed by Chastain (1980: 71-74). He suggests that the instructor underline all errors (thus pointing them out to the students who want complete feedback) and select two or three to be eliminated in future compositions (see sample in Appendix C). For those, the instructor, on a separate sheet, (1) labels the grammatical structure involved, (2) copies the student's incorrect version, (3) provides the correct version, and (4) underlines both the error and correction. Students are encouraged to ask if they still fail to comprehend. Students turn in the error sheets with succeeding compositions; repeated errors are doubly penalized. Finally, I believe it fair to offer students structural and stylistic corrections when they have tried to go beyond their current level of grammar control (e.g., "qui paraissent" in Appendix C).

Advantages

Both teacher and students profit from treating writing as a mental process and a means of communication. When students realize that teachers read their writing to understand what they are trying to say rather than to judge their grammar and usage, they write more interesting compositions. They are also willing to write more, which is perhaps the best way to refine one's writing; and they eventually take more care with what they write because it means more to them. "Positive comments bring about more positive attitudes toward writing" (Osterholm 137). Student effort does repay teacher effort. Many compositions are actually fun to read, especially when we learn to ignore for a while some details of form. My own experience indicates that less correction of grammatical errors, together with honest attention to content, can sometimes reduce — and seldom promotes — grammatical mistakes in future compositions. Teacher grading time can be reduced in length and enhanced in quality.

On the affective level, teachers find reacting to writing as a process remarkably gratifying because most of their suggestions are directed toward students' intellectual development. Of course, students benefit immensely: working on their writing ability in a second as well as a first language can only improve their general cognitive skills of reasoning and logical thinking. Magnan (118-19) has already noted the importance of teaching analytical and composition skills in the return-to-basics movement in education. Finally, if we think selfishly for a moment, we see that teacher will be rewarded in having students who can think more clearly and express those thoughts more intelligibly. In the long run, we should produce better language majors; furthermore, we can influence most significantly all those citizens and voters who leave foreign language study, and who, though they may never write again in French after leaving our classrooms, must use the critical thinking skills our work with writing has given them.

Appendix A
Comment écrire une composition
I. *Façon de travailler*
1) Lisez et étudiez les textes nécessaires.
2) Etudiez les principes présentés ci-dessous (dans les sections II, III, IV).
3) Prenez des notes sur vos idées.
4) Organisez vos notes d'une façon claire et logique.
5) Ecrivez la première ébauche au moins 4 jours avant la date finale.
 —Suivez vos notes.
 —Ne vous arrêtez ni pour chercher un mot que vous ne savez pas ni pour corriger la grammaire. Vous ferez ce travail au moment de la révision.
 —Indiquez par ? vos questions au sujet de la grammaire ou du vocabulaire.
 —Ensuite, révisez ce que vous avez écrit.
  Rendez vos idées les plus claires possible.
  Vérifiez que l'organisation est logique.
  Cherchez les mots que vous ne saviez pas.
  Corrigez les fautes de grammaire que vous trouvez.
 —Pour utiliser un dictionnaire:
  Pour chaque mot que vous cherchez dans un dictionnaire, consultez le dictionnaire des deux côtés, c'est-à-dire, cherchez le mot dans la section anglais/français et vérifiez-le dans la section français/anglais. La signification des mots dépend très souvent du contexte où vous les employez.
6) Laissez cette ébauche pendant un ou deux jours.
7) Révisez, rédigez, et récrivez la deuxième ébauche. Faites attention à:
 —la logique des idées et de l'organisation;
 —la clarté de la présentation;
 —la précision de la grammaire et du vocabulaire.
8) Tapez à la machine la forme finale; attention à la présentation (voyez ci-dessous section IV).
II. *Idées: Prenez des notes:*
  des idées principales;
  des idées subordonnées;
  des exemples, de la pensée de l'auteur ou de votre propre logique.
III. *Organization: N'oubliez pas d'organiser votre composition avec:*
1) Une introduction
 —Identifiez le texte (et l'auteur) au sujet duquel vous écrivez.
 —Donnez un résumé de vos arguments nécessaires.
2) Un développement de vos idées
 —Mettez les idées différentes dans des paragraphes différents.
 —Identifiez chaque idée d'une façon claire.
 —Donnez tous les exemples et les arguments nécessaires.
3) Une conclusion
 —Donnez la conclusion que vous avez trouvée *après* avoir raisonné à travers le développement.
 —La conclusion *n'est pas* une répétition des idées de l'introduction.
4) Un titre
 —Choisessez un titre clair.
 —Choisessez un titre que indique un peu la direction de la composition.
IV. *Présentation: Considérez ces détails:*
1) Si vous citez les mots de l'auteur, il faut les mettre ente guillemets (< ... >) et noter la page où on les trouve (p. 000).
2) Marges d'au moins 1" de tous les côtés.
3) Composition tapée à la machine ou à l'ordinateur, toutes les deux lignes.
4) Rendez la copie originale.
5) Attention à l'orthographe, aux accents, à la ponctuation.
V. *A Rendre:*
1) les notes que nous avez prises
2) la première ébauche
3) la deuxième ébauche
VI. *La note dépendra:*
1) des idées et de l'organisation: 50%
2) de la précision de la grammaire, du vocabulaire, de l'orthographe, de la ponctuation, de la présentation: 50%

Appendix B
Sample Student First Draft with Teacher Comments

Pourquoi formidable?

La Presse Libre et Formidable ←

Très clair! / Aujourd'hui, la presse libre est important aux Etats-Unis et en France parce que ce donne les gens une occasion pour exprimer leurs opinions. Dans une démocratie, il faut donner une voix à

qui?

ATTN aux formes des mots: à + les = ? etc. les gens, et ils ont besoin de les faits et les opinions d'autres. *Oui, d'accord.* Si la presse n'était pas libre, les gens devraient croire les faits et les opinions du gouvernement. Ainsi, un peu de gens pourrait contrôler beaucoup de gens, et ce ne serait pas une démocratie.

A quelle sorte de protection faites-vous référence?

C'est une bonne transition, mais c'est une nouvelle idée. Révisez l'introduction et mettez-y cette idée. Dans une démocratie, les gens doivent avoir la protection aussi. Il faut avoir les limitations avec la presse. La presse *ceux (Ch. 8)* ne peut pas exprimer les faits faux, spécialement ~~les~~ qui peuvent endommager quelqu'un. Ce n'est pas une probleme avec les journaux *Quel autre problème? Voudriez-vous dire que c'est un problème avec les journaux moins* respectables, mais c'est une autre probleme. Les journaux forment *respectables?*

ATTN au genre et aux accords souvent les opinions, et les gens oublient que toutes les opinions ne sont pas toujours représenté. Les gens doivent lire les journaux avec objectivite et décider quelle position qu'ils vont prendre.

Oui, je comprends.

Alors, quel est votre argument principal? Mettez-le dans votre conclusion, avec un résumé de vos arguments.

Cohen, Andrew D. "Student Processing of Feedback on Their Compositions." *Learner Strategies in Language Learning.* Ed. Anita Wenden and Joan Rubin. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice/Hall International, 1987, 57-68.

Cooper, Charles R. "Measuring Growth in Writing." *English Journal* 64, 3(1975): 111-20.

Dvorak, Trisha. "Writing in the Foreign Language." *Listening, Reading and Writing: Analysis and Application.* Ed. Barbara H. Wing. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference, 1986, 145-67.

Flower, Linda. *Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing.* 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985.

_____ and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 32 (1981): 365-87.

Gaudiani, Claire. "French Composition Teaching: A Student Generated Text Editing Approach." *French Review* 53 (1979): 232-38.

_____. *Teaching Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum.* Vol. 43 in *Language in Education: Theory and Practice.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981.

Hendrickson, James M. "The Treatment of Error in Written Work." *Modern Language Journal* 64(1980): 216-21.

Herman, Gerald. "How to Make (French) Composition Challenging and Productive," *The French Review* 60 (1986): 56-64.

Krashen, Stephen. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

_____. *Writing: Research, Theory and Applications.* Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English, 1984.

Lalande, John F. "Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment." *Modern Language Journal* 66 (1982): 140-49.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Teaching and Testing Proficiency in Writing Skills to Transcend the Second-Language Classroom." *Proficiency, Curriculum, Articulation: The Ties That Bind.* Ed. Alice C. Omaggio. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference, 1985, 109-36.

Omaggio, Alice C. *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1986.

Osterholm, Katherine K. "Writing in the Native Language." *Listening, Reading and Writing: Analysis and Application.* Ed. Barbara H. Wing. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference, 1986. 117-43.

Perkins, Kyle. "On the Use of Composition Scoring Techniques, Objective Measures, and Objective Tests to Evaluate ESL Writing Ability." *TESOL Quarterly* 17 (1983): 651-71.

Raimes, Ann. *Techniques in Teaching Writing.* New York: Oxford, 1983.

Rohman, G. "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process." *College Composition and Communication* 16 (1965): 106-12.

Semke, Harriet D. "Effects of the Red Pen." *Foreign Language Annals* 17 (1984): 195-202.

Staton, Jana. "Dialogue Journals: A New Tool for Teaching." *ERIC CLL News Bulletin* 6, 2 (1983).

Zamel, Vivian. "The Composing Processes of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies." *TESOL Quarterly* 17 (1983).

_____. "Responding to Student Writing." *TESOL Quarterly* 19 (1985): 79-101.