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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Problem Background: The Dynamics of Writing Instruction

At the center of the so-called crisis in education is the English teacher, a language arts specialist charged with teaching the skills crucial for academic success. No language arts skill has received more attention in recent years than writing. As SAT and ACT verbal scores declined and remedial writing courses proliferated on college campuses, national attention began to focus on the writing teacher teaching writing, or not teaching it, as many critics claimed. A 1979 National Assessment of Education Progress report provided one explanation for the literacy decline: writing is not extensively taught in American schools. Of the 25,000 seventeen-year-olds surveyed, only 7% appeared to be receiving comprehensive writing training (NAEP, 1975). Other important national studies reaffirm the NAEP report. For example, the National Study of Secondary Writing found that only 3% of a student’s time is devoted to "extended writing" (Applebee, 1980).

More recently, The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education similarly recognized the problem and suggested a remedy for it. The commission recommended that all students should write well-organized, effective papers and that four years of English should be
required (1983). Many scholars, classroom teachers, and informed critics cannot agree on the instructional strategy required for students to write "well-organized, effective papers." There is, however, agreement on strategies that fail. Graves concluded that writing instruction fails because conditions are not created to give students a purpose to write (1978-1979). As a result, students too often write only to a "teacher audience" (Britton, 1974). Thus, the composing process, for the student, becomes artificial and unnatural (Bartlett, 1979). This artificiality can be lessened if teachers are able to create conditions intentionally designed to enhance the composing process: identifying an audience, providing feedback, encouraging self-generated topics, and providing interactional support (Mehan, 1979). Hillocks reviewed every experimental study produced between 1963 and 1982 and then outlined "what works in teaching composition" and what fails. His findings indicated "that the dimensions of effective instruction are quite different from what is commonly practiced in schools and colleges" (Hillocks, 1984).

During the past twenty years, the literacy "crisis" has refocused attention, and research, on the teaching of composition. This research has centered on the writing process of the written text. The process research has emphasized the writer while the product or textual research has excluded the writer and writing context to focus only on the final written product. Currently, the research methodology is generating as much attention, and controversy, as the research itself. On the one side are the scholars who attack the "positivist" approach (Emig, 1982; Graves, 1980) which dehumanizes and decontextualizes the writing
experience. On the other side are those who "would learn about the writing and the writer through scrutiny of textual features, often focusing on syntax, diction, punctuation, and other scribal or grammatical matters as indicators of fluency and proficiency (White, 1985, pp. 172-173). Both of these research ideologies provide useful information for classroom teachers. Yet neither perspective integrates the important components of the classroom writing experience: the student, the composing process, and the teacher's mode and content of instruction.

In his exhaustive meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies, Hillocks recognizes "the current disdain for experimental studies" but, nonetheless, uses 500 of them in his review of composition research from 1963-1982 (1984). He does however recognize, as other experimental researchers have not, that the classroom writing experience is considerably influenced by mode of instruction and that this mode can significantly affect writing performance (Hillocks, 1984). More importantly, a mode of instruction must be inserted into a context where students execute a successful composing strategy. White suggests that "studying writing in its context provides insight for writing teachers that could not have emerged from more traditional procedures" (1985, p. 183). These "insights for writing teachers" should derive from both teachers and students in a context that Christopher describes as "the actual writing situation in our schools" (1981, p. 228).
Background: The Columbus Public Schools-Ohio State University Writing Program

On May 14, 1982, The Ohio State University in cooperation with the Columbus Public Schools initiated a pilot project that would serve as a composition outreach program. This cooperative effort was originally labelled "The Ohio Writing Program" but evolved into the "Early English Placement Project" and contributed to a mastery education program in the high schools and became early placement indicator, the Early English Composition Assessment Program (EECAP). The participants in this project were approximately 4000 tenth grade students in sixteen high schools in Columbus, the entire sophomore population of the Columbus Public Schools.

The original 1982 study had three specific purposes: 1) to serve as the basis for determining the general writing competence in each tested school population; 2) to serve as a guide to high school English teachers in evaluating their curricula and pedagogy; 3) to become the basis for more refined testing through which high school juniors could be advised individually of their writing deficiencies and the specific improvement required to bring their writing to a level necessary for direct entrance into college work. The principal university investigators were Sara S. Games, Associate Professor, English; Frank O'Hare, Professor, English; E. Garrison Walters, Assistant Dean, College of Humanities; Frank Zidonis, Professor, Humanities Education (Appendix A).

In the summer of 1982, Professor Frank O'Hare led a "writing institute" composed of twenty Columbus Public Schools teachers. The purpose of this institute was to focus on the personal writing skills of the teachers since evidence suggests that teachers who practice their own skills become better writing teachers (Hagaman, 1978; Soulen, 1980).
In Autumn 1982 these same twenty teachers participated in an evening course designed to reinforce during the school year the skills developed in the summer, to train the participants as "colleague consultants," and to train them in the theory and practice of evaluation, especially in holistic scoring. After the autumn training, the teachers completed evaluating the essays of the Columbus sophomores. The results of their efforts were distributed to the cooperating schools and the participating students in spring, 1983 (Appendix B).

During the 1983-84 school year, the sample population was again tested to establish results for the same class as eleventh graders and during the 1984-85 schools year as twelfth graders. Data from all three of these samples have been assembled and include the essay scores for each participating student (Appendix C), the mean for each teacher and class and the ranked scores, from high to low, of the sixteen high schools who participated in the program.

Statement of the Problem

At the conclusion of the 1984-85 school year, one entire graduating class in the Columbus Public Schools had written scored essays as tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students. These essay scores represent potentially valuable data in tracing the writing development of a high school student. In addition, the data could be extremely useful for those interested in writing pedagogy. If these data are to be useful, however, the composing processes should be identified that produced high performance essays.

Furthermore, if high rated essays are clustered in particular classrooms, an examination of content and mode of instruction for those
high performance classes could be beneficial. The three years of data provide unlimited comparison possibilities. For the purpose of this study, scores from the 1983-84 school year were used to identify high performance writers. These writers were selected from two classes whose mean ranked in the top five of the 201 participating class groups. The two selected classes ranked one and five. In other words, of all the class groups tested these two classes had two of the lowest mean scores because of the clustering of high performance writers in them and both classes were within the top 2.5% of all tested writing groups for 1983-84. Since the tested groups greatly varied in size, a class was defined as a group whose student population included no less than ten scored essays.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to identify the composing processes most frequently applied by high performance writers and to determine the content and mode of instruction presented to them in their high performance class groups. Too often, research studies, especially experimental ones, distort the dynamicism of the writing experience by isolating only one of its components. This isolation may yield useful information, but it does not provide the synthesis and integration that constitute the total writing experience. The instructional mode is, for example, important to both the total writing experience and environment. The limitations of this "reductionist" approach are recognized by Clark and Folio (1978) who have emphasized that the real experience of teachers and students are too often omitted from studies of writing and its pedagogy.

Additional questions suggested by the main problem include these:
1. To what extent do high performance writers describe their composing processes similarly?

2. To what extent do high performance writers describe similarly the content and mode of instruction of their eleventh grade high performance class teacher?

3. To what extent do teachers of high performance writers describe the content and mode of their instruction similarly?

4. Do the teachers of high performance writers apply in practice the content and mode of instruction which they describe?

This study focuses on teachers and students engaged in the process of writing. More importantly, this engagement occurs in a writing environment which has produced significant clusters of high performance writers. Teacher engagement is frequently omitted from an examination of writing performance and the process which created that performance. A young writer may create a piece of writing by applying an eclectic, certainly recursive process, possibly the sum total of cumulative instructional strategies. On the other hand, a student may adjust the writing process to apply a strategy suggested by a current teacher as Pianko discovered when students completed assignments to "give the teacher what they (sic) want" (1979, pp. 917-18).

It is clear that the roles and goals of student writers and their teachers may not always coincide. In fact, Christopher discovered marked differences between high school teachers and students perceptions of the writing process and what it produced: teachers felt trapped by
the "system" and that they had no control of student writing (1981). Payne, who explored traditional and interactional teachers, found a similar feeling of entrapment, especially among the traditional methodologists.

Typically, they would endorse old-fashion tactics and then agree that those methods do not work very well. In marginal notes these people were much inclined to blame their students' lack of ability on motivation rather than worn out, inappropriate strategies and attitudes they believe should still be employed (1982).

Payne characterizes the teachers whom she studied as "traditional" and "interactional," labels describing theoretical perspectives which seem to dominate among writing teachers. These same perspectives have been also described as "current-traditional" (Fogarty, 1959) and interactionist (Elsasser and John Steiner, 1977). Regardless of the terminology, a perspective links to a mode of instruction and may influence its outcome. Recently, Hillocks has defined these "modes of instruction" to include "the configuration of variables characteristic of certain teacher/classroom relationships and activities, particularly the role played by the teacher and the kinds of activities in which students engage" (Hillocks, 1984). Hillocks refines the instructional modes to include presentational, natural process, environmental, and individualized (1981, 1984).
Content of Instruction: What We Teach

The content of instruction should be differentiated from its mode. Mode of instruction refers to the variables that define "teacher/classroom relationships and activities," and the "activities in which students engage" within the classroom context (Hillocks, 1984).

Content refers to the substantive information presented within the execution of a particular teaching mode. Teachers may, for example, elect to present only grammar lessons even though these lessons could be executed through a natural, rather than presentational, mode. Thus, the information delivered to students may or may not be valuable in effecting high performance writing. Teachers may also encourage students to connect with the stages of their composing processes (conception, incubation, and production) or may emphasize one stage of that process more than another one. The content of instruction may be balanced among the composing process stages or imbalanced to emphasize one at the expense of the other. An illustration would be those teachers who are criticized for teaching primarily the conventions of standard edited English without instructing students on pre-writing or editing strategies. As a result the conventions would dominate as the content of instruction.

Berthoff describes content of instruction as "what we teach." This important "what" is determined by a view of learning, previous learning experience, and philosophy of language. In Berthoff's description

What we teach when we teach composition will depend on our views of the nature of learning and language.

If we think of learning as a matter of digesting information, then teaching composition will be
simply a matter of assigning topics and correcting the resulting work (1981, p. 19).

The content of instruction is, therefore, powerfully influenced by a teacher's philosophical grounding. Brannon and Knoblauch assert that currently a confusion exists because of the "philosophical uncertainty" of writing instruction (p. 17). They also recognize how philosophy governs classroom content and what it can mean to the writing teacher. . . . It means being aware of what one is doing and why. It includes having an exploratory and reflective attitude toward ideas, issues, and questions pertinent to how people write and how they develop as writers. It means teaching from sound conceptual premises that are understood, consciously sustained, and continually modified in light of new knowledge about composing and accumulated experience in the classroom (1984, p. 2).

"What we know" translates into "what we do." As Britton suggests, "What we do in any situation, then, is done in the light of what we make: and the representation is made in the light of what we perceive and what we know" (Britton, 1969). It is the "knowing" knowledge which molds content and mode of instruction. Bringing the "knowing and doing" together completes the teaching act. This same process underscores classroom research. As Britton asserts, Research findings are things we can know which could have a bearing on what we do when we teach. And 'development' should be the name we give to
the process of bringing this kind of knowing into relationship with this kind of doing (1969, p. 150).

If "what we know" is a theoretical perspective which shapes content then "what we do," or "doing," is mode of instruction. Ideally, the informational content and mode of instruction integrate to develop a productive and ultimately superior writing environment. To separate the teacher from the student, to look at one without the other, to dislodge either or both from the writing experience is to understand only partially the classroom writing experience. Thus, the goal of this study is to better understand the content and mode of instruction that creates a successful partnership between the teacher and student writer.

Irmscher emphasizes the importance of this relationship:

The question is not to determine who is ideal and who is not, but to identify the qualities that good teachers seem to share, attitudes that made a difference to students, and attributes that gives the relationship between teacher and student a working chance (1979, p. 49).

Mode of Instruction

Although teaching models have a variety of labels the ones most frequently applied to composition instruction include current-traditional and interactionist. A current-traditional teacher emphasizes the writing product while the interactionist focuses on its process. Kroll has refined and expanded these labels to reflect developmental perspectives: interventionist, maturationist, interactionist. The interventionist
is discipline and text-centered, the perspective most frequently criticized by Emig, Flowers and Hayes and a growing number of writing teachers. The maturationist is student centered and applies a process pedagogy. The interactionist creates a synthesis by combining both the interventionist and maturationist roles (Kroll, 1980).

It is important to emphasize that "what we know" directs "what we do." Thus, an interactionist would, for example, know about theories implicit in the works of L. S. Vygotsky, especially Thought and Language (1962) and Mind in Society (1978). These works describe language development in terms of human activity and social intercourse and the "complex social activity" which writing reflects (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 118). The maturationist focus is more on the person and much less on "what teachers do." "The pedagogical emphases are on the student and on self-actualization, the full, healthy functioning of the student in relation to present circumstances" (Kroll, 1980, p. 745). The interventionist mode is much more prescriptive. "... education is a process of transmitting fundamental knowledge and skills" (Kroll, 1980, p. 742). Usage, methods of development, sentence structure and all the written conventions become educationally essential to the interventionist.

In his previous study, Hillocks defined mode of instruction as "clusters of instructional features including stated attitudes, selection and organization of materials, kinds of materials, discussion patterns, and seating arrangements (p. 376). In his 1984 study, he defines mode by referring to the "configuration of variables characteristic of certain teacher/classroom relationships and activities (p. 141). Hillocks reviewed sixty studies and classified the teaching modes in
each. He characterized the primary modes for this classification as presentational, natural process, and environmental. For natural process, "Treatments in this mode provide a low level of structure and are non-directional about the qualities of good writing" (p. 143). A maturationalist would follow the "natural process." The environmental mode is more structured than natural process and "makes objectives clear by engaging students in their pursuit through structured tasks" (p. 144). An interactionalist would follow this mode. The interventionist would adhere to the most structured of these instructional strategies, the presentational. Hillocks describes this as the most common teaching mode of composition instruction in secondary schools and colleges. It "emphasizes the role of teacher as presenter of knowledge about writing" (p. 145). In this mode, students learn specific concepts and skills deemed important by the teacher who presents the material in a lecture form.

For the purpose of improved classroom writing instruction, the combination of mode and content become critical for effective instruction. Although modes of instruction was one of only three dimensions of the Hillocks study, it surely was the most important. The Hillocks study discovered that "While the differences among the presentational, natural process, and individualized modes are not significant, the environmental gain is three times the gain for the others. . . ." (p. 149). Mode of instruction is at the core of the research problem especially as it relates to high performance high school writers. What we know is what we do although they may not always be the same. Paradoxically, a
maturationist could lecture about the composing process while at the same time demonstrating the presentational mode.

Methodology

In her study of the writing processes of twelfth graders, Emig states that there are five sources of information that can describe the factors that influence a student's writing process: student statement, student practice, teacher observation, teacher written evaluation of former pieces, student descriptions of composition teaching (1971). These multiple meanings and realities require multiple data-gathering devices. This study, therefore, combined a quantitative and qualitative approach to data gathering. The quantitative data were derived from the student essay scores and class means. The qualitative data include the observation and interviews in the school setting. First, the high performance classes were identified from the mean class scores established in the 1983-84 testing of all eleventh graders in the Columbus Public Schools. Within the two high performance classes, students were identified as high performance writers when they received a 1 or 2 on their holistically scored essay.

Once identified by this quantitative methodology, the classes, teachers, and students became the qualitative source of information. Student and teacher interviews and multiple observations provided the primary data for this descriptive analysis. In addition, content analysis of documents supplied by two high performance class teachers contributed to the data. Guba and Lincoln define a document "as any written material other than a record that was not prepared specifically in response to some request from the investigator" (p. 228).
As Williamson, et al., suggest, documents can provide specialized information for investigators. Guba and Lincoln summarize their discussions in this way:

... they sometimes want to make inferences about the values, sentiments, intentions, beliefs, or ideologies of the sources of authors of the documents; they sometimes want to make inferences about group or societal values; and they sometimes want to evaluate the effects of communications on the audiences that they reach (1982, p. 237).

The documents analyzed in this study included informational handouts, class assignments, course evaluations, and evaluated student essays (Appendices L-R).

Limitations are inherent in these research tools, especially the interviews and observations. Ary, et al., list the limitations as "complexity of subject matter, difficulties in observation, difficulties in replication, interaction of observer and subjects, difficulties in control, and problems of measurement" (1972, pp. 18-20). The imperfections of interviews and observations as research tools do not eliminate their value as a data source. If educators are to better understand student writing processes and the pedagogy which may influence those processes, then descriptive data are fundamental for the problem inquiry.

In a study by Stallard of the writing behavior of good student writers, similar data gathering techniques were used. Stallard's techniques included direct observation, interviews, and an analysis of respondent writing (1974).
Description of the Research Setting

The two teachers selected for this study taught at the same urban high school in north Columbus during the 1983-84 school year. They were selected for two reasons. First, and most important, both teachers taught an eleventh grade class in 1982-83 which included clusters of high performance writers and ranked in the top 2.5% of all classes tested. Second, since the teachers were at the same school, travel time was decreased and convenience and effectiveness increased for the researcher. The two teachers, Fran Spratley and Kevin Stotts, were experienced teachers who had an active and enthusiastic interest in effective writing instruction. Since the study was conducted over a four month period, its intensity and longevity was enhanced by this kind of interest and enthusiasm.

During the four month period of prolonged observation, Kevin taught an Intermediate Composition course which is described in the course scheduling booklet:

Using the writing process, students will produce polished final drafts using various essay forms. Students will keep a journal, read and respond to literature, write literary analyses, and evaluate their peers' writing as well as their own (1983).

In addition, Kevin taught an AP Language and Literature course. The Intermediate composition course was the primary setting for classroom observations.

During this same period, Fran taught two courses: Mythology Survey and Independent Study. Although neither of these courses were
designed exclusively for composition instruction, both courses embedded an important writing component in the course content. The Mythology survey course was the primary observation setting in Fran's class. The course scheduling booklet described this course as

... a survey course designed to cover classical Greek and Roman myths. Main themes within the myths will be discussed as well as how these influence modern thought and writing. Myths from various cultures will be integrated for thematic comparison to Greek and Roman myths.

The observations were made weekly in one and sometimes two different classes for each teacher. Before, after or between classes, teachers and high performance writers were extensively interviewed. Kevin's Intermediate Composition class was conducted from 1:13-1:56 in room 114. Sixteen students were enrolled in the class. Fran taught her Mythology survey course from 2:01-2:44 in room 206. Twenty-one students were in the class.

The high school where Fran and Kevin teach has a diverse, racially and ethnically mixed student population of approximately 500 students. The school's student population is drawn from a variety of different socio-economic levels throughout Columbus. Of the sixteen high schools participating in the Columbus Public School/Ohio State University writing program, this high school had the highest performance for all students tested throughout the school system. In other words, this school was the larger context for more high performance writers than any other high
school in the Columbus system. The entire English program is taught by five teachers, two of whom are Kevin and Fran.

Four programs constitute the school's curriculum: Academic, Business Education, The Arts, and Practical Education. Upon completion of requirements, students at the school receive either a diploma of graduation, the basic diploma for the Columbus Public Schools which is the one awarded to a majority of graduates or the Diploma of Graduation with Distinction which requires at least 19 units of credit and a B average. By most high schools' standards, this one is unusual because of the large number of independent study programs, the small student population, and an innovative curriculum which includes a community work program for all students in grades 10-12. An extensive Advanced Placement program is also offered in the major academic areas.

An Overview: Content and Format of Study

In Chapter II, I will examine the literature related to writing instruction. This literature begins with the composing process studies in the early seventies and extends into the eighties as the research increased and became more sophisticated especially with the work of Flower and Hayes and others. The research was divided into two parts: the composing process and the teacher and the composing process. The teacher-process literature will especially focus on the content and mode of instruction.

In Chapter III, the research design and rationale for the selected research methodology are reviewed. Procedures used to collect data will be described in detail. This chapter outlines the evolution of holistic evaluation from an infrequently used assessment instrument to a widely
used evaluation and research tool. Chapter IV presents the results of the investigation and will include relevant quantitative data that was accumulated during the three separate writing tests for the sixteen high performance writers. The results will also include descriptive data intended to provide useful insights about the relationship between mode and content of instruction and high performance writing. A content analysis of pertinent documents will reinforce these data. The final chapter will highlight the implications and conclusions of the study. Speculations and research recommendations will also be made that could extend and elaborate on the information presented here. This final chapter will emphasize the positive relationship between content and mode of instruction and high performance writing and its implications for teaching and learning.

The research for this study was conducted in order to generate knowledge about the high performing student writer, knowledge of potential value both to the practicing teacher and other researchers. The information included in the study is, therefore, pragmatic for both writer and writing teacher. The "story" of this relationship could not be told without extensive information related to composing, holistic scoring, and content and mode of instruction. These areas dominate the dissertation and make it reflective of past and current knowledge in a field which has been revolutionized during the past fifteen years.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature relevant to this study is in three parts: the composing process, the composing processes of experienced and high performance writers, and the teacher and the composing process. In Chapter I, the purpose and rationale for this study was established. This rationale separated content from mode of instruction as "what to know" and "what to do." Pertinent literature related to mode of instruction was presented with the rationale in Chapter I. Where relevant, this chapter will again review the "mode of instruction" literature, especially as it influences a student's composing processes.

Again it should be emphasized that writing is a dynamic, not static, activity. This dynamism only increases the research challenges and prevents an orderly separation of those elements which interact to create high performance writing. Content and mode of instruction, although closely linked, are more easily separated and defined. They are generated by the teacher and can be traced to both grounded and ungrounded theory. On the other hand, the content and mode integrate with a variety of student composing processes. The recursiveness of these processes, and when and how they integrate with either mode or content, is difficult if not impossible to delineate.
This review reflects the delineation problem. Indeed, this entire study is an attempt to describe a combination of important factors that produce high performance writing but does not attempt to assign one description, one process, one mode that will always work in every writing situation for every student writer. The divisions of this review become, therefore, artificial boundaries required for a logical academic discussion. They are the "threads" or themes which illuminate but do not always delineate the many complexities of writing and effective writing instruction. Murray has noted the problem of discussing, or teaching, the writing process.

... in order to analyze the process, we must give unnatural priority to one element of an explosion of elements in simultaneous action and reaction. Meaning is made through a series of almost instantaneous interactions. To study those interactions within ourselves, or our students, we must stop time and examine single elements of the writing process in unnatural isolation (1983, p. 4).

The Composing Process

Although disagreement prevails regarding effective modes of instruction, a consensus has formed for what has been termed the "new paradigm for teaching writing" (Hairston, 1982, p. 86). The early proponents of this model were Rohman and Wlecke (1964), Vygotsky (1978), Emig (1971), Elbow (1973), and Moffett (1968). These proponents contributed significantly to a major theoretical shift from traditional, product-oriented prose to a process orientation where the work of the writer naturally
evolves. In contrast, the traditional mode focuses on the final product and the surface conventions of standard English even at the expense of a writer's purpose and audience. Form and content are conceptually fused for the traditionalist as rules and exercises become the teacher's staples and the elimination of error the primary pedagogical goal.

The emphasis on a student's natural composing process is an important one. Petrosky and Brozick emphasize that "recent research and theory on the growth of language systems in children suggest that we may learn how to teach writing skills from an examination of the process of writing or composition rather than from the more traditional study of the final written product" (1979, p. 96). These more traditional studies have long dominated composition research. After reviewing the research literature in composition Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Shoer found that up through the early sixties, only two important studies even remotely related to the actual composing process (1963). Hillocks continued this tradition by exploring all the research from the Braddock, et al. review through 1982 and confined his review to experimental studies because "the total number of experimental studies completed in the past 20 years exceeds the total number included in the Braddock bibliography" (1984, p. 135).

Braddock and his colleagues disdained the experimental study as a tool to elicit information about composing effectively. Recently, the widely quoted Hillocks study ignored the Braddock call for more case studies and direct observation and elevated the experimental study even more by omitting descriptive studies from the meta-analysis of "what works in teaching composition." Janet Emig took the Braddock charge

The Emig study confirmed what good writers and teachers had long-suspected:

> The composing process does not occur as a left-to-right, solid, uninterrupted activity with an even pace. Rather, there are recursive, as well as anticipatory, features; and there are interstices, pauses involving hesitation phenomena of various lengths and sorts that give . . . composing aloud a certain . . . tempo (1971, p. 57).

Emig also noted that "there are elements, moments, and stages within the composing process which can be distinguished and characterized in some detail" (1971, p. 33). Although described by various terms, these stages include conceptualization, incubation-formulation, editing-revising (Petrosky and Brozick, 1979; F. Smith, 1982). During these stages, pre-writing, writing, and re-writing occur in a recursive cycle (Moffett, 1968). Britton clarified, and in some ways simplified, the stages to include conception, incubation, and production (1975). For Britton, the conception stage begins with "What it is that provokes the decision to write," and the stage is completed, "When the writer knows what he is going to write and has formed some ideas of what is expected of him" (1975, p. 25). In the production stage, Britton described the writer as "alone with his thoughts" and at this point the writer
concentrates intensely, pauses, and scorns what he has written. Once the production stage concludes, revision is "the final stage of the process by which a writer presents himself" (1975, p. 47). Smith describes similar stages differently. He characterizes rewriting as "the writer's own response to what has been written" and "editing and polishing of the text to make it appropriate for the reader" (1982, p. 27).

"The emergence of focus" is how Elbow regards the process and, for him, its four stages: writing, disorientation and chaos, emerging center of gravity, mopping up or editing (1973).

The work of Flower and Hayes adds a psychological element to the composing process. For these researchers, writing becomes a skilled, cognitive activity which can be identified through "composing episodes" (1979). An analysis of these episodes reinforce what Emig and others had previously discerned: the writing stages or episodes do not establish a linearity for most skilled writers. As White summarizes:

The research of those studying the writing process has made it clear that the linear model of the process enshrined in the old writing handbooks has little relation to the recursive method of composition used by most skilled writers. These writers are constantly moving back and forth from one part of the process to another and rarely stop one activity even though they may have moved on to the next (1985, p. 191).

Although Emig is most widely cited for increasing awareness of composing and the process it entails, Rohman and Wlecke should be more
accurately credited for introducing the importance of process to writing and thinking. In 1964, these two Michigan State researchers conducted a study involving freshman writers. Convinced that pedagogy had long ignored natural thought processes, Rohman and Wlecke formed two experimental groups to test their hypothesis. One experimental group was intensely trained in "prewriting exercises" and the other control group was not. The exercises focused on what Aristotle labelled "invention" and included analogy, meditation, and journal writing. The goals of the prewriting exercises were to increase the students' available content resources so as to expand the experiential world linking self to writing. The control group was presented no prewriting exercises and was taught in a traditional, product-centered instructional mode. After these different pedagogies had been applied, the two groups wrote essays which were holistically evaluated. Those students who were taught the prewriting exercises wrote essays judged superior to the group who had no formal prewriting instruction (1964).

For two reasons this study was significant in the development of the process paradigm: 1) the term prewriting was introduced to the literature and its practical application became useful to writing instruction, and 2) writing was viewed as a process with stages important for the development of a final written product. Although Rohman and Wlecke outlined the process as linear, Emig's research altered this earlier perception. Emig set out "to examine the composing processes of twelfth grade writers, using a case study method to elicit data about the writing behaviors of students" (1971, p. 15). Emig's case study approach was as novel as the research itself and introduced a different
methodology for writing research. Using a kind of protocol analysis, Emig studied eight selected Chicago-area students. Her protocols included taped interviews, teacher-evaluated essays, personal "ego-centric" writing, and what she termed "composing aloud." After studying these protocols, Emig concluded that student writing was either extensive or reflexive. Extensive writing was school sponsored and dominated the students' writing repertoires. Reflexive writing included some of the students' best writing but was infrequently a part of the school curriculum. More important, while composing aloud Emig's subjects applied a process whose stages were clear, definable, and distinct from one another. These stages were denoted as prewriting, writing, and rewriting.

Since Emig's study, researchers have explored the process stages in a variety of populations. Perl, in describing the composing processes among students, concluded that "... the composing process is now amenable to a replicable and graphic mode of representation as a sequence of codable behavior" (1978, p. 334). Perl followed the case study methodology applied by Emig. By having five college freshmen compose aloud, Perl noted the recursive features of the process as these five basic writers applied it. Perl discovered from the coded and taped sessions that basic writers have difficulty in applying an effective writing strategy because of an already internalized, deeply embedded composing process (1978).

It is not surprising that the college freshmen whom Perl studied had "a deeply embedded composing process." Even in seven-year-old-children, Graves identified two distinct processes in two sets of
children whose process approaches he described in detail (1975). In his observations at Atkinson Elementary School in New Hampshire, Graves saw the writing process at work among first and fifth graders.

In first and fifth grade alike, children at Atkinson experience the professional writer's cycle of craft. Visitors to Atkinson will find ... some children will be rehearsing for writing, while others will be drafting or revising what they have written (1983, p. 47).

Graves introduced "rehearsal" to the literature as a term more appropriate for elementary school writers. For Graves and his research colleagues, "rehearsal refers to the preparation for composing and can take the form of daydreaming, sketching, doodling, making lists of words, outlining, reading, conversing, or even writing lines as a foil to a further rehearsal" (1983, p. 221). In addition to rehearsal, Graves defined composing as "everything a writer does from the time first words are put on paper until all drafts are completed" (1983, p. 223). Thus, rehearsal and composing are the primary stages in the process outlined by Graves. However, Graves emphasizes that "composing patterns" are followed and that writers of all ages usually follow one simple pattern: select, compose, read, select, compose, read (1983, p. 226).

An intensive study of one student writer formed Mischel's case study. Mischel closely observed one twelfth grade student. Using Emig's device of "composing aloud," Mischel distinctly identified her subject's composing stages as rewriting, planning, starting, composing aloud, reformulating, and contemplating the product. These descriptive findings
reinforced the importance of the case study for process research and successfully replicated the earlier Emig study. For example, Mischel's respondent essentially reiterated Emig's contention that school-sponsored writing is often a detriment for effecting writing improvement (1974).

If the development of research on the composing process began, in a sense, with Aristotle whose rhetoric introduced the concepts of invention, arrangement, and style, then Flower and Hayes represent the sophistication of research today. Flower and Hayes have used protocol analysis to form their model of the entire composing process. Their analysis includes the psychological processes which a subject applies to perform a particular task. Flower and Hayes explored the "composing episodes" of writers. These episodes were observed through protocol analysis and were the major planning units where writers worked. Goal-directed and units of the writer's process, these episodes influenced planning at many levels (1981).

Flower also discussed the composing process in terms of long and short-term memory. Her introduction of the terms "writer-based and reader-based prose" was to explain how this prose functions as a "medium of thinking". As a result, the writer-based prose" was more effective because it is "an economical strategy we have for coping with information" (1979, p. 279). Flower used another case study to explore these new cognitive considerations and discovered, like Emig, Mischel, and Britton that self-sponsored writing, rather than school sponsored, more effectively connected with the writer's cognitive processes. Flower concluded that writer-based prose is often regarded by teachers as a "problem" to correct. In reality it is a useful strategy to sort,
organize, and retrieve meaningful information. Looking at the broader context of cognitive operations, writer-based prose represents to Flower "a major functional stage in the composing process and a powerful strategy well-fitted to a part of the job of writing" (1979, p. 287).

The Composing Processes of High Performance Writers

Repeatedly, and with considerable conviction, a growing number of scholars have criticized the positivist, empirical direction of writing research. Graves has commented, for example, that descriptions of products, controlled methodological studies, or studies in correlations are too far removed from reporting what children actually do to be of help (1978). Rohman and Wlecke (1964), Britton (1975), Emig (1971), Perl (1979), Graves (1978), and Mischel (1974) all observed "what children actually do." Yet none of these quantitative researchers analyzed an exclusively high performing group of writers. Much could be learned from these writers who execute a process to a successful conclusion. An analysis of high performing writers and their processes was difficult to undertake in the past because no accepted methodology was securely in place to identify high performance essays. With the increased sophistication and acceptance of holistic assessment, essays can credibly be scored and identified.

A review of the research of high performance writing can, therefore, only include either a description of the creative process of professional writers or studies of writing behaviors of successful student writers. In both cases, the research is meager and too often isolates the writer and misses the dynamicism of the process. Of the existing
studies, two are significant: one by Stallard who observed fifteen good high school writers and one by Sommers who studied twenty professional writers and college freshman writers.

Fifteen good high school writers and fifteen randomly selected writers formed Stallard's two comparative groups. Stallard interviewed each student after a writing assignment had been completed. In addition, the final drafts of all thirty students were analyzed. Stallard then identified writing behaviors which linked the two groups. For example, the amount of time on task, nature and amount of revision, contemplation at intervals, and clear purpose were important differences in the groups' behaviors. The good writers spent more time contemplating the assignment, prewriting, and writing. These same writers changed more words and paragraphs, and they wrote and made changes as they read their paper. Unlike Emig's, Stallard's subjects did not compose aloud and were unaware that they were being observed while composing (1974).

The Sommers study compared experienced and inexperienced writers. Sommers studies twenty college freshman writers and twenty professional writers and noted numerous strategical differences in the two populations. The experienced writers approached writing holistically. In contrast, inexperienced writers concentrated on one composing stage at the expense of another. As an example, the experienced writers revised at both the semantic and lexical levels; whereas, the inexperienced writers focused primarily on the lexical and became overly concerned with the writing conventions. The relationship between writer and audience was also quite different between the two groups. Sommers found that inexperienced writers did not fictionalize an intended audience but experienced
writers created an "imagined audience." In addition, experienced writers applied revision at all levels of their writing. Inexperienced writers primarily revised at the surface level to correct the conventions of the written product (1979).

The revision stage of the process, and the written product, was isolated by Bridwell in her study of the revision procedures of senior high students. One-hundred seventy-one high school seniors composed an essay about something "they knew well." They worked on the assignment for three days and wrote prewriting notes, the essay and its revisions. The students used different colored pens to indicate whatever changes were made in their writing. Like Sommers, Bridwell also found that good writers and basic writers revise differently. The basic writers concentrate on the surface conventions such as punctuation and spelling. The good writers make changes at the lexical and semantic levels of discourse (1980).

Finally, some insights about the composing process are offered by experienced, obviously high performance, professional writers. Malcom Cowley, for example, abstracts the process by which professional authors work their craft:

There would seem to be four stages in the composition of a story. First comes the germ of the story, then the period of more or less conscious meditation, then the first draft and finally the revision . . . (1961).
In *The Art of Thought*, Wallas presents the process in four stages: preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification (1926). Emig maintains that the Wallas typography is a "delineation that persists, with occasional shifts and changes of terms and categories, into the present literature" (1975, p. 59).

The Teacher and the Process

Composition teaching in the secondary schools is widely and emphatically criticized. Typical of these critics, Emig states that "much of the teaching of composition in American high schools is essentially a neurotic activity" (1971, p. 99). Flower and Hayes join the criticism: "... there is a systematic and pervasive failure in the quality of instructional interaction between teacher and student" (1979, p. 211). As early as 1968, Squire and Applebee noted that writing was infrequently taught in the schools and the bulk of the instruction was "after the fact--after the papers had been written" (1968, p. 13). Since the Squire and Applebee study, dramatic change has occurred in writing instruction. Hairston and others describe this change in terms of a "revolution" and "paradigm shift" (1982). Young has described the so-called "shift" more specifically:

The overt features... are obvious enough: the emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into description, narration exposition, and argument; the strong concern with usage... and with style; the preoccupation with the information and research paper; and so on (1978, p. 31).
The Composing Process and Theoretical Perspectives

Regardless of the "paradigm shift" in the sense described by Kuhn (1963) and applied by Hairston (1982), significant change has occurred in composition instruction. As a result, the content and mode of instruction have been altered in schools throughout America. One has influenced the other. In his analysis of learning, Britton has posited the idea that "the traditional or stereotypic teacher may come along with the best intentions . . . set about to observe . . . behavior, analyze it to throw up the rules, and then teach those rules as a recipe" (1985, p. 74). It is the "recipe" for the instruction which has been attacked so aggressively in recent years. And the current-traditional model is at the center of this criticism. In this theoretical model "the composing process is linear" and "teaching editing is teaching writing" (Hairston, 1982, p. 78). "The current-traditional teacher of writing is a figure of authority whose role it is to test and correct whatever students write according to standardized values" (Edelsberg, 1980, p. 16).

Conversely, process theorists have led the way in promoting what is commonly labeled Interactionism. The label derives from the idea that writing is generated as people interact in socially meaningful situations. Thus, writing becomes an extension of thinking. "The interactionist believes that intellectual development results from the conflicts which arise when a person confronts a writing problem which he or she cannot adequately resolve through application of routine strategies" (Kroll, 1980, p. 751). Moffett maintains, therefore, that disorder is the best teacher of composition. "Clarity and objectivity become learning challenges only when content and form are not given to the learner
but when he must find and forge his own from his inchoate thought" (1985). The strategy for such disorder must be an "emergent synthesis" whose "aim ... is the development of higher levels of active intelligence" (Kroll, 1980, p. 748). To the current-traditional and interactionist models Kroll has added the interventionist and maturationist perspectives. For the interventionist, "education is a process of transmitting fundamental knowledge and skills" (1980, p. 742). The maturationist is at the other end of the spectrum. "Whereas the focus in interventionism is the content of instruction, the focus in maturationism is the person" (Kroll, 1980, p. 745). The maturationist viewpoint is the "nature" theory implicit in human growth and development. In sum, the interventionist is content and text-centered, the theoretical base most criticized by Emig, Flower, and Hayes. The maturationist is student-centered and applies a recursive, process pedagogy. The interactionist creates a synthesis by combining both the interventionist and the maturationist perspectives and shares learning responsibility with the student.

The Composing Process and Modes of Instruction

Hillocks has, in a sense, taken developmental perspectives and applies them to specific modes of instruction. A "mode of instruction" is the configuration of variables characteristic of certain teacher and classroom relationships and activities, particularly the role played by the teacher and the kinds of activities in which students engage (Hillocks, p. 141, 1984). According to Hillocks, the modes include the presentational, natural process, and environmental. Each of these instructional modes reflects a theoretical base. An interventionist would be presentational. A maturationist would apply the natural process
mode. The "emergent synthesis" of the Hillocks typography is the environmental mode. Like the interactionist, the environmentalist would "urge students to think about the audience and to write specifically" but would also engage students in "feedback from peers", an activity common to the natural process mode (Hillocks, 1984, p. 144). Mode of instruction often is parallel with content to reflect a theoretical perspective.

Usually, but not always, a particular theoretical perspective will shape and direct both the content and instructional mode. Thus, an interventionist would most likely present rules as laws and grammar exercises as fundamental knowledge to be transmitted. The presentational mode would most comfortably fit the interventionist. Conceivably, a maturationist could believe strongly in the full development of the individual but present "maturationist content" in a presentational mode. The most common example of this gap in theory and practice is the teacher who lectures about the composing process. If the process is taught to students as a linear concept, then the presentational mode is probably at work in the classroom. Murray asserts that "Some teachers present each part of the writing process to their students in a prescriptive, sequential order, creating a new kind of terrifying rhetoric which 'teaches' well but 'learns' poorly" (1983, p. 4).

Of the three perspectives the interventionist places the most emphasis on product and is the most remote from all stages of the composing process. Ample evidence exists that "correcting and evaluating" a final product is not a useful model for teaching writing (Shaughnessy, 1977). Both Perl and Pianko have again reaffirmed the pedagogical failure of this strategy (1979). The most effective role for the teacher in the
writing process has been frequently discussed but inadequately researched. Ungrounded theories abound for when and how teachers should influence the writing process. There are those, such as Elbow, who even propose a "teacherless writing class." Elbow's rationale is that "the goal is for the writer to come as close as possible to being able to see and experience his own words. . . ." (1973, p. 77). For Elbow, a maturationist perspective would be embedded in a natural process instructional mode. A well-known advocate of this same perspective is James Moffett. Linking to the work of Vygotsky, Moffett views the teacher's role as facilitator. Since "writing should be taught as an extension of speech," the teacher's role should be minimized as the natural process evolves for the speaker and writer (Moffett, 1968, p. 41).

Other researchers have tried to define specific roles for the writing teacher. Joining the student process with the teacher in "collaborative composing" was successfully tested by Clifford (1981). Flower and Hayes endorsed a similar approach: "Teachers must become collaborators more than evaluators" (1979, p. 212). More specifically, Dias outlines the teacher role as "trusted audience" (1981). Individualizing the process and making writing a "special act" are the primary teaching goals according to Hagaman (1978). And Haugen characterizes the writing teacher as an "accessible reference" who sets the stage during prewriting and then transfers responsibility to the students for proofreading and revising (1981).

Most theorists agree that the most essential role of the writing teacher is to "provide an environment in which a child will want to write
and in which a child will learn about writing" (Smith, 1982, p. 201). "Accessibility" defines the teacher within this context. Again, because of the dynamicism and complexity of the writing act, Smith asserts that "teachers have to develop a sense of when to offer help, when to intervene, and when to stand back" (Smith, 1983, p. 202). Ideally, this environment would be like the room described by Graves where the teacher and context function together, not separately, with each other:

He worked hard to help them control their writing, but he also knew that responsible writing didn't occur in a vacuum. The same philosophy had to prevail throughout the day. Children couldn't, on the one hand, be told to be responsible for the information in their selections and to learn to control the process of writing and, on the other, take no responsibility for the conduct of the classroom (1983, p. 33).

Many aspects combine to create a productive writing environment and the teacher is responsible for developing this productivity. Smith maintains that "The different aspects . . . cannot be separated from each other and delivered to children one bit at a time." Smith continues "Reading, writing, talking about writing, and talking in order to write must be continual possibilities; they overlap and interlock" (1983, p. 202).

Boiarsky, et al., have constructed a "cognitive map for the effective teaching of writing." This map outlines a variety of roles for the writing teacher: teacher as writer, teacher as scholar, and teacher as
teacher. As a writer the teacher has competent writing skills. As a scholar, the teacher is knowledgeable about language theory and pedagogy. As a teacher, the writing teacher has curriculum design and instruction competencies (1980, pp. 79-81). Teacher as writer is to Emig the most crucial of these roles. "Persons who don't write cannot sensitively, even sensibly, help others learn to write" (1983, p. 141).

But an increasing amount of evidence is accumulating that peers, not teachers, may play the most important role in writing instruction (Louise, 1979; Elías, 1981). As an example, Karenzianes, et al., used low achieving tenth grade students to determine the effects of a structured peer editing methodology. The students were divided into two groups: one group had its essays edited by a teacher and the other group used peer editing. The peer edited group had significantly higher writing proficiency than did students whose essays were edited by teachers (Karenzianes, et al., 1980). More surprising, a one-to-one tutorial model where the teacher completely individualizes writing instruction may not be the most effective role in improving student writing (Overton, 1980).

A combination of features may combine to create an effective mode of instruction. Hairston has listed the principal features to include: instructor's intervention in student writing during the process; instructor's help for students to generate content and discover purpose; teacher-designed writing assignments that focus on audience, purpose, and occasion; instructor's evaluation of the written product by how well it fulfills the writer's intention and meets the needs of the audience (1982).
The debate as to the most effective mode of instruction assumes that teachers can make a difference in effecting writing improvement. Applebee underscored this assumption when he surveyed the 1977 NCTE Achievement Awards in Writing winners. He found that these successful student writers had teachers who discovered ways to get involved when involvement was helpful to the students' composing processes (1978). Where and when that "helpful involvement" merges with the student to produce a good piece of writing is unknown even among the advocates of the process teaching strategy: "Seldom, if ever, has the current popular wisdom about measuring and rewarding extended to measuring and rewarding of teaching processes" (Davis, et al., 1981, p. 109).

In her pioneering book, Errors and Expectations, Mina Shaughnessy addresses the importance of mode of instruction to effective teaching and learning:

Precisely because writing is a social act, a kind of synthesis that is needed through the dialects of discussion, the teaching of writing must often begin with the experience of a real audience, not only of teachers but of peers. Yet classrooms in their usual assymetrical arrangements with the teachers on one side, talking, and the students on the other listening—or looking at the back of other students' heads—do not breed discussion (1977, p. 83).

Shaughnessy's description of a most probably interventionist teacher dispensing information in a presentational mode is typical of the criticism of current-traditional writing pedagogy. This criticism
is responsible for the "paradigm shift" which some theorists maintain is revolutionizing writing instruction: "... the traditional and prescriptive and product-centered paradigm that underlines writing instruction is beginning to crumble" (Hairston, 1982, p. 80). Before completely destroying the traditional paradigm, more data are needed to validate the relationship between content and mode of instruction and writing performance.

The Composing Process and Content of Instruction

A theoretical perspective usually guides and directs both content and mode of instruction. The interactionist perspective, for example, would discourage students from imitating "the forms of teachers' language as if they were models to be copied" (Barnes, 1969, p. 61). On the other hand, since an interventionist perspective centers on the teacher transmitting information, the information most easily transferred would be rules to avoid errors or prescriptive grammar. "Transmission" would suggest that the presentational mode of instruction was executed to deliver the content. Ideally, the writing teacher presents students useful content in a mode which successfully links to their writing processes.

Increasingly, the traditional content taught in all American classrooms is being challenged. The most adamant criticism is leveled at grammar instruction. Both Haynes and Hillocks reviewed the research in composition instruction and came to the same conclusion: "The study of traditional school grammar has no effect on raising the quality of writing" (Haynes, 1978; Hillocks, 1984, p. 160). Hillocks, Haynes and others do suggest the content that can raise the quality of writing. Myers
proposes that teachers should focus content on distancing, modeling, and processing. Processing emphasizes "the sequence of steps or stages on the writer's mind" and distancing "the relationships between the speaker and the subject and speaker and audience"; modeling encourages "imitation of written texts" (1983, p. 3). Hillocks also found that "the presentation of good pieces of writing as models is significantly more useful than the study of grammar" (1984, p. 160). Hillocks and Haynes also agree from their research reviews that sentence combining can be useful content for the classroom. In fact, in the Hillocks' study, sentence combining was twice as effective as free writing (1984) for effecting writing improvement.

Hillocks adds to his list of effective content scales, criteria, and specific questions that students apply to their own or peers' writing. The research also indicated that inquiry is important content. Hillocks defined inquiry as "strategies for dealing with sets of data" and discovered the inquiry treatments" are nearly four times more effective than free writing and over two-and-a-half times more powerful than the traditional study of model pieces of writing" (1984, p. 161).

The Haynes review of the research concluded what many writing teachers had already assumed: "... increased reading results in improved writing" and teachers should "incorporate a greater number of reading experiences into the writing program" (1978, p. 87). Additionally, her review encourages teachers "to direct methods of instruction and to the solving of communication problems before and during the writing process" (1978, p. 87).
Teaching the writing process as content may also be effective if the instruction is naturally applied to the student. However, Murray warns:

In teaching the process we have to look, not at what students need to know but what they need to experience. This separates the teaching of writing from the teaching of a course in which the content is produced by authorities—writers of literature, scientists, historians—and interpreted by textbooks and teachers (1983, p. 13).

Murray's admonition is an attempt to clarify how and what should be included in composing process pedagogy. He reasserts that the concept should be taught as "discovery through language" and as a "process of exploration." Murray encourages the writing teacher to teach "unfinished writing" and the "glory of its unfinishedness" (1976, p. 80). The danger, of course, of teaching the process as content for students to learn and apply is that the process itself will become a recipe. In turn, students may apply the process in a linear, formulaic way and return to another unnatural composing strategy which was intended to replace an original, ineffective recipe. Knoblauch and Brannon refer to this artificial attempt to be natural as a pseudoconcept:

The process of composing belongs to writers; production recipes belong to teachers. Whenever a teacher's own notion of some orderly procedure for writing usurps writers' personal choices in
determining how writing "ought" to be undertaken, the teacher is working from a pseudoconcept of process (1984, p. 81).

Berthoff emphatically maintains that students "can and should be taught" four concepts of the composing process: invention, specification, developing and deploying syntactical resources, and revising and editing. However, she also warns that it is "easy to mistake the methods appropriate to teaching the product as being equally appropriate to teaching the process (1981, p. 20). Like Knoblauch and Brannon, Berthoff is critical of those textbooks which present process content as a linear sequence. Composing is not a process like playing a game of tennis," states Berthoff, "or cooking a meal; there are no hard and fast rules and it does not proceed in one direction—in a straightforward manner" (1981, p. 20). Talking about the process and teaching it are quite different pedagogies although they are sometimes confused with being the same. Teaching process as content may reveal a common misconception "that by talking about the 'composing process' we are doing something about teaching it" (Berthoff, 1981, p. 24).

Because the writing process is a dynamic one, the teaching process must be equally dynamic. Emig and others subscribe to a developmental, maturationist perspective of teaching and learning where the learner is the focus. The content presented by the teacher is not in the traditional sense "content." Instead, the teacher presents "advice" since "Writing is predominantly learned rather than taught" (p. 140). According to this perspective, a teacher must be a writer sharing a craft with another writer. "Both craft processes, writing and teaching, demand
constant revision, constant reseeing of what is being revealed by the information at hand (Graves, 1983, p. 226). Looking at the "information in hand," and shaping content to conform to the writer's needs becomes the content of instruction. According to Emig, "But to believe that children learn because teachers teach and only what teachers explicitly teach is to engage in magical thinking, from a developmental point of view" (1983, p. 135). Thus, what a teacher should present is what a student needs to know. However, too often what a student needs to know is not always what a teacher explicitly presents. White views assessment as the key to both knowing and teaching. "The more we know, and the more we help our students know about assessing writing, the more effective our teaching will become (p. 289)."
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In her study of the writing processes of twelfth graders, Emig states that there are five sources of information that can describe the factors that influence a student's writing process: student statement, student practice, evaluation of student writing, student descriptions of composition teaching, and teacher observations (1971). These multiple meanings and realities require multiple data-gathering devices. These devices reflect both the complexity and dynamic integration of the writing art. In a study by Stallard, for example, of the writing behavior of good student writers, direct observation, interviews, and textual analysis were all used to gather information, methods not unlike the ones applied by Emig. These multiple methods, or triangulation, were useful for improving the "truth value," applicability, and consistency of the study. For the goals and objectives of this study, triangulation was also important to validate research findings and to establish a full and descriptive analysis of the complex dynamics that promote high performance writing and its relationship to mode and content of instruction. The value of triangulation is apparent:
Triangulation forces the observer to combine multiple data sources, research methods, and theoretical schemes in the inspection and analysis of behavioral specimens. It forces him to situationally check the validity of his casual propositions. . . . It forces him to temporarily specify the characteristics of his hypothesis. . . . It directs the observer to compare the subject's theories of behavior with his emerging theoretical scheme. . . (Denzin, 1971, p. 177).

Prolonged and persistent observations, structured and unstructured interviews, and holistic evaluation of essays were the multiple methods applied to this research study. The aim of these methods was to develop "thick description" that would be instructive to those who want to better understand high school writers and how best to teach them. Petty has observed that "The most important research problem facing the profession is that of determining why practices based upon the results of well-established research are found in so few schools" (Petty, 1984, p. 34). The description from this study will highlight real teachers and real students as they function in the school context. However, unlike familiar qualitative research, the subjects for this study have been identified by a quantitative approach as "high performance writers". In turn, the teachers for the study have been identified from exceptional means in two of the writing classes where these high performance writers have clustered. This research design joins the best elements of both quantitative and qualitative research. The hard data usually associated
with science is tempered by the human element implicit in a qualitative technique. In developing a similar design, Payne speaks to the "blend of both designs . . . in the hope that one . . . would largely compensate for the other" (Payne, 1982, p. 113). Thus, the context, so important to naturalistic research, has been selected by a procedure more commonly associated with a more experimental design. The "blending" of these two research methodologies does not represent a theoretical compromise meant to please those on both sides of the quantitative-qualitative debate. More practically, the best available data shaped the study's design rather than the design shaping the data to conform to a research bias. Recent research in composition has been obscured, and to some extent diluted, by what Emig calls "a governing gaze." Such terminology reflects the rigid boundaries of the debate, the intransigence of the positions. The Emig metaphor identifies the gazers as postivistc, phenomenological, or transactional-constructionist (1982, p. 65). From these identities, Emig rigidly outlines how each "gazer" views the world. As a result of characterizations like this one, the "gazer" is increasingly drawing more attention than the world view responsible for the fixation.

Inappropriately, linear boundaries are sometimes imposed on the composing process. Equally inappropriate are similar boundaries which limit a research model to one gaze in one direction. The dynamics of teaching, learning, and composing demand a research model that can account for the synergistic elements of these processes. The limitations of both the naturalistic and scientific paradigms make a fusion of the
two a logical and indeed desirable alternative. Chrony reinforces this point:

It may be that for English Education there is a need to refine the concepts of validity, reliability, subjectivity, and objectivity in a theoretical framework encompassing both experimental and ethnographic research as interrelated and mutually supporting modes (1984, p. 24).

Guba and Lincoln also see this paradigm integration as a possible and realistic compromise: There is no reason why both camps should not exploit both quantitative and qualitative techniques, should not be concerned with both relevance and rigor, should not be open to empirically grounded theory as well as to flashes of insight from conceptual leaders in the field, should not be interested in both verification and discovery... (1981, p. 77).

The exploitation of these two paradigms most probably violates assumptions of both. The assumptions which define the paradigms and give them theoretical life also make them inviolable to their proponents. As Guba and Lincoln suggest, and Emig, Hairston and others have reaffirmed, "hard choices must be made" (1981, p. 77). These choices should be made not by the predisposition of a "governing gaze" but by the demands of the research problem. If writing research is, as White maintains, "often badly written, unclear, clogged with data, and self-evident", then poorly designed research methodology should surely share the
blame (1985, p. 170). To be too qualitative or too quantitative and to see the sanctity of one to the exclusion of the other is to deny the intrinsic and extrinsic complexities of both. The classroom is a microcosm of this complexity and the actors in it, the teacher and students. The outcomes of this study, by any definition, derive from assumptions implicit in the naturalistic paradigm. Rooted in these outcomes, however, is the scientific notion that statistical data can begin to locate "truth" even though field study will confirm its multiple realities.

Theoretical Perspectives of Writing Research

Purves asserts that "Within language studies . . . exist two broad approaches which are often rivals but which are really complementary . . . language as a system or as human production" (1984, p. 5). In short, language can be studied as a theoretical system or through its practical application. These approaches, therefore, have formed distinct perspectives from which writing is researched and discussed.

White categorizes three perspectives:

The first focuses on the text and is product based; the second focuses on the interaction between writer and reader and concerns itself with the way that communication takes place; and the third attends principally to what is going on inside the writer's head, looking closely at cognitive operations or processes (1985, p. 172).

White's categories reflect the dominant and prevailing theoretical perspectives of writing research. Writing improvement is the primary goal of much of this research. Yet, too often the teacher, student, and
mode and content of instruction are separated and analyzed in isolation from one another. A textual analysis, for example, excludes the writer and writing environment. The analysis of the communication act itself includes the writer and reader but excludes the teacher. And any analysis of cognitive operations returns to the writer but again excludes the reader and teacher. As a result of this exclusion, the dynamics of teaching and learning writing become fragmented and, as a result, lack both credibility and practicality for classroom application. This study assumes that the teacher, the student, and the content and mode of instruction must be integrated for a full and realistic description of the classroom writing situation.

Identifying High Performance Writers and Their Teachers

The Columbus Public Schools/Ohio State University Writing Project tested an entire class population during its tenth, eleventh, twelfth grade years. Approximately 4,100 students were included in this population. The holistic scores for the evaluated essays were grouped by teacher and class and listed on computer printouts (Appendix C). The mean score provides an example of this grouping for each class/teacher. The class mean scores were then ranked from high to low. A low score indicated a high performing class since individual scores of 1 or 2 are defined as "high performance." Since essays were infrequently scored "1", a score of "2" was also considered "high performance" for this population (Appendix 3). The project also described a 2 score as "high." A score of "5" was given to essays which generated only a few sentences or to essays when students were absent on the second of the two writing days. For the purpose of this study, high
performing student writers and their teachers were identified from the 1983-84 sample.

This 1983-84 sample was selected for several reasons. First, the results of two samples could then be compared. Since the same students had two different teachers during the tenth and eleventh grade, differences in the teachers' mode and content of instruction could be instructive. The writing sample was collected in late January 1984. The students eventually identified as "high performance writers" were students from September through January in two classes that the data reflected as high performing classes.

As a result, this study's sample population was identified from the 1983-84 testing sample and studied during the 1984-85 school year. The students and teachers selected for the study were in two classes which ranked at or near the top of all the participating classes in the 1983-84 project. Of the 201 eleventh grade classes tested during that year, these two classes ranked one and five and were in the top 2.5% and number one and five of all the classes tested in the entire population. These rankings are established by low mean class scores because of significant clusters of high performance writers. A class was defined as a group of eleventh grade students with no less than ten students with scored essays. Of the remaining three high performance classes, one did not meet the minimum testing frequency. When this class was eliminated, four remained. Two of the four classes were the subject of this study. The other two classes were eliminated from the study because of their inconvenient location and the travel time required for prolonged observations and interviews, time which would have significantly
distracted from the overall quality of the study. After the two high performing classes and students had been identified, their teachers were notified and the study was initiated.

Conditions of Testing

In December 1982, the original writing sample was completed during two class periods so as to allow time for writing, revising, and proof-reading. A similar procedure was applied for the 1983 sample which is the focus of this study. Teachers at all testing sites were given the same instructions for administering the sample. These instructions acted as a "script" to establish consistency at the sixteen participating schools (Appendix E).

Teachers involved in the testing were asked to have at least five dictionaries in their rooms. In addition, the teachers were to have previously announced the day and time of the writing sample so that students would bring loose leaf paper and a pencil or pen on the appropriate testing day. During the first day, students were permitted to plan their essay by writing notes, lists, or outlines. Time was, therefore, encouraged for prewriting. Students were also encouraged to write a rough draft on one day and to revise the draft on the second day of testing. Prior to writing, each test group was asked to complete a questionnaire.

On the first day of testing, each student was asked to have a clear desk except for blank paper, pens or pencils, and the question sheet which could be used for scrap paper. The administering teacher then read aloud the prompt which was also included on an instruction sheet. Five minutes before the end of the period the students were told that
their papers would be collected soon. Two minutes before the end of the period, the testing groups were told to stop writing. No name was to be written on the final essay booklet. All the tested students were encouraged to save time to re-read their essay and to make corrections. Twelve minutes before the end of the second writing period, the teacher was to state: "You have ten minutes to complete your final draft." Five minutes before the end of the period the teacher would state: "You have three minutes before I will collect the papers." Two minutes before the end of the period all the students were to stop writing. If a student was absent on either day, the absence was to be noted on all testing materials. These testing conditions were replicated for each sample during the three years of the project, though the prompts differed.

Holistic Scoring as a Research Tool

An important feature of this study, and any value related to information derived from it, is clearly linked to the credibility of holistic scoring. White emphasizes "to proceed holistically is to see things as units, as wholes, and to do so is to oppose the dominant tendency of our time ... which breaks things down into constituent parts in order to see how they work" (1984, p. 400). It has been argued throughout this study that writing is a dynamic process, one which defies this reductionist tendency. Indeed, the methodology applied to the study's research reaffirms the complexity of the writing act and the multiple methods needed to evaluate it. Holistic scoring also recognizes this complexity and responds to it with a blend of naturalistic humanism and empirical certainty. Ironically, this holistic approach to evaluation often satisfies both positivists and phenomenologists. The positivists
like the numerical accountability and coded anonymity; the phenomenologists
like the humane focus on the whole without the analytic obsession on the
part. As both camps have filled scholarly journals with their defense
of one or the other paradigms, holism has prevailed as a mixture of
both. "In one decade", states White, "in a notoriously conservative and
slow-moving profession, a new concept in testing and in teaching has tri­
umphed while no one was watching" (1984, p. 401). The Educational Test­
ing Service, and researcher Paul Diederich, and the National Assessment
of Educational Progress are primarily credited with the work that has
led to this "triumph."

The essence of a holistic grading scoring system is to match one
piece of writing with another in a graded series, score the writing
piece for the prominence of certain features and then assign it a letter
or number grade. Cooper and Odell describe the variations in the system
of holistic grading as primary trait scoring, general impression mark­
ing, and feature analysis (Cooper and Odell, 1977). White views pri­
mary trait scoring as a particular kind of holistic scoring but states
that analytic scoring is not holistic because of its different assump­
tions. "Primary trait scoring" says White, "merely defines with greater
precision and exclusiveness the criteria to be used in holistic scoring"
(1985, p. 23). On the other hand, "Analytic scoring . . . is based on
analytic premises and therefore ought never to be called holistic"
(White, 1985, p. 120).

Holistic scoring, as White would define it, was applied to the
essays scored and identified for this study. Using a system originally
designed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), raters applied a
numerical scale of 1-4. These numbers were assigned to the papers based on the "general impression" of the rater. For this study, papers scored a 1 or 2 were high and scores of 3 and 4 indicated a low writing performance. For this sample, a 2 rating also reflected high performance writing because of the low frequency of 1 scores (Appendix F). For example, during the 1982-83 testing, only 30 essays of the 4141 scored received a score of 1. In this same sample, 319 received a score of 2, 7.7% of the total population. A 3 score was received by 38.9% of the essays and 29.1% received a score of 4. A 5 score was received by 20.6%. At least two trained readers assigned a score to each essay. A score of 5 was assigned if the essay booklet was blank or nearly so, the student was absent one day of the writing test, or the essay did not respond to the assignment.

The reliability of holistic scoring systems can be high. Britton and his colleagues, for example, achieved as high as 82% agreement between teams of three raters who were experienced teachers (1966). Coffman found that "In general, when made aware of discrepancies, teachers tend to move their own ratings in the direction of the average ratings of the group . . . and the ratings of the staff as a group tend to become more reliable" (1971). Cooper and Odell concluded

When raters are from similar backgrounds and when they are trained with a holistic scoring guide . . . they can achieve nearly perfect agreement in choosing the better of a pair of essays; and they can achieve scoring reliabilities in the high eighties or low nineties on their summed scores
Mellon also has emphasized the reliability of holistic scoring. We know that trained readers are consistent in their own overall quality ratings and agree with the ratings of other readers about two-thirds of the time. This is a far higher percentage than we initially thought, on the basis of earlier judgments of writing ability, could ever be attained (1975, p. 23).

The success and reliability of holistic evaluation depends on "calibration" or sensitizing a rater's perception and clarifying what should be evaluated (Pollman, 1967). The Columbus teachers who evaluated the 1983-84 essays were "sensitized" and "calibrated" in numerous training sessions to achieve the kind of homogeneity required for rating reliability. By discussing sample papers or "range finders," some would call them "anchor papers," raters were trained to achieve rating consistency. Table leaders were assigned to maintain the consistency and were given detailed duties as well as individual instructions for each reading session (Appendices G, H, I, J). These training sessions were important to formulate a "community standard," or rubric, which then could be uniformly applied to the 4,000 scored essays (Appendix F). These training methods were consistently applied for all three years of the project.

Although White advocates the use of what he terms "holisticism," he also notes its limitations. For White these limitations include the
facts that the score can give no meaningful, specific diagnostic information, that it cannot represent an absolute value in itself, and that reliabilities are customarily overestimated (1985, pp. 28-29).

Despite its limitations, the praise for holistic scoring is widespread. White characterizes this evaluation tool "as the most successful method of scoring writing in quantity that is now available" (1984, p. 408). Cooper and Odell concur: "Where there is commitment and time to do the work required to achieve reliability of judgement, holistic evaluation of writing remains the most valid and direct means of rank-ordering students by writing ability" (1977, p. 3). Finally, Myers has indicated that "The general consensus seems to be that, despite the many research issues and doubtful procedures, holistic scoring is still the best way to assess writing" (1980, p. 4).

Background to the Field Research

After the essays were scored and the testing data became available, the two high performance classes were identified by their exceptional class means. In turn, students in each of these two classes who scored either a 1 or 2 on the writing sample were identified from their numerically coded essay. From the two classes, a total of seventeen of the 34 eleventh grade students were designated "high performance writers". Of these seventeen, five received a score of 1 and twelve received a score of two. It should again be noted that less than 1% of the 4,000 plus students who were tested scored a 1. For the purpose of this study, the two high performance classes will be designated "Class A" and "Class B." In Class A, nineteen students participated in the sample and nine were high performance writers, nearly 50% of the entire class. In Class B,
fifteen students participated in the sample and eight were high performance writers, in excess of 50% of the entire class. Class A included more scores of 1. As a result, Class A had a lower mean than Class B and ranked as the highest performing writing class of the entire sample population.

Table 1
1982-83 Summary Results for Each Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay Score</th>
<th>Number of Essays</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (high)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrecorded scores</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once these classes and high performance writers had been located, arrangements were made to observe the classes of the two high performance class teachers. These observations began in January 1985, and extended into April 1985. During this same period, both teachers were extensively interviewed about their teaching philosophies and the mode and content of their writing instruction. The seventeen high performance writers from the two high performing classes were also interviewed. In addition to the interview notes, each session was taped. The teachers of the two
high performing classes were also asked to accumulate documents which were representative of their teaching pedagogy especially as it related to writing. These documents included class assignments, evaluated papers, student course/teacher evaluations, and informational handouts.

This descriptive study includes informative data from a variety of sources: student and teacher interviews, class observations, and classroom documents. These accumulated data, when assembled and analyzed, provide considerable insight into the composing processes of high performance writers and the content and mode of instruction which was presented to them during the 1983-84 school year. The scored writing sample was completed in late January 1984. In short, the high performance writers had been in the high performance classes from September to the time of the test, late January 1984. The high performance class teacher taught these students for a period of five months prior to the writing test.

The In-Depth Student Interview

Prior to the interview, each student was told that he or she had been identified as a high performance writer based on the 1983-84 writing sample and that the researcher was exploring the strategies of high performing writers. No other information was divulged that would lead or shape the student answers. Each student interview opened with two unstructured questions: 1) From beginning to end, how would you describe the process you follow to create a piece of writing? 2) What teacher from grades 9-12 has had the most influence on your writing development? These interviews were conducted during the school day in one of several private, quiet locations. The student and the interviewer were the only
participants in each session. The interviews ranged from 20-50 minutes in length.

From the two questions a variety of "probes" were used to elicit additional information. These probes included clarification, critical awareness, amplification, and refocus (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p. 179). Extensive notes were taken for each response and the complete interview was tape recorded. Following the seventeen student interviews, each of which followed the same process, an analysis and integration of the tapes and field notes was completed. There are usually two stages of interview analysis:

The first is the analysis of the single interview; this takes into account the respondent's personal context, the possibility of respondent bias, the credibility of what has been reported, and the interactional process between interviewer and respondent. The second is the analysis of the interview data which will be integrated to form the total inquiry (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p. 183).

From these interviews, two sets of descriptors were formulated. The first set were descriptors relating to the composing processes of the high performance writers. The second set were descriptors relating to the teacher attributes associated with mode and content of instruction. Other pertinent information from the interviews was also included in the analysis when it contributed to the "thick description" so essential to a phenomenological study.
The In-Depth Teacher Interviews

In these in-depth interviews, several of which were taped, the two teachers of high performance classes were asked to describe the mode and content of their teaching. In essence they were asked to describe how they taught students to write and the theories that guided their pedagogies. The teacher interviews were both formal and informal. The formal interviews were taped and directed by one or two lead question. The informal interviews were wide-ranging and elicited information on a variety of topics. These topics included essay evaluation, personal background and training, teaching goals and objectives, career direction, theoretical evolution, and classroom management philosophies. In addition to these one-on-one interviews, the two teachers participated in a number of group discussions where additional descriptive information was presented. Extensive field notes were recorded for the formal and informal interviews and the group discussions.

There are, of course, important strengths and inherent weaknesses of the interview as a research tool. Cuba and Lincoln cite interviewing as "virtually the only technique that provides access to 'elites'--those with specialized knowledge of the situation--and it provides information much more quickly than observation" (1981, p. 187). The weaknesses of this method has been much discussed: limited generalizability and unpredictable results.
The Classroom Observations

The classroom observation was another research tool used to increase the reliability of this study. Douglas has suggested that "Direct experience seems to be the most pervasive, fundamental test of truth" (1976, p. 5). During their interviews, the teachers and students described the modes and content of instruction that contributed to high performance writing. The observations were useful in confirming the descriptions provided by the subjects of this study.

With few exceptions, two days a week were devoted to the observations. One teacher was observed on a Thursday and the other on a Friday. Sometimes the observations would include both teachers. A discussion usually followed each observation during which instructional goals and objectives were discussed. Using the Bogdan and Taylor definition, these were participant observations: "A period of intense social interaction between researcher and subject in the milieu of the latter" (1975, p. 5). Guba and Lincoln define "participant" as "a member of the group" with "a stake in the group's activity and the outcomes of that activity" (1981, p. 190).

Writing instruction is a complex activity involving a dynamic process. Observation was essential in capturing both this complexity and dynamicism. Douglas asserts that when meanings are problematic or the phenomena under investigation are not concrete, the use of observational techniques may be the only methodology for understanding the complexity of the situation (1976, p. 25).
Content Analysis of Documents

These documents included class assignments, evaluated papers, informational handouts and course/teacher evaluations. The collection of documents for each teacher was obviously different. For example, one teacher submitted course/teacher evaluations but the other did not because no evaluation had been executed. One teacher taught intermediate composition. As a result, many informational handouts were accumulated related to writing. The other teacher taught Mythology and included writing instruction within the context of this subject. However, fewer handouts were distributed to students. For each teacher, the researcher kept a folder. Either the teacher requested that a document be included in the folder or the researcher would request that a specific document be submitted.

The analysis of these documents is another form of triangulation. Holsti has defined content analysis as "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages" (1969, p. 14). Guba and Lincoln list four important characteristics of content analysis: it is a rule-guided process; it is systematic; it is a process that aims for generality; and it is a content analysis that deals in manifest content (1981, p. 240-241). These characteristics were applied to evaluating the documents accumulated in the field from the two teachers of the high performance classes.

The Data Analysis

What results from this triangular research is "thick description" of the content and mode of instruction for two teachers of high performance writers and the relationship of both content and mode to the composing
processes of seventeen high performance high school writers. The observations, interviews, documents, and surveys are intended to establish layers of corroboration that will reinforce the study's credibility.

Chapters IV and V present the results and conclusions of this study. In Chapter IV, the actual composing processes of the students are described. In addition, the mode and content of the teachers' instruction is described through the data accumulated through the observations and document analysis. In Chapter V, the research results and their significance are explained. Chapter V also explains the applicability and impact of the results and speculations, especially as they relate to content and mode of instruction. Research recommendations will be highlighted in this chapter in addition to final reflections on the research problem and the data derived from its exploration.
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CHAPTER IV
THE COMPOSING PROCESSES OF HIGH PERFORMANCE WRITERS

Introduction

This study differs from other process analyses because it recognizes Emig's contention that "persons, rather than mechanisms, compose" (1971, p. 5) but also that "it is the business of the writing class to make writing more than an exercise" (Shaughnessy, 1977, p. 89). Too often, writing studies decontextualize the writer from the writing environment or discuss the "writing class" without the student's composing process embedded in it. More frequently, the textual products of the class are scrutinized at the expense of those factors which may have most influenced their outcomes, factors that include the teacher's mode and content of instruction.

This study explored the multiple factors that shape the real, classroom writing experience. Much like Caulkins, who traced writing development in young children, this research was undertaken as "a project which would show teachers and children in the context of their classrooms and one whose findings are intended "to reach teachers as well as researchers" (1983, p. 6). Theory cannot be successfully applied in the classroom if it is unrecognizable to the practitioner. To some extent, then, educational research, to be useful, must always include elements
of personal narrative. The research must derive from personal experience and reflect a reality which is familiar and recognizable. This reality, and the narrative elements embodied in it, forces the researcher from what Emig describes as the "extensive mode", writing "detached and reportorial," and into the "reflexive mode" often associated with "thoughts and feelings" and a "trusted" peer audience (1971, p. 91).

Elbow suggests that "writing is not just getting things down on paper; it is getting things inside someone else's head" (1973, p. 76). If theory is to meet practice in the writing classroom, and they should, the researcher's challenge is to get "inside someone else's head," to construct a reality which can be shared. The sum total of these data is not only an analysis of the composing processes of high performance writers but also the mode and content of instruction that influenced these performances.

Another distinguishing factor of this study is that it focuses on high performance, not dysfunction or pedagogical failure. Chorny has reaffirmed the need for educational research which describes the success, not failure, of a process:

Much previous research has been concerned with language failure rather than with success: in relation to the estimated tens of thousands of studies on reading, for example, one might speculate fairly securely that most are concerned with why children can't read, rather than with how they can (1984, pp. 24-25).
Chorny also emphasizes that too much research disregards the importance of context and the total process as it is contextualized:

Much of the research . . . has tended to dwell on discrete elements of surface structure and process as a whole or to the contexts in which it operates (1984, p. 25).

The data from this study not only describe the complete composing processes of high performance writers but also how mode and content of instruction interact with those processes. This study assumes, therefore, that any analysis of classroom writing performance must include the multiple factors that shape the writing process and how that process functions within the classroom.

What follows in the remainder of this chapter is a summary and analysis of the test scores from the seventeen students identified as high performance writers. In this analysis, the focus is on the 1983-84 test where high performance writers clustered in two high performance classes. After the identification process for these writers is reviewed, the in-depth student interviews are presented and pertinent information from them summarized. Mode and content of instruction are explored through the teacher interviews and the document analysis. In some cases, mode and content of instruction are also described in the student interviews. A description of the relationship between high performance writing and mode and content of instruction concludes the chapter.
Identifying High Performance Writers

For each testing year, the holistic scores for the evaluated essays were grouped by teacher and class and listed on computer printouts. The mean score for each class was then tabulated. These tabulations were used to identify two high performing classes for the 1983-84 school year. A low mean indicated a high performing class since individual scores of 1 or 2 were defined as "high performance." Whenever these scores clustered, a low mean was established. Of the 201 classes tested during 1983-84, the two high performing classes selected for the study had two of the lowest mean scores of the entire population. In fact, one class had the lowest mean of the 201 classes tested. The second class selected had the fourth lowest mean of the 201 classes. Classes whose frequency was fewer than ten scored essays were not considered for the study. Every student in each of the high performance classes did not participate in the 1983-84 testing sample.

These two identified high performance classes included seventeen students whose essays received scores of 1 or 2 on the 1983-84 test. Class A had a mean of 2.05556 and included nine high performance writers. The remaining essays from this class all received scores of 3. Class B had a mean of 2.46567 and included eight high performance writers. The higher mean can be attributed to the other students in the class, all of whom had scores of three or higher. Class A had a total population of 19 students. Thirteen of the nineteen students completed the test and had their essays scored. Nine of the thirteen scored either a 1 or 2. In class B, fifteen students constituted the total student population.
All participated in the testing and eight of the fifteen scored either a 1 or 2 on the 1983-84 sample.

Table 2
High Performance Classes
1983-84 EECAP Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Class mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.05556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.28571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.39130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.40741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.46667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not meet the minimum class size frequency

**At the same high school

Of the seventeen high performance writers from both class A and B, three did not participate in the 1983-84 testing, and six of the writers did not participate in the 1984-85 testing. The high performance writers for this study were identified from the 1983-84 results for several reasons. First, the results from the two samples could be compared since 1982-83 was the first year of the project. Second, the data from the 1984-85 testing sample was not available until May 1985. As a result, the student subjects were about to graduate and could not have participated in an extended study. Consequently, the testing results
from 1982-83 were the only ones which could accommodate this study's research objectives.

Comparison of Results from Two Samples

Once the data was gathered and students and teachers identified, the interviews and observations began. After the study was in progress, scores from the previous year were gathered and compared to the 1983-84 results. Of the seventeen students identified as "high performance writers," fourteen participated in the 1982-83 testing sample. These fourteen students, therefore, have scored essays from both years, as tenth and eleventh graders. This two-year comparison is dramatic. Seven of the fourteen were not high performance writers during 1982-83 because of scores of either 3 or 4. Ten of the fourteen improved their scores on the 1984 test. Four of the fourteen had the same score for both test years. Of the ten writers who improved their scores between the testing samples, seven improved by one rating point, two by two rating points and one by three rating points. No high performance writer had the same writing teacher for both years of the comparison. These data alone suggest that particular factors promote an improved writing performance. The factors analyzed most prominently in this study are mode and content of instruction. Data from the student interviews elaborates on those factors, including content and mode of instruction, that influence writing performance.
Table 3
Holistic Scores for the High Performance Writers in Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Grades, 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1982-83 Score</th>
<th>1983-84 Score</th>
<th>1984-85 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The essays were scored on a 4 point scale, 4 is low performance and 1 is high performance.

**A 5 was automatically given to inappropriate or "no" response essays.
Comparison of Results from Three Samples

The results for the final year of testing, 1984-85, were gathered in the spring, 1985. These results were then compared to the previous two years. Six of the seventeen high performance writers did not participate in the final testing sample. Of the remaining eleven, ten were still identified as "high performance" because of scores of 1 or 2. The one student whose performance declined scored a 3 on the final sample and a 2 on the previous one. Nine of the eleven students maintained their high performance. One student maintained a high performance but had a 1 rating point decline from the previous sample.

Nine of the seventeen students participated in all three samples as tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders. Seven of these nine students improved their writing performance between the tenth and eleventh grade samples and eight of the nine maintained a high performance through the final testing sample in 1984-85. In the three years of testing, seven of the eight writers who maintained their high performance through the final year did not have high performance scores on the initial, tenth grade sample. Unquestionably, these data indicate that the second year of testing, 1983-84, was the significant testing sample, the year when most of the students improved their writing performance. Ten of the seventeen students in the high performance classes became high performance writers by the time the test was administered in January. The factors associated with this improvement are explored in this study through student interviews, teacher observations, and document analysis. The student interviews focused on the writers' processes as they integrated with the teachers' content and mode of instruction. Since the
1983-84 testing year yielded the most significant writing improvement, the mode and content during that important instructional time frame were essential for any descriptive analysis of the writing development of the seventeen high performance writers.

Seventeen High Performance High School Writers

Each student interview opened with two questions: 1) From beginning to end, how would you describe the process you follow to create a piece of writing? 2) What teacher(s) from grades 9-12 has had the most influence on your writing development? These interviews were conducted during a four month period and ranged from 20-50 minutes. No information was divulged which would shape the student responses. Prior to the interview each student was told that he or she had been identified as a high performance writer through the Columbus Public Schools/Ohio State University Writing Project. Probes were used to elicit additional information. These probes included clarification, amplification, and refocus (Guba and Lincoln, p. 179). The interviews were conducted at the school and always included only the student and interviewer. When permission was granted, the interview was audio taped. Extensive notes, including direct quotations, were recorded from each interview session. Information pertinent to the research problem has been summarized for each of the seventeen high performance high school writers who are identified by their first names. In essence, what follows describes seventeen maturing writers as they explain and try to understand the dynamics of a successful writing experience.
Robert was one of only five high performance writers to receive a 1 on his scored essay. Robert approached his writing seriously and methodically. He described his process as beginning with "five minutes of thinking." For Robert, the thinking assimilates ideas in his head. He then "jots down those ideas." From the jot list, he begins to write. He thinks in terms of a "thesis paragraph" and makes sure that thesis re-appears in some form near the end of the essay. Robert devotes much of his writing time to revision. He rereads his first complete draft and immediately makes spelling and grammatical corrections. He then searches for sentences "where I didn't clarify my thoughts." When those sentences are located "I add and delete things." When he "didn't state something quite right," he may elect "to go in more detail." Robert indicated that one of his important writing goals is to "try to say the most in the least amount of time and space." Robert used the term "writing process" and consistently stressed "revision" as the key to his writing success.

Robert credited several teachers for helping him to write effectively. These teachers included his European History teacher who made him read and then react as a thinker and his eleventh grade English teacher who provided feedback about the need for "a strong thesis." This same teacher helped Robert to "tighten up" his writing and to become a "better thinker" who writes in "logical steps" and pushes for "better original thoughts." More than any other high performance writer, Robert described writing in terms of thinking. In fact, Robert saw good writing as simply an exercise of good thinking.
#2 Jeff: Thinking Fast

Jeff begins by writing a "rough draft." He will "revise the rough draft while writing it, especially making changes in sentences." He will then "edit this draft." Jeff makes a distinction between editing and revising. To Jeff, revising is confined to the sentence level and includes diction, grammar, and punctuation changes. Editing involves more substantive changes that may include major idea alterations, changes which could even shift the essay's focus.

Jeff begins fast by thinking as he writes, a kind of free writing strategy to get started. Although he does not give primary credit for his writing success to classroom instruction, he did single out his eleventh grade teacher for making him conscious of his vocabulary and mechanics and the "jot list." This "jot list" was a strategy to begin a paper when he could not immediately begin drafting. He writes "however many drafts needed" but usually will always "move on to a second draft." Jeff was a high performance writer for the tenth and eleventh grade testing samples, with scores of 2 both years, but was the only student to receive a 3 on the final, twelfth grade sample.

#3 Thomas: Talking Like a Writer

Thomas discussed his writing as would a mature, well-seasoned writer. He also spoke by using a combination of writer and writing process terminology:

I go through a bit of prewriting. I brainstorm; it brings out the sketchy with no organization to it. Few items I find. Those that strike me are often enough to start a more detailed subject.
Thomas also spoke of the "evil twists" of the first draft. "Often I find myself in love with the first draft." He described this draft as "something wonderful" that always "surprises me." He usually writes, however, several drafts. "My first draft is marked up with changes." "I clean things up in the second draft." Thomas describes writing as hard by the third draft. Thomas was one of the few students to speak of the audience. "I've never found the courage to publish. There is a fear of scrutiny by those who might not understand, those who might understand and find fault."

Asked if any teacher had influenced his writing, he gave most of the credit to his eleventh grade teacher. "One thing she did was editing by other people. She seemed to have far more knowledge than any other teacher I've had." Thomas also greatly appreciated this teacher's evaluation of his papers: "Her comments on the paper hit directly on the faults and good points as well. The first directness I'd seen." Thomas viewed this teacher not as a teacher but as a reader-audience. "I had to have her as an audience and I actually enjoyed that audience."

Thomas received a 3 on his tenth grade scored essay and a 1 on his eleventh grade essay. The holistic trainers selected Thomas's essay as an anchor paper to train teachers. As a model for a 1 essay, Thomas's paper represented one of the best performances of the 4000 plus participating eleventh graders.

#4 David: Being Selective

David's process is always initiated by "considering the topic." After this consideration, "Then I just start writing whatever I feel is relevant." David spoke of the next stage as "being selective."
"Basically I search for the deepest feelings or the most instant response. David was one of the few writers to associate feelings and the writing act. These feelings often extend to the required topic: "Writing on a required topic is a hindrance but can also be an inspiration."

The control for David's classroom writing came from his tenth grade teacher. "I learned something from the writing process even though from a horrible teacher." David described this process as "starting with basic ideas, narrowing those to a thesis, writing a first draft, then continuous revision until you are required to turn it in." David described his eleventh grade teacher as "again teaching the writing process" but that "she gave much more freedom." Although David is grateful for having learned about the writing process, he stated that "I almost feel that I could have written just as well without the classes or teachers."

Finally, as an afterthought, David explained why many students don't write well: "A lot of programs and curricula are made with people who don't have the motivation or intelligence." David did not complete the test in tenth grade but scored a 1 on both the eleventh and twelfth grade samples. His essay was used as an anchor paper in eleventh grade as an example of the best writing in the entire test population.

#5 Laurie: Listening to the Teacher

Whereas David was suspicious of classroom instruction, Laurie followed it methodically. She always tried to apply what she was taught including a composing process which she found successful. This process always began with "jotting down ideas" to form what she called a "jot list." She would then peruse the list "to see what I like best." Her
choices became sentences which evolved into a rough draft. From this point, Laurie would "revise until I liked it." Revision was important to Laurie and was one way she compensated for a lack of "natural writing talent." Laurie methodically and consistently applied this process strategy. Her persistence paid off as she received scores of 2 on both the tenth and eleventh grade writing tests.

Laurie appreciated what she was taught by her tenth and eleventh grade teachers. She credited her tenth grade teacher for introducing the "jot list" to her and "for the way I write now." Her strongest and most extended praise, however, is for her eleventh grade teacher "who showed me how to revise." Laurie emphasized that this teacher always "gave me all kinds of ideas how to improve the paper." Like many students, Laurie commented that she didn't know how to revise. This teacher taught her the importance of revision. "I'd quit after the second draft had it not been for her."

#6 Steve: Trying to be Satisfied

On all three testing samples, Steve received a 2. He was the only high performance writer of this group to establish such consistency. Steve described his process as beginning with a "jot list" where he "gets ideas down on paper." He indicated that he may opt to "freewrite" as a device to get started. In both cases, he emphasized that the material "may not then be organized" but that he will "go from there and expand." The expansion and rewriting usually takes "two or three drafts." Even with the final draft, Steven states "I'm never really satisfied with it."
The most important instruction for Steve came in eleventh grade. His teacher was important to him because he "evaluated papers and projects draft by draft and helped us improve." This teacher also introduced Steve to peer editing which Steve regarded as a tool to improve his writing. It "helped a lot—if your peers like it; it must be pretty good." For Steve, good writing takes "practice" and practicing is the best advice he could give to those other students who want to improve.

#7 Benjamin: Discovering Freedom

Benjamin always begins a writing assignment by thinking. "I think about it a little while" and then "I do a jot list." He then expands the jot list with other ideas but doesn't "characterize them." The first draft derives from the expanded list. "I'm a pretty good first draft writer" because "when I start to write things begin to flow." Benjamin stated that "Sometimes I stick to my jot list pretty closely." He then begins revising. "Before I proofread, I revise." To Benjamin, proofreading is for "tightening." He usually will write two drafts but "I was taught to revise three drafts."

Benjamin provided fascinating insight about this classroom instruction. Liberation came for Benjamin when he was in eleventh grade where his teacher "Let me be more free with my writing." Benjamin further described this freedom. "We had assignments, but I was never smothered in any way." Benjamin also liked the evaluations of his papers. "She offered good advice but it didn't take away from your original work." This same teacher encouraged Benjamin "not to be afraid to be more lengthy" and "encouraged me to use the skills I've already learned." In essence, "she encouraged me to be a better writer." The teacher was a
thoughtful audience for Benjamin who greatly appreciated her understanding of him as a writer. "She seemed to understand why I wrote whatever it was the way I did." Benjamin's liberation and confidence-building in eleventh grade paid off. The previous year he had scored a 3 on his writing test, a mediocre to low performance. He became a "high performance" writer in both eleventh and twelfth grades with scores of 2.

#8 Alex: Trying to Make it a Little Bizarre

According to Alex, he writes in two modes: one is serious and the other is not. For Alex a "serious" paper is written for the classroom. The other writing is more personal, more reflexive. "I start with whatever comes into mind; I try to be a little silly." Alex always discussed his writing in relationship to a broader audience, one beyond the teacher. I try to write something that I'd like to read and I try to make it a little bizarre." Violence is often a motif, according to Alex, in his work. "Violence is something that everyone can understand." For "serious" papers, Alex stated that he uses a "jot list" or even a "mental jot list." This list will lead to a "sentence outline" and to a first draft. "The second draft is more clarification than revision." Also in the second draft he will edit "for punctuation and spelling." Usually, Alex indicated he will complete a third draft which will be the one turned in to the teacher.

The teacher "who gave me the forms" was his most influential. This eleventh grade teacher "gave me what I need for technical writing." Revision was the teacher's emphasis. "We had four, five, six papers, and he went through the steps with us. Before that I hardly ever revised." Alex attributes songs, journals, ninth grade and his eleventh grade
teacher for influencing his writing. This unusual young man likes to write, and he is intensely aware of his audience. Alex spoke of "technical writing" and "forms" as appropriate for the classroom audience and "the bizarre" that "shocks" and is "silly" for writing which is shared but not evaluated. Alex also took pride in his other forms of writing, especially his poetry. What he learned in eleventh grade was how to have a controlled creativity which considered both the audience and the purpose of the assignment. More importantly, he learned to "revise papers more." Something he had never done before.

#9 Stacy: Incubating for a Few Days

From the description of her composing process, incubation is an important element. The incubation begins at the outset when Stacy stated, "I think about it for a little while." After this "thinking time," she starts to organize. "Then I write down a real, real rough, rough draft." Stacy then incubates some more. "I wait a few days" and "go back to it several times and read it." Stacy will then revise by "adding new ideas." "After that, I just keep rewriting and rereading it, crossing out things." Stacy's strategies change depending on her interest in the assignment, her personal investment in the paper. "If I'm interested in a paper, I usually do three or four drafts." On the other hand, Stacy indicated that she writes only one draft if the assignment does not provoke her interest.

Stacy chose her tenth grade teacher as her most influential, not because of his enthusiastic teaching, but because "he taught me the basics, the writing process and stuff." Stacy defined the writing process as jot listing, writing multiple drafts, and editing. During
grades eleven and twelve, Stacy told of her "blank out" period. She did not attend many classes and did not involve herself in the academic program. Despite this unproductive period, Stacy was able to score a 2 on her eleventh grade writing test. She attributes this success to what she learned as a tenth grader, "the writing process and stuff." Stacy's course grades reflect the difference between her tenth and eleventh grade years. She received an "A" in English in tenth grade and an "F" for the eleventh grade year.

#10 Jeri: Searching for the Reality Situation

Linking her personal experience to the required assignment is an important writing strategy for Jeri. "First," she stated, "I think about it, about the subject." Jeri continued, "I try to put it in a reality situation: Has this ever happened in my life?" Jeri characterizes her approach to writing as that of a "realist." She stated that as she is thinking and a "thought hits me, I just start writing." Jeri writes multiple drafts, usually two or three, and then seeks an informed audience for reaction to her work. "I give it to someone for an opinion, usually my mom" or "I may let students or peers read it to see what they think." Jeri especially appreciates her Mom's opinion about her work. "When I was younger, my Mom talked to me a lot and I was more mature than my other friends, and I had more experience. I can write about them. I can look at things and think more logically about them."

Jeri selected her eleventh grade teacher as her "most effective writing teacher" because of "her way of teaching the class." Jeri elaborated. "Her personality has a lot to do with it—something about her that makes you think she cares about you. Takes a lot of time to
work with you." Jeri also emphasized "She makes things not easy but you want to do them out of enjoyment." Jeri became a high performance writer with the eleventh grade sample. She had received a 3 on the tenth grade sample and described her writing instruction during that year as not especially memorable other than the teacher "expected more out of her." Several times Jeri returned to the idea of experience and the importance of it to her writing. Using personal experience as the catalyst for her writing made the writing experience a real one for her.

\#11 Dominique: Thinking of a Painting

Painting and writing involve similar processes according to Dominique. In both cases, she stated, "You get general ideas" and then go about executing those ideas as an artistic expression of your thinking. Specifically, her actual writing begins with a "jot list" which evolves into a rough draft. The rough draft is then revised. The revised draft then sits while "I wait a day or two" to do research to get a better idea of what I'm doing." Dominique did not describe research in a formal sense. Rather, research is more focused thinking about the revised draft or a kind of informal information-gathering. For some assignments, Dominique does not write multiple drafts. These are the assignments which she "whips out." When she wants a quality product, however, and with a paper which has "interested and excited her," she writes four drafts.

The teachers who influenced her writing development included two in her eleventh grade. She did not like her tenth grade teacher because he "goes directly by the book and is more concerned with getting the work done." She stated nonetheless, that this same teacher did teach
her about the "process of writing," "jot listing," and drafting.
Dominique reserved her praise for the eleventh grade teachers, one of
whom taught her much vocabulary and the other who taught her "quality
writing." She singles out this latter teacher as more "interested in
meaning" than in "formality and techniques." In short, Dominique viewed
this teacher as interacting with her as a writer and not as a teacher
who "went by the book." Dominique received a 5 score on the tenth grade
sample and a 2 on both eleventh and twelfth grade writing tests.

#12 Caroline: Moving Beyond a Structure

In describing her composing process, Caroline will "think of topics
to write on." She will then "take notes on a jot list" or "sometimes I
just freewrite for the rough draft." From the rough draft, Caroline will
revise more and edit. She defined editing as "Take out parts, add
parts." This process, according to Caroline, has recently been altered.
Her writing development has moved her away from the structure which she
was taught and applied. "Usually, I would have notes, jot listing, and
a rough draft . . . but I haven't done that for a year now." The jot
list has been eliminated as she begins with a rough draft and then revises
on that copy. Usually, Caroline will write, according to her accounts,
two or three drafts.

Pondering who most influenced her writing, she thought it should
probably be her tenth grade teacher who "was the first to go through all
the parts of the paper but he was boring." Caroline then considered two
eleventh grade teachers and concluded that the one "real critical of
everybody's work" was the most influential. "He's made me realize what
I can improve," she stated. "It makes you work harder on the paper when
your teacher is a hard grader." She also gave credit to her other eleventh grade teacher but because the course was an independent study her interaction with the teacher was less frequent than in her regular English class. Caroline received a 1 on her eleventh grade writing sample. She received a 2 score on the tenth and twelfth grade essays.

#13 Sharon: Compressing the Process

Between her sophomore and junior years, Sharon's scored essay would reflect considerable improvement. In the tenth grade, Sharon a 4 on the essay and in the eleventh grade she scored a 2. Sharon develops a piece of writing by first thinking and then by "writing down whatever I'm thinking about" as it relates to the assigned topic. She will use this "thinking draft" as the one to revise. She will then "just try to arrange it and then copy it over." Sharon, therefore, greatly compresses the process but will "usually write two drafts."

In describing her writing teachers, Sharon provided some insight into her improvement. It was in the eleventh grade, the year she became a high performance writer, she "started liking writing" and "when I got into poetry." She regarded her tenth grade teacher as influencing her writing the most and for motivating her to write. "He just encouraged me a lot. He would praise what he liked. He gave a lot of writing assignments." Sharon especially pointed out the journal as an important assignment. The journal helped her to enjoy writing more and encouraged her, like the teacher, to write more and about topics that made writing meaningful.
Anthony became a "high performance" writer during the eleventh grade. He received a 3 score on the previous year's essay. At length, Anthony discussed the composing process which was the most successful for him. Consistently, he reiterated that "my writing process is not rigid." He will sometimes begin with what he called a "partial outline." He was, however, critical of those teachers who require detailed outlines. Anthony's rationale was simple: "you cannot have the whole picture in your head before its done." For Anthony, his papers evolve. "I generated ideas as I write. These ideas are eventually generated into a rough draft which leads, usually, to two or three or even four drafts. Anthony described the first draft as "really a jumble of ideas but not a disconnected jumble." The second draft is "filled with carets where I have inserted things." The third draft would often be typed on the word processor and all the "careted insertions" placed smoothly in the text.

Anthony had some difficulty determining his most influential writing teacher. His twelfth grade teacher was praised for reinforcing "jot listing" and "brainstorming." Also, peer editing was used in her class and Anthony's second draft was the one usually judged by his peers. This teacher, however, taught a "more rigid style of writing" which included a required outline. The teacher's emphasis on revision was her strength. The teacher who Anthony finally designated as the most effective was his eleventh grade instructor. This teacher encouraged him to "freewrite" in class. According to Anthony, the freewrites "taught me not to be conservative." In addition, he helped Anthony to generate ideas and "forced me to produce."
writing instruction, Anthony concluded that his eleventh grade teacher "had a good effect on me." Anthony's score in tenth grade indicated that he was not a high performance writer. He improved his score in eleventh grade and feels that the score reflected his writing improvement.

#15 Cheryl: Thinking with "Quick Writing"

Cheryl was another student writer who scored a 3 on her tenth grade essay and became "high performance" during her eleventh grade when her essay was scored 2. By her own evaluation, Cheryl does not perceive herself as an above average writer. She does, however, feel that she is aware of strategies that, when applied, can make her "usually pretty happy with the final paper." Topics are important to Cheryl's productivity. She stated that "if a topic interests me, touches me ... I can do a really good job." Once Cheryl has the topic, she begins by "thinking about how I want to do it." In the next stage she may do what she termed "research," information-gathering designed to add substance to her writing. Her first draft is what she called "quick writing" which "basically gets my thoughts down." After this "quick writing," Cheryl will "go back and change words around, fill-in words." These changes then evolve into her second draft. Usually, stated Cheryl, "I will go through it again to the final draft." In sum, she normally writes three drafts.

The two teachers whose instruction most influenced Cheryl were her eleventh and twelfth grade English teachers. The twelfth grade teacher stood out to Cheryl because "She gave me a lot of help" and said "a lot of positive things about my papers." As an afterthought, Cheryl indicated that a history not English teacher really influenced her writing
the most. This teacher taught her "where to put the thesis and how to get into details." She also had praise for her eleventh grade English teacher who made her write multiple drafts and follow a cycle which included "writing-rewriting-writing-rewriting." From Cheryl's own analysis, she has benefited greatly from classroom instruction and is a competent writer only because several teachers provided her with strategies that she was then able to link to her own composing process.

#16 Joel: Finding a Thesis

Joel's essay scores from the three year sample would indicate that he has mastered "academic writing." During his sophomore year, Joel scored a 2 on the writing test. In succeeding years, as an eleventh and twelfth grader, Joel was one of the few students in the entire population to score a 1 for both samples. Joel's approach to writing is methodical and is guided by a thesis statement. After "deciding what to write," Joel stated that he will "find a thesis." After the thesis is identified, Joel establishes a "jot list" and then narrows the list by "finding things important" on it. The "important things" are then organized into paragraphs "to support the thesis." The final task in this draft is "to write a conclusion." Joel emphasized that he "always writes multiple drafts." In fact, regardless of the assignment, Joel always writes several drafts to refine his work.

Without hesitation, Joel selected his eleventh grade teacher as the one who has most contributed to his writing success. She was especially good "for creative writing, all that fun stuff." She introduced Joel to "writing dialogue" and "interesting things that have happened to you." She encouraged several drafts and "definitely talked of writing as a
process." Although Joel described his own process as a recursive rather than linear strategy, he noted that the "plan" he applied always main­tained the same form even though the stages of the plan came at differ­ent intervals. Joel reiterated the importance to him of "finding the thesis" as a way to organize and direct his thinking through all of the paper's drafts.

#17 Lawrence: Waiting Before Writing

Lawrence begins most of his writing with a "jot list." The list is used to formulate the first draft. After a first draft has been as­sembled, Lawrence referred to a period of inactivity where he moves from the paper and back to his thinking about it. He described con­templating what he had written in the first draft and what he needs to change. No actual writing takes place during this stage. Yet Lawrence's process is neither dormant nor stymied. Rather the time away from the actual writing of the paper permits him, in a sense, to compose another draft in his head. Once the thinking is completed, he will return to write again and usually compose a second draft. When this draft has been completed, Lawrence will again "wait for a day or so" before he completes the final draft. The final draft becomes, therefore, a com­pilation of the "interim thinking" and the notes on each draft that this thinking has motivated.

Lawrence asserted that teachers were responsible for helping him to formulate and apply useful writing techniques. Specifically he pointed to "brainstorming" as the "most important lesson." He was also taught to write more than one draft and indicated that the writing process was "really stressed." Two teachers during his junior year were noted as
influencing his writing productivity. One of the teachers helped him with "brainstorming processes" and to see writing as "trial and error." The other provided "creative options: and did not do "fill in the blanks" all of the time. This teacher also went over papers with students but was more of a "guide on a path" who suggested where the paper may be "goofed up."

A Summary: The Composing Processes of High Performance High School Writers

The interviews of the seventeen high performance high school writers elicited descriptions which are noteworthy because of their consistency. This consistency extended even to the process terminology that was used by the students for their descriptive analyses. Although some consistency had been anticipated, the extent of the descriptive uniformity was quite unforeseen. It should again be emphasized that these interviews occurred in isolation, one from the other. The same two questions, without exception, were asked of each student. A summary of the significant data from the interviews may yield important insights into high performance writing. These data includes the following:

1. All seventeen students described writing multiple drafts, usually two or three and as many as five.
2. Five of the seventeen students described in some way the importance of connecting personally with the writing assignment.
3. Seven of the seventeen students described a quiet thinking period which was required before any actual writing could take place. This solo thinking extended from a few minutes to five days and always came before the first draft and sometimes prior to the revision of a second or third draft. These seven students characterized this solo-thinking as a time where the topic and self came together to form an idea strategy that made actual writing possible.

4. Ten of the seventeen high performance writers referred to a "jot list" and used this exact term in doing so. These students defined a jot list as a written idea list or brainstorming device which is a by-product of solo thinking.

5. Four students used the terminology "writing process," three the term "brainstorming," and four referred to some form of "freewriting."

6. Two of the seventeen students specifically described a "thesis" as a prewriting organizational device.

7. Twelve of the seventeen students had received a grade of C or lower in one high school English course. Eight of the seventeen students had received a grade of D or F in one high school English course in either tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades.
8. Many of the students described effective instruction as emphasizing multiple drafts, evaluating critically and specifically without overlooking the need for positive input and encouragement, providing help for generating ideas, permitting the freedom to think and write creatively while responding more to the thought than the form in which it is presented, designing writing assignments that focus on the writer-as-person rather than more generic assignments whose focus is the writer-as-writer, providing opportunities for peer editing, formally teaching writing as a process but encouraging individualized and idiosyncratic application of that process in practice.

9. Fourteen of the seventeen high performance writers selected one of the two teachers from the two high performance classes as the high school teacher whose writing instruction was most significant to their writing development and success.

10. Not one student listed grammar instruction as important to writing.

11. In selecting their most effective teachers, only one student noted "marking mechanics" as important to her writing performance and development.
Teacher Interviews: Teaching High Performance High School Writers

The seventeen high performance high school writers were students in two classes at a small, urban high school in Columbus, Ohio. This high school was one of sixteen that participated in the Columbus Public Schools/Ohio State University Writing Program. These two classes had two of the lowest mean scores of all the 201 classes tested in the 1983-84 sample. Class A had a total of nineteen students, thirteen of whom had essays scored for this particular sample. The mean score for class A was 2.05556. Class B included fifteen students, all of whom had essays scored for the sample. The mean for class B was 2.46567. These mean scores ranked class A at the top of all classes tested. When classes were eliminated which did not meet this study's numerical criterion for "class," class B had the fourth lowest mean of all classes tested. Unquestionably, the seventeen high performance writers clustered in these two classes are responsible for the low mean class scores.

Each high performance writer was asked during the interview to name the teacher, 9-12, who had most influenced his or her writing development. Fourteen of the seventeen students named one of the two, and sometimes both, high performance class teachers. These two teachers had been originally identified from low mean class scores. During the interviewing process, no specific teacher was ever named by the interviewer. All seventeen students volunteered the names of teachers whom they regarded as influential to their writing development. The two names that were noted by fourteen of the seventeen students were Fran and Kevin. Because of the exceptionally low mean scores of two of their
Intermediate Composition classes, Fran and Kevin were selected as the teacher subjects for this study. Their selection was reinforced by the fourteen students who named them as effective writing teachers. In order to determine the content and mode of instruction that made them successful writing teachers, Fran and Kevin were extensively interviewed. Instructional documents and multiple class observations were additional methodological tools applied to this study's research. The interviews took place during conference periods and after school and were usually taped. Each teacher was interviewed separately and without the participation of anyone else except the interviewer. The interviews spanned a period beginning in January 1985, and ending in late March 1985. Each interview was 15 to 90 minutes in length. The interviews were unstructured but did include probe questions intended to clarify, amplify, or to provide critical awareness. The combined interviews elicited information on a wide variety of topics. These topics included essay evaluation, personal background and professional training, and theoretical evolution. Kevin and Fran also discussed teaching goals and objectives, career goals, and classroom management philosophies. In the next two sections of the study, pertinent information from the interviews is summarized. This information is presented separately for each teacher and includes direct quotations to amplify or reinforce major pedagogical perspectives, especially those related to content and mode of instruction.
Fran: A Philosophy and Style in Transition

After thirteen years of teaching experience, Fran continues to evolve as an educator in general and a writing teacher in particular. Fran has taught at several different schools and currently teaches at a city high school where she has been on the faculty for five years. She describes her educational philosophy as "dynamic." She extends this definition to state: "Education should foster students' ability to create a life as it necessarily exists. Education should be a mentally liberating act. It should be balanced between self and other centeredness." She characterizes her teaching philosophy as "whatever works." This pragmatism does not, however, exclude theory where she emphasized, "there is always great room for theory." She cited the "writing process" as an especially good example of joining theory and practice. Fran did emphasize her disdain for "straight ivory tower" and suggested that "trial and error" and "asking kids" is sometimes more successful than what the "ivory tower" might suggest.

By her own admission, Fran is currently "in a transition now" with her teaching style. She is "trying to make class less teacher-centered" but feels she is not "there yet cause I'm not sure how much 'control' is desirable to let go of." She does consider herself "organized and energetic." She stated that "I like class to be a relaxed yet purposeful place where people share opinions and ideas." Her goal is to "demystify knowledge." She indicated that she is headed towards what she hopes is a more "dialectic in class." This evolution includes "listening harder and asking better questions." Both of these goals reinforce Fran's belief in what she calls "a sense of the personal." This sense was
reflected in her classroom by board messages to her students such as one which stated "Have a Great Week." Also, the first week of her course is devoted to developing a "comfort zone" for her students. Her students will bring something from home to contribute to the classroom decoration. "We do it together." They then receive an information packet with a syllabus and a writing questionnaire. Class activities during this week are designed to familiarize the students with her and each other. Ultimately, Fran wants to show to students, "I care." Fran also wants her students to feel comfortable which she thinks is reflected in her "comfortable" teaching style. With some hyperbole, she stated, "I'm usually a mess."

In comparing her teaching style and philosophy to the other high performance class teacher, Kevin, Fran indicated "His philosophy is probably more academic." She added that "he is more positivistic." She also characterized his teaching style as being "probably more teacher-centered which I'm trying to move away from." Specifically, she saw Kevin in the classroom as a "ham" who has a "sense of humor" and who "likes to be in front of a class." Because of his academic approach, the perception of Kevin, according to Fran, is that he is less affective than she. She disagrees with this perception: "I know he is every bit as concerned about their [students] emotional selves."

After many weeks of interviews and observations of Fran's classes, the researcher discovered that she had been a "coresearcher" for a 1980 doctoral dissertation. This dissertation, authored by Charles Edelsberg, was entitled "A Collaborative Study of Student Writers' Uses of Teacher Evaluation." Dynamic growth is Fran Spratley's professional theme.
Thus, transition and evolution are inextricably woven throughout her professional life. As an illustration of this theme, and its persistence, Edelsberg wrote in 1980:

From the very first mention of my plan to inquire into the classroom teaching of writing, Fran expressed an interest in participating in the research. She openly welcomed the opportunity to collaborate in systematic study of one of her classes. Although she did not help to formulate the research problem, Fran indicated the desire to examine any facet of classroom life that could lead to new insight into student experience of her writing curriculum (1980, pp. 102-103).

"Teaching Writing in the Secondary Schools" was the title of a course which was supposed to shape Fran's own writing instruction. This 1972 course included nothing about what is now called the writing process since the Emig study had been only recently published. Like many teachers throughout America, Fran had not been introduced to process strategies in her own education and this university course was no exception. "There was no change in how I was taught to write." This course and other university training did not provide "a change in vision of writing or how it was done." She left this class and the university "without any clear cut idea of how to teach writing other than how I had always learned it." As she began to teach herself, "I would teach some aspects of grammar and structure and those kinds of things and would usually begin with paragraph writing, thinking that's the way you did it." Unfortunately, what she started seeing early on was "that it
just didn't work," but "I didn't know what to do about it." "New insight" guides and motivates Fran's teaching philosophy and style. A similar "new insight" also reshaped her writing curriculum. For Fran this too was an experience which involved both transition and evolution.

Fran: The Evolution of a Writing Teacher

As a writing teacher, Fran's evolution has been as dynamic as her educational philosophy. She is even able to remember years, events, and people who contributed to the change that constitutes her current pedagogy. She began teaching in the fall, 1973, "what I was taught in high school." What she was taught included grammar, sentence construction, paragraph writing, and sentence types. She saw "early on" that this content "didn't work." Students responded to her instruction but wrote "boy scout" papers which were "empty, circular, cold." Their writing was often "correct" but had "no voice." About this same time, Fran was introduced to journals through her professional reading and through journals "found out about the life" of her students. Suddenly, student writing had voice and "took on more meaning." She then began to use ideas from the journals as a basis for class writing assignments.

The success of journals in Fran's writing classroom motivated her to seek other useful techniques to improve student writing. In the fall of 1979, a student teacher's arrival on the scene provided her the time to explore theoretical perspectives for teaching writing. Her exploration led her to the research literature and theorists such as Shaughnessy, Emig, Britton, Murray, Graves, and to her "guru," Macrorie.
After her reading, Fran described the outcome as "like throwing these people in a blender and then synthesizing." For her, Macrorie emerged as the most influential because of his "helping circle for peer revision." This "helping circle" was implemented in Fran's classroom as a kind of group peer revision. At this point, Fran said she was discovering "pieces of process," a pedagogy made well-known by Janet Emig's *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. Increasingly, Fran became "excited about the information coming out of scholarly journals." As a result of this information and research literature which she had read, Fran set down to revamp her writing pedagogy. This transition period convinced her of a number of important changes for her writing classroom:

1. Topics for essays should be student-generated.
2. Students should be provided with written models.
3. Drafting should be emphasized.
4. Peer editing (critics circle) is a valuable teaching tool.
5. Students should be regarded as writers.

For Fran, "the results of figuring all of this out were staggering." The results from the students were equally surprising. Students became excited about their writing and their "writing was more lively." The "final vision," however, came in the summer of 1982 when Fran and thirty other teachers attended a summer institute designed to prepare them for a Mastery Education project. This institute, sponsored by Ohio State and the Columbus Public Schools, formed the basis for what would eventually lead to a competency education program in Columbus. More immediately, the institute's participants were responsible for designing a course of
study called "The Writing Process." This booklet was to be distributed to every Columbus high school teacher and was preliminary preparation for the 1983 testing of 4,000 Columbus tenth graders.

The thirty teachers who participated in the summer institute were being prepared to teach writing more effectively and to help their colleagues do the same. The Columbus Public Schools were about to embark on a Mastery Education Program which would implement holistic scoring as the assessment tool for writing. This program would evolve into competency-based testing as the state of Ohio had mandated it. Fran understood these issues and knew the reasons for teachers being trained to teach writing more effectively. Like the other institute participants, Fran was not prepared for the "final vision" that transformed her writing instruction for years to come. This "vision" was not limited to Fran. The institute divided the middle and high school participants into two groups. One group had course work for two intensive weeks and the other group had the same work spread over a five week period. After the course, all participants were paid to complete projects useful for all Columbus's, secondary writing teachers. These projects included integrating textbooks used in Columbus secondary schools with Columbus's graded course of study. The final product of this effort was a booklet called "The Writing Process" which was used by Columbus's teacher-authors to in-service high school English teachers throughout the city.

Prior to developing this booklet Fran and her other colleagues were "thoroughly indoctrinated" in what she terms "process." This was a theoretical shift for language arts in Columbus and, according to Fran, probably in response to "low test scores" and the Columbus commitment to
use writing samples for competency testing. Regardless, the "process indoctrination" excited Fran and her colleagues to the point that she and others described the experience in almost mystical terms. The process included prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. The "process" is described by Fran as a "turning wheel which is always recursive." The wheel "can rock" and "the most recursive aspects are from prewriting through drafting and revision." She provided as an illustration that "you get into a draft and at any time you reread and think you are prewriting again." As a result, a process approach for teaching writing has thoroughly enveloped Fran's writing classroom. "I've been doing a writing process approach ever since" and "I'm at the point now that I'm so wrapped up in drafting and rewriting that I never have enough time to do enough editing." For emphasis, Fran indicated that "I do believe in Standard Edited American English." At this point in her evolution, Fran feels frustrated that she is unable to devote more time to editing and publishing.

In spite of this frustration, Fran described the process pedagogy which she now applies in her writing classroom as making her "so much happier, so much more contented." She also stated that she is "so much more sure that what I'm doing is a tangible process that works and still needs refinement but that's good, solid." Returning to the "workshop institute" that changed her direction, Fran said "we were deeply placed in the process; we had to write." It was for her, "a real learning experience" so powerful that when people shared their "writing gems," the catharsis of the shared writing experience "brought tears" to many in the group. Fran attributed the emotional nature of the experience to
watching the writing process as it functioned from paper to paper and from person to person. "We had watched the evolution from people's ideas to drafts to this to that to that power."

More than anything else, Fran added, she is "convinced that you've really got to have the immediate feedback and when you know that as a writer and feel it as a writer then you can constantly keep in touch with how important it [feedback] is for students as writers." The feedback "has got to be hot or I don't care." Relating her own process to her student writers provided Fran with the concrete strategies which she implemented in her classroom. Peer evaluation became an important device for immediate feedback, the "hot" element in Fran's own composing process.

Getting in touch with her own writing has helped her to better understand how it should be taught. She "does practice what she preach-es." As a writer, "I do a great deal of prewriting in my head." She then, "commits a mental outline to paper." She may think "in the car or in the shower." Thus, the mental outline "is in my head for a long time." She also provides her students with this "thinking time", the time for a "mental outline." Emphatically she stated, "I tell students about upcoming assignments one and two weeks in advance, always." She then will tell them, "to start thinking about it" and will even permit them to work with a "mental outline" which they never write on paper. Students, she indicated, will often ask her "Do we have to do a jot list if we can already do our own ideas in our head?" For these students, obviously familiar with process, no "jot list" is required. Her theme in these classes is the same for her own writing: "The writing process
is there to help not to hang up." Her advice to student writers is to utilize the process as it best works for them. "If you can skip a part of it, skip it," she tells her classes "but don't skip it if you haven't given it an honest try or because you haven't given it an honest try or because you're lazy."

Fran once wrote about her approach to teaching writing as it has now evolved and used an "archeological" metaphor to make her point:

I have taught writing before, and although I have much to learn in each new circumstance, I can bring to my students my collective experience such as it exists at the time. The site, of course, is themselves. The search, of course, is for themselves. Writing is the digging tool; the earth, individual consciousness embedded in human creativity.

Each student who is willing to cultivate the patience required of the process peels back layers of self. Students help one another--discuss each others' work, rewrite idea after idea discovered by one, common to all, which excites and may lead to deepended self-knowledge (Edelsberg, 1982).

The "collective experience" of Fran enriched and extended her evolution as a writing teacher. From teaching "grammar and structure and those kind of things" in 1972 to what she termed "process" in 1985 reflects not only a personal journey but also a professional one. She is "so much happier, so much more contented." Fran's theoretical shift is parallel to a similar one in schools and universities throughout the nation. At
the time Emig's study refocused the emphasis to "process," Fran was discover­ ing that her writing instruction "just didn't work." Her shift to a process pedagogy altered this sense of failure. She is now confident of her instruction. She fused theory and practice into a working relationship and produced a high performance writing class with a significant cluster of high performance writers, most all of whom credit Fran for their improvement and success.

Kevin: An Idea-Centered Philosophy and Style

Kevin has taught for ten and one-half years in three high schools in Columbus. He has been at his current high school for the past four and one-half years. Kevin's university training was at Ohio State where he received both his undergraduate and graduate degrees. Like his colleague, Fran, Kevin's educational philosophies and instructional strategies have evolved throughout his teaching career. Also like Fran, Kevin seeks professional growth and probes for information and ideas which will make him more effective in the classroom. This probing led both Kevin and Fran to a reassessment of their writing instruction and is ongoing in shaping and refining their educational philosophies.

Kevin views himself as a "student-oriented teacher." He is, however, realistic enough to admit, "but not enough as I would like to be." Kevin does not want to teach "warm bodies" but would rather teach "individuals." He strives to improve his teaching in order to accomplish this goal: "I want to be better--to help more individuals." Helping individuals may, for Kevin, involve bending the rules "when I can." Helping and teaching the student may sometimes come in conflict. As a result, Kevin has "wrestled" with the issue of grades and how arbitrary they should be
assigned to student work. He realizes that grades are important "in terms of self-esteem." He also realizes, however, that a grade should credibly reflect an academic outcome. He indicated that he is probably perceived as a "hard grader" but still sometimes struggles with the grading issue. For now, "I don't know how to do it better than I'm doing it."

The thought that Kevin has devoted to his grading philosophy is typical of his educational approach. His professional maturation has always indicated thoughtful reassessment of the content and mode of his instruction. Often this reassessment is based on new information and ideas which he has processed from colleagues, students, workshops, or university courses. Kevin seeks new ideas and will risk using them in his classroom.

By his own characterization, Kevin is "idea-centered." This attribute underscores his classroom philosophy. "Not that I don't focus on skills but I want people to learn how to think." For students, this thinking requires them to "make sense of abstractions in a concrete way." Thus, the assignments he gives are never "busy work", but are what he described as "relevant assignments." Many of these assignments have been designed for two courses, Intermediate Composition and AP Literature and Composition. Both of these courses emphasize writing. Kevin has taught writing to several ability levels.

Kevin's educational philosophy differs from Fran's more in style than substance. Both are "more comfortable with upper classmen." Yet, both also agree that at this time, Fran is probably more student-centered than Kevin. Both "enjoy being in the classroom" where each has a dominating sense of humor. Fran indicated that she appears to be more student-centered but that Kevin "is every bit as concerned about their emotional selves." Both admit to being pragmatic and to using
"what works." Both also described their writing instruction in terms of "an evolution." Fran's "final vision" in this evolutionary search came at a summer workshop where she and thirty other English teachers had an "intensive immersion in the composing process." Kevin was one of those other teachers, and it was at this same time that he became "a born again process teacher."

Kevin: A "Born Again" Process Teacher

As a writing teacher, Kevin's evolution was not unlike the one described by Fran. "I never felt that I was not prepared to teach writing," Kevin stated. He added, "no one taught me to teach writing." As a result, Kevin's writing program was "hit and miss." He emphasized that he "had the kids rewrite but I never had a good system of doing it." He "could not piece together what I was doing right or wrong." Kevin had taught in two other high schools and continued to struggle at each one for an effective "system" to teach writing. Also, he emphasized that "I got more and more away" from teaching writing as such and turned to "skills exercises" because his students were so deficient in these basic skills. He then discovered that these exercises "didn't improve their writing; they just did skill exercises."

An important turning point in Kevin's pedagogical change came at the 1982 summer institute, the same one that was so "staggering" for Fran. "I was once again reminded of the importance of process and what that meant for me was giving people the time to come up with good ideas." To Kevin, "process" also meant "letting them get words on paper, letting them have some feedback, and/or time to revise another round." The institute course gave Kevin "a way to structure some things I already
knew but wasn't able to put into a structure." Following the course, Kevin began to apply this new system or structure to his writing classroom. The results were immediate. "I'm convinced it works especially for slightly above average and below kids." "I could see that they were just better writers than they were if they just sat down and were given a topic." Advanced writers do not always need the process system, according to Kevin. "Sometimes they need it [system] and sometimes they don't" because these more advanced writers can sometimes "eek out something the first time around and don't need all that rewriting all of the time."

Since the 1982 institute, Kevin has thoroughly immersed his classes in a writing process system. He now says that "I feel like a born-again process teacher." The new "system" is working for Kevin. He indicated that "we have lots fewer poor writers." He is also pragmatic about the limitations of the "system." "The writing process is not a cure-all but it's going to make somebody below average ... up to acceptable standards." Kevin also noted "the lasting effect" of his process instructional system. "The [essays] get better each time."

Like Fran, Kevin is himself a writer who also follows a process. He did emphasize, however, that his process varies according "to what my task is." As examples, he described two pieces which he had written in the 1982 summer institute. One piece was eventually published in a textbook. "Both pieces had been in my head," he stated. Therefore, when he wrote, he "revised a lot as I wrote." The result was one revision for each of the two pieces. Both pieces "dealt with a significant event in my life." The writing helped Kevin "to work out" the events which had long been on his mind. Writing experiences like this one have taught
Kevin that "less prewriting is required" when topics are personal and are finally "worked out" in a writing situation.

On the other hand, college recommendations require an entirely different process. "I'll write a letter that will answer all questions to all colleges." Kevin then makes a list that deals with all the academic questions. "I'll have a list of key words from all the applications." He then writes "a multi-paragraph essay that fits all colleges." He concludes by "working on transitions." The "two personal pieces" and the college application writing illustrate insights Kevin has derived from his own writing experience. He shares this insight with his students and permits them to adjust their own writing process "whenever something works better for a particular assignment."

For many years, Kevin Stotts was dissatisfied with his own writing instruction. He taught students to write as he had been taught: writing was a series of skills to be mastered and rules to be learned. This instruction, however, did not make his students "writers." They continued not only to write ineffectively but also to commit the same surface errors the exercises were designed to eliminate. The gap between instruction and production frustrated Kevin and led him to new answers and new teaching strategies. The 1982 summer institute provided the answers which Kevin had sought. The institute focused on writing as a process and brought together theory and practice in a logical and practical "system," or as Kevin described, "structure" which could be implemented in a real writing classroom with real writers. When school began in September 1982, Kevin was prepared to alter radically his writing instruction. And he did. The "writing process" was the focus of his
Instruction and quality time was now devoted to prewriting activities and especially to revision. Students were no longer just given a topic and told to "write an essay." Kevin provided his classes with time to think, write, and revise. He had become a "born-again process teacher" and would never be the same.

Teacher Interviews: A Summary

The lengthy teacher interviews provided insights regarding the content and mode of instruction for the two high performance class teachers. The interview data contribute to the "thick description" and corroborate information from the other research sources. The high performance class teachers similarly described elements of the content and modes of their instruction. The similarities included:

1. Quality class time is devoted to preparing students to think, write, and revise and to eventually respond to each other's writing.
2. Depending on writing maturity, the writing process may or may not be presented and applied as a linear sequence.
3. The teachers respond to students as writers involved in an idiosyncratic composing process not as students charged with successfully completing formula exercises whose outcomes are already determined.
4. The teachers' university training received before 1975 did not prepare them to teach writing.
5. The "writing process" is not, according to both teachers, an instructional cure-all; however, a process pedagogy does provide a system or structure that is sensible and practical for students and teachers alike.

6. The teachers provided adequate time for their students to think, write, and revise.

7. Revision is the stage most emphasized in the writing process.


Teacher Observations: The Process Applied

The prolonged and persistent classroom observation was another research tool applied to this study. During their interviews, the teachers and students described both the content and mode of instruction which contributed to high performance writing. The observations were useful for confirming these descriptions and for increasing reliability through triangulation. The observations began in January and concluded in March. With few exceptions, two days per school week were devoted to the observations. Usually, one teacher was observed on Thursday and the other on Friday. Kevin taught Intermediate Expository Composition and AP Literature and Composition. Kevin's seventh period Intermediate Composition course was the class most frequently observed. Fran also taught two courses, Mythology Survey and Independent Study (IS). Unfortunately, Fran was not scheduled to teach a composition course
during the observation period. However, writing was an integral part of the instruction in the two courses Fran taught. Fran's seventh period Mythology Survey course was the class most frequently observed.

Fran: An Involved Interactionist

Fran's seventh period Mythology Survey class consisted of a diverse mixture of personalities, races, and ability levels. It was this diversity which made the class robust and energetic, sometimes to the point of distraction. Fran's demeanor in the class never changed. She was always patient, enthusiastic, well-informed, and tolerant of the many disruptions which seemed prevalent at this time in the school day. Fran's classroom environment reinforced her teaching. Walls were covered with visuals which illustrated myths or important elements of them. Throughout the room student projects from the past and present were displayed. The room was visually interesting and educationally productive.

By her own admission, Fran has become more student-centered. Evidence of this evolution was everywhere. Students spoke to her respectfully but with a familiarity, not distance, that is uncommon in teacher-student linguistic processes. She was approachable and did not use either verbal or non-verbal cues to intimidate or to establish authority or control. Only once in her teaching career has Fran established a seating chart. No chart was formulated for this class either. As a result, students sit where they chose and usually clustered with friends of the same sex. To Fran, "It's crazy to give juniors and seniors a chart" and then use it as a "discipline" device.
The free and open atmosphere of Fran's class also extended to student expression. During discussion, class members spoke freely and with a candor that was uninhibited and often unrestrained. Students spoke in no particular order and sometimes even simultaneously. Prior to the beginning of each class, different students would use the board to communicate a feeling, idea, or clever saying such as "I'm so broke, I can't even pay attention." Fran constantly interacted with her students and exhaustively responded to all of their quips, questions, and comments. She also sought and legitimately valued student input about the course and its content. She asked her class, for example, to evaluate the syllabus and to note what assignments should be repeated or deleted.

Although the classroom environment was ostensibly unstructured, Fran's instructional goals and objectives were neither obscured or diluted by her contextual design. In fact, what seemed to work in Fran's classroom was her ability to surround her instructional objectives with a comfortable learning environment. The environment never overwhelmed the objectives because of Fran's teaching clarity. In addition to the extensive course syllabus which Fran distributed to her class, clarity was manifested through a variety of other methods.

One method was a daily review procedure. Fran would begin each lesson by quickly reviewing major points from the previous day. In addition, students were never reluctant to ask questions to probe, amplify, or clarify. In turn, Fran would frequently ask the class, "Do you have any questions?" Assignments, both immediate and long range, were always written on the board, reiterated each day in class, and often illustrated
with models. The assignments written on the board were clear, specific, and logically coordinated with the instructional content presented to the class.

Assignment: March 8, Myth Draft due
March 11, Myth due
February 2, Monday, timed writing
Bring notes (50 points)
Writing (50 points)

For the February 2 "timed writing" Fran provided her students with what she termed "prewriting questions". The students were to read and then think about the questions and to be prepared to answer one for the "timed writing." The questions listed were

1. Where was the underworld?
2. How do you get there?
3. What does it look like? A subdivision? separated?
4. How was it ruled? Judges?
5. Where are specific locations of rewards/punishments?
6. What are the rewards/punishments?

This assignment was typical of Fran's emphasis on the "writing process." She gave students time to think and rewarded them as much for "pre-thinking" as the "notes" which were the concrete extensions of that thought. The fifty points encouraged students to engage themselves in the composing process. Another assignment rewarded students with forty points for creating a "jot list." Frequently, Fran listed days when "drafts" of essays were due. She also listed assignments that included "notes in the form of a jot list" and "peer editing responses." Student
sharing and audience awareness were formalized by assignments which instructed the students to "bring your myths to class, then tell everyone the type of myth and what it's about, and then read a 'gem' from the writing." Assignments also appeared on the board which referred to the papers' "last draft" and to the "last ten journal entries." Frequently students would exercise what Fran called "creative options" and write, for additional points, original works which were shared with other "options" at the conclusion of the grading period. In sum, Fran had her students thinking, prewriting, drafting, revising, and responding constantly throughout the time period in which she was observed. Students never asked her questions about their writing, nor did she ask them, that focused on grammar, punctuation, or other rule-governed conventions. Rather, they asked questions like "When is the last draft due?" or "Do we have to do a jot list?" Thus Fran's instruction was clearly directed at the process of the writing experience not the eventual product. Fran rewarded her students for linking to their composing processes and these rewards came not in the final grade but were accumulated along the way. As a result, the essay's final evaluation was in a sense anti-climatic, a predictable outcome resulting from a process which Fran encouraged and nurtured.

The structured tasks embedded within Fran's pedagogy were disguised by a wide ranging teaching repertoire. The presentational or lecture mode was the exception, not the rule, in her classroom. On one day, Fran showed a film and students responded to it. On another day, students assembled in small groups and had "study sessions." Groups presented "mythological skits" on two consecutive days. Students shared "gems" from
their own myths, the culmination of a major essay assignment. "Alumni Day" brought several former students back to Fran's class to interact and share "more mature" insights with the current students. Students presented "creative option" projects during another period. In short, Fran's students both gave and received information. They received information from other students as well as from Fran herself. Regarding her students as resources, she interacted as a teacher and learner, as a speaker and listener, as a writer and audience.

Kevin: A Synthesis of Ideas

Kevin's seventh period Intermediate Composition class provided many opportunities for observing the practical application of an instructional strategy. Kevin's class met in room 114 everyday at 1:13. Depending on the day, between eleven and fifteen students attended class. The typical Intermediate Composition student is an average or below writer and is not always motivated to complete work or to accept rigorous academic challenge. The students in Kevin's class appeared comfortable and at ease with each other and Kevin himself. The informal atmosphere of the classroom was enhanced by the small number of students and the arrangement of tables and chairs in a semi-circle. Students talked freely and their conversation sometimes even had to be discouraged by Kevin's admonition that "class has begun" or "it's time to get started people." Like Fran, Kevin maintained no seating chart. Also like Fran, all class time was fully utilized by a variety of instructional activities. Both teachers, as a result, emphasized time-on-task.

Fran and Kevin have much in common, especially the philosophies which guide and direct their writing instruction. They did, however,
project quite different images and styles in their classrooms. Kevin was more paternal and clearly more professorial. Kevin "preached" a doctrine of writing and expected his students to follow it. Fran espoused the same "doctrine" but taught it matter-of-factly and without the emphasis and urgency which characterized Kevin's class presentations. Kevin used sarcasm and humor to disarm his students and to make his points. Fran also relied on humor but with less seriousness and intent than Kevin. An interesting difference in the two teaching styles was that Fran taught to the entire class and Kevin always seemed to be teaching to specific students in his class. Thus, the class was Fran's student; the students were Kevin's class, a confirmation of Fran's earlier observation that Kevin is also student-centered.

Similar to Fran, Kevin established clear goals and objectives in his class. Students always knew where they were, where they had been, and where they were going. This clarity was established through written assignments on the board and a constant reiteration of the assignments during class. One assignment listed on the board stated

- vocab quiz #3 tomorrow
- corrected error sheet due by tomorrow
- revision of narration draft due by Monday
- focused
- showy/not telly
- effective opening
- personal voice
- sentence structure
In addition, Kevin would constantly review and add new information only when the old had once again been summarized. Assignments were always clarified by models and numerous supplemental handouts. Kevin distributed these handouts to amplify, clarify, introduce, or inform. Both teachers relied on supplemental handouts instead of the text. In Kevin's composition course, for example, the text was never prominent as an instructional tool.

Kevin's instructions were always explicit, almost prescriptive. For one assignment he wrote

> Silently read your essay. Separate sheet of paper for little but important writing. Write a new first sentence. A new beginning. Write a new first sentence for the most dramatic incident/example about this person. The first sentence should focus on the opposite of the person (contrast).

Nonetheless, students always knew the task and the goal, time, and purpose for it. Fran and Kevin always kept their students busy with well-planned tasks that were useful and productive. Of his many handouts, Kevin never distributed "fill-in the blank" exercises or other similar rule-governed and repetitive "seat work" purposely designed to maintain order rather than teach writing. Instead, he gave his students handouts to reinforce the writing process and to enhance the process as a practical writing system. Specimen samples of these handouts included: a prewriting exercise on the five senses, a model of an "I-Search" essay, a peer editing guide sheet, a "Best of" brainstorming sheet in preparation
Kevin coordinated these handouts with his instructional goals and objectives. Quite clearly, what he termed "the writing process" linked both the content and mode of his instruction. At one point in the course, students in the Intermediate Composition course were writing narratives, drafting college application essays, developing ideas for an I-search paper, and completing journal entries. All of these activities could occur simultaneously because they were in the different stages of the writing process. Thinking was beginning on one assignment while jot listing was being completed on another. Peer editing was being applied to a more advanced work-in-progress while a final draft was being completed or evaluated. Throughout the entire observation period, Kevin referred to prewriting assignments, to drafting and revision, to journals and jot listing, to revision and editing. More significantly, Kevin's students also used these terms, knew what they meant, and took them for granted as a logical part of their composing processes. And like Fran, Kevin rewarded his students for completing prewriting and revision assignments when he evaluated the final draft. The final draft included, therefore, a peer editing sheet, a revision sheet, and three revised drafts of the paper. The revised drafts were always labelled on the board as revision 1, revision 2, and revision 3 and were mandatory assignments for all students. Following this extensive process, and providing students with the time to complete it, permitted Kevin to assign six papers for the semester. Clearly, quality was more preferred to
quantity. The quantity came in the twenty-one journal entries which he required during a two month period.

Linking students to the stages of the writing process was an important element of Kevin's instructional strategy. These stages were presented in a linear sequence and always included prewriting, drafting/revision, and editing. During one of Kevin's interviews, he noted that advanced writers do not require the kind of arbitrary application of the writing process that he presented to his intermediate writers. On the other hand, he emphasized that average and below writers are usually the ones who eliminate important stages of the process. Consequently, they need a "system" that forces engagement with those stages important to their continued writing development. "The writing process" is the "system" which he has emphatically adopted.

During the observational period, Kevin's mode of instruction was more presentational than the one applied by Fran. Like Fran, however, Kevin did not rely on the presentation/lecture as his primary mode of instruction. He varied his instructional strategies. For example, each day students taught a vocabulary lesson and were urged to be "as creative as possible." This creativity could include "costumes, props, or pictures" or anything that would capture the interest of the class. The reward for a well-done student presentation was "bonus points" if everyone in the class correctly answered the test question in which the word appeared. During another period, Kevin had his students searching for "new leads" by asking questions of each other. On the second day of the semester, students in the class interviewed each other in order to begin preparation for a "focus feature." A Cat Stevens record was the
prewriting catalyst for a freewrite which would evolve into a narrative essay. Peer editing dominated another two periods as students conscientiously assessed each other's work. The pace was again changed on another day when Kevin individually responded to students about a particular assignment. To introduce a "pro-con" paper, Kevin had his students read an essay, "The Case for Torture," and then a student went to the board and noted both the pros and cons that his classmates suggested. In essence, this was a class period completely filled with student-generated and managed information. The students were then instructed "to start bringing in articles of controversial topics." The articles were then shared with the class in succeeding periods. A comparison paper assignment began with students establishing "Best" and "Worst" lists such as "the best or worst hamburger." The poems "Miniver Cheever" and "Richard Cory" were also discussed and the discussion constituted a comparison, much like the one the students would eventually write. Finally, Kevin instructed the class "to ask other teachers for a comparison/contrast question" and to bring to class "at least three different questions from three different sources."

Quality class time was devoted to these activities, many of which were "in preparation for writing" but did not include actual drafting. In contrast, a minimum of time was devoted to grammar, usage, and the other conventions. Kevin would interrupt his process teaching to present, from time to time, surface errors prevalent among students in the class. The difference between the contraction "it's" and the possessive "its" was taught for ten minutes on one day. Another assignment was asked the class to "review nouns, proper and otherwise" and "capitalization."
Thus, Kevin did not ignore the mechanical elements of his students' writing. He did, however, place them in a practical and useful perspective that reflected his students' learning needs.

The self-proclaimed "born-again process teacher" conducted a writing class where an evangelistic zeal for prewriting, revision, and editing prevailed. Kevin's students knew no other "theology" and never once requested a rationale for three drafts or peer editing or prewriting. For these students, this system was not Kevin's way of writing, it was the only way. They spoke of "drafts" not "papers" and talked like writers. Kevin did not invent the process system which he so enthusiastically embraced. His good instincts about teaching and learning led him to journals, books, and finally to that fateful summer workshop. All of these sources were combined and eventually synthesized. Kevin then accumulated teaching materials that promoted the "writing process" and that made it real for students. All of these materials were combined and also synthesized. Finally, the synthesis was complete, and Kevin was "born-again" in the writing classroom.

Teacher Observations: A Summary

The persistent and prolonged observations of the two high performance class teachers were intended to corroborate the data from the other research sources. The observations were important for the study's triangulation. As a result, the observations established a number of generalizations common to both teachers.

1. A presentation/lecture mode of instruction was, whenever possible, minimized.
2. When writing was taught, the "writing process" dominated the content of instruction.

3. A variety of class activities, interactions, assignments, and materials constituted a wide-ranging teaching repertoire.

4. Grammar, punctuation, and the conventions of standard edited American English were taught within the student's own composing process not exclusive from it in both teachers' classes.

5. Substantial, quality time was devoted to prewriting, drafting, and revision.

6. Incentives and rewards for students were built into the writing program to encourage prewriting and especially revision.

7. Students used common terminology describing stages of the writing process.

8. Peer editing was a natural outgrowth of revision and was always a part of the drafting process.

9. Both teachers presented the process initially as a linear system. The process system was, however, recursively applied and altered to meet the idiosyncratic needs of the developing intermediate writers.

10. A textbook was infrequently used for instruction or as instructional material.
Although their personal styles differed, the high performance class teachers shared the same content and mode of instruction.

Well-planned tasks linking the student to the writing process dominated the instructional time, even in a course that was literature-based.

Explicit instructions, stated objectives, daily review, and written and verbal models were routinely presented to increase instructional clarity.

Comfortable learning environments encouraged verbal and written self-expression.

Content Analysis of Documents

The two high performance class teachers were asked to accumulate documents representative of the content and mode of their instruction. In turn, the researcher would sometimes ask specifically for a document relevant to the research problem. Since Fran was not teaching a composition course when this study was in progress, she included documents from recent writing courses which she had taught, documents which emphasized the importance of writing-across-the-curriculum. Kevin collected documents exclusively from his Intermediate Composition course. Combined, the documents from both teachers included class assignments, evaluated student papers, informational handouts, and course/teacher evaluations. The content analysis of these accumulated documents is another triangulation form intended to increase the data reliability.
Fran Spratley: Document Analysis

The documents that Fran assembled and I requested for the study concentrated on three major areas: informational handouts (Appendix M), teacher evaluated essays (Appendix M), and course evaluations (Appendix N).

Informational Handouts

Fran taught Mythology Survey at the time the study was conducted. Consequently, she distributed informational handouts less frequently than in her Intermediate Composition course. The handouts that Fran did distribute were either developed by her or reproduced from reference books such as one entitled "The Underworld" from the LaRousse Encyclopedia of Mythology. She also distributed a reproduced handout, "Writing About Literature," which established guidelines for a critical analysis and urged students to "learn to write papers in which you interpret and evaluate imaginative literature." On the opening day of the course, Fran distributed her course syllabus. This syllabus presented the course's philosophy and objectives, texts and supplementary materials and supplies, and a weekly breakdown of the course content, and a similar "breakdown of points." The syllabus clearly and specifically described course and teacher expectations, yet was neither too prescriptive nor unrealistic and authoritarian. The positive tone of this particular handout was illustrated with the final item in the "for your information" section. The item stated "Let's have a great nine weeks." The assignments were diverse and involved students in a variety of learning tasks. These tasks involved "timed writings," quizzes, tests, "mini-projects," "personal journals," and original myths. Fran obviously placed a high priority on
student writing as the point values for the written assignments were
greater than for the other required work. Students also has the oppor-
tunity to write in different genres and to express themselves through
journals or even "computer programs" or "any interpretative piece of
art."

Fran began her instructional evolution when she discovered the value
of journal writing. She had noted that journals were the only "bright
spot" in her previous writing program. Students not only developed their
ideas in these earlier journals, but they also wrote with a strong
"voice" that was often missing in their other classroom writing. Fran
has not abandoned journals. She has adapted them and made them more
sophisticated to meet the reading/writing needs of her students. She
distributed two informational handouts for a "reader's journal": "Some
Guidelines for Keeping a Reader's Journal" and "Starters for a Reader's
Journal." Students used a "contract for readings" in this course so
the journal was "based upon readings from the contract." Students could
also include illustrations in the journal. Generally, however, the
journal would include a student's response to the characters, setting,
author and all other related ideas inspired by the reading.

The "writing process" was also a focal point in Fran's Mythology
class. Her handout, "Writing a Literary Analysis," revealed consider-
able insight into Fran's writing pedagogy. The handout urged students
to recognize the strategies "which can and do help if you used them to
serve your individual needs." She emphasized that the handout's strat-
egies were "suggested." The suggestions were to "make a thorough jot
list of ideas" and to "look at your jot list after it has 'cooled' a day
or two." She then suggested, "try to group your ideas into categories using numbers." The handout encouraged a "thesis statement" and a "rough outline." At this point, the process may become recursive because after consultation with the teacher and a reader "you may find you'll have to go back to steps 1-16." The handout even incorporated peer editing: "have a classmate (reader) or two look at your rough draft." This draft would, according to the suggested guidelines, evolve into draft #2. The second draft could be handed in to the teacher for "comments after a reader or two has checked it out. A third and final draft is then recom­mended. In a few instances, this handout was, for Fran, untypically prescriptive. She suggested, for example, that an outline be incorporated into prewriting and also provided a formula for the paper's eventual development. None of the twenty-one guidelines were imposed on the students. More than anything else, this particular document encouraged students to approach writing with a strategy. Prewriting, drafting/revising, and editing constituted the suggested strategy detailed in "Writing a Literary Analysis."

Another document, "Timed Writing #1: Concepts of Death," gave students "twenty minutes to finish the writing in class." Even within this brief and concentrated effort, students were urged to maintain some elements of the composing process. Prewriting was urged by the instruction, "you may use brief notes taken previously." Revision was also encouraged when the assignment included instructions that "After the time is up, have two student-readers use the criteria to check off their responses and add comments." The reverse side of the instruction sheet provided a specific peer editing sheet designed to accommodate two readers. All the
informational/instructional handouts emphasized writing as a process and were consistent with what the high performance students described as the content most frequently applied in Fran's writing classroom.

Teacher Evaluated Essays

Throughout the entire study, many of Fran's evaluated essays were collected and analyzed. Representative samples of these essays appear in Appendix R. Three consistent patterns were evident in Fran's evaluations: 1) she evaluated the essays as a reader and addressed the logical thinking of the student. She discriminated among the mechanical errors which she marked and 2) she was positive. The essays analyzed for this study included literary analyses and original myths. All the papers included extensive evaluative remarks. The remarks focused on the students' logic, development and included "audience reaction" from the teacher-evaluator. This reaction might be a simple "interesting" to "fun to read!" to "I thoroughly enjoyed it!" or "What a lovely paragraph." In addition, questions were often rhetorically posed to encourage more thought: "Does this say that...?" "Twain really gets down on hypocrisy, stupidity, huh"? "Your paraphrase here"? "Why exactly does this happen in the story"?

Positive comments were dotted throughout all of the essays: "nice quote," "well-said," "good quote," "excellent conclusion," "nice touch," "nifty logic," "ah!, good example." The positive comments extended to the summary evaluation on the front of each paper. Typical examples of these comments included

Dan, you blend just enough "myth logic" to have a funny and compelling myth. I thoroughly enjoyed it!
Beth, You summarize his position on simplicity very well. But, what's left out is important too. The "connection" to nature. What does he learn from nature? What does he think about while hoeing a bean field? For example, one cuts out material things to get to "essences." What are essences for Thoreau? What ideas bring happiness itself? Non-materialism is a key that unlocks a door—what's behind that door? See what I mean? At any rate, I applaud the effort and think your reading of Walden well worthwhile.

In an analysis of these essays, it becomes apparent that Fran's writing priority is logical, organized thinking. Rarely did she describe mechanical weaknesses in her discursive, summary comments. The surface errors which she did mark were usually confined to spelling, disruptive punctuation, and to some extent, diction and syntax. Fran has reiterated that students should correctly apply the conventions of standard edited American English. These skills are taught and learned, however, within the broader context of a student's composing process. As a result, multiple drafts and peer editing often eliminated many of the errors prior to the final draft. An example of this process is the essay "Two in the Wilderness." The essay's final draft is attached with two other drafts and a jot list. Fran had worked hard to help make this a "nice paper" by the final draft. She had helped the young girl get started, helped her to establish a focus, and had joined another student
in the class in critiquing the first draft. As the drafts of this essay evolved, Fran interceded in the student's composing process to insure that the paper would not include disruptive surface errors, flawed logic, and anemic development. Thus, the final draft is, and should be, relatively free of mechanical errors because the "process system" has eliminated them along the way. Now the teacher, as Fran did, can concentrate on the substantive thought of the essay and assist the student in developing more rhetorical maturity.

Fran's civility in responding to her student's writing revealed her reverence for the process itself. In her Literary Analysis handout she wrote: "There is no 'easy-to-follow-sure-fired-well-sequenced-step-by-step-process' in writing a literary analysis." She preceded this warning by indicating, "There is no magic." Her realization about the writing process, her "final vision," reminded her that implicit in this instructional system is a real person, a real writer. At this point, the teacher-student roles must be redefined. Fran's approach to writing required her to be a "teacher" in the revision process but a reader when that process was complete and the final draft was evaluated.

Course Evaluations

Since Fran was not currently teaching her Expository Writing course at the time of this study, she provided course evaluations from two classes she taught the previous semester (Appendix S). This evaluation included five categories: the writing process, types of assignments, class atmosphere, teacher, and text and handouts. For this study, the categories of most interest were "the writing process" and "teacher." The "writing process" was defined on the evaluation as "prerating,
drafting, rewriting, editing, and publishing." Unanimously, students praised the instructional content of this system. The evaluation asked students to "write one specific statement (or more) which explains how you feel, or what you learned re: that category." About the writing process the students wrote

This was very helpful. I was really suprised [sic.], also pleased with the improvements. Maybe another adult reader would be better too though.

Good idea, but sometimes it dragged out too long.

It really helped me to have a better paper after writing it once, the prewriting made it better.

It gave me the ability to be able to look at my or anybody's else's writing and make it better.

This process is very helpful and worthwhile even if it is extra work.

It helped to see how students (friends) thought of my writing.

Although I already knew the different stages of writing, this class helped me to learn to go through the stages more thoroughly.
I agree w/the stages of the writing except that I like it done in three drafts w/critics like we did during the year.

I think it was great. Don't change anything it's a good way to learn to write.

The writing process helped me to improve my final drafts.

I learned how to edit someone's paper. I helped them write a better one.

Rewriting helped me to produce better papers. It showed my errors and what I could do to improve the paper.

Rewriting really helped me write better papers because I can look back and improve my writing.

I liked the writing process a lot it helped me learn a lot of new things.

I learned about most of this in classes before this but I learned a little more and it really helped my writing.

Long but worth the effort.

This helped me to accumulate the best paper I could.
I like to write and revise
it leaves me room for improvement.

Very fun and also helps you in making a better
paper by redoing it over and over again you
find things you normally wouldn't have.

The writing process I already knew about and
used (a lot), however getting basic review help
[sic.] inspire me to more creative writing.

It was ok. It helped to develop better
writing skills. I hated doing all the rewrit-
ing, but it was better for me.

Clearly, Fran's students recognized the additional work of following
the writing process but also felt the results were worth the effort.
Fran was personally able to engage her students in the process and de-
veloped a class atmosphere that was a productive writing environment.
Repeatedly, students described how "comfortable" they felt in her class
and that she was "the best English teacher." Students alluded to her
teaching clarity: "She is very clear and precise in her explanations." Another student wrote, "you organize and make one understand thourally
[sic.] their given assignments." She also established herself as a
trusted audience: "I really felt I could trust you therefore I worked
harder and improved my writing." She motivated students to "want to
write and not to have to write."
The evaluation of papers and journals received praise. One student wrote, "I loved reading your responses in my journal." Another stated, "I like the way you spend [time] on each individual paper." In addition, students noted that the teacher devoted time to individualizing instruction, to intervening in their processes when intervention was needed. "She takes time out to tell you your mistakes," wrote one student. Another stated, "You know what we are doing and are willing to take the time to explain until we get it." The same comment was reinforced in yet another evaluation: "The class was small enough for good individualized help from the teacher and different students." Perhaps the most accurate summary response came from a student who wrote, "Her teaching strategies were successful."

Document Analysis: Kevin

The documents Kevin submitted for this analysis included materials for developing a writing environment (Appendix O), informational handouts (Appendix P), prewriting activities, peer editing forms (Appendix Q), and teacher evaluated essay (Appendix R). Kevin's documents differed somewhat from those submitted by Fran Spratley. First, Kevin did not use a course evaluation for the previous semester. Thus, no evaluations were available. Second, Kevin formalizes prewriting to a greater extent than Fran. As a result, he submitted numerous prewriting materials. Finally, Kevin was teaching Intermediate Expository Writing when the study was conducted. He had more writing assignments than Fran used in her Mythology course and, therefore, more documents related to his writing instruction.
Kevin begins his Intermediate Expository course by trying to develop a comfortable writing environment. In order to shape this environment, he surveys his students about themselves and their writing habits. The survey first asked questions related to career and reading interests and then probed student opinion about writing. The questions asked "What is the hardest part of writing for you?" "The easiest part?" "How do you start a piece of writing?" "Do you write more than one draft?" The survey also asked a series of questions about audience. The results of this survey helped Kevin better understand his students' writing perceptions and the areas of most and least misconception. The students also completed an "Experience Portfolio" to determine areas of experience and interest which could provide material for writing. Finally, during the first week of the course, each student writes an in-class essay. This paper acts as a diagnostic essay to chart a student's writing growth. The essay is evaluated by using a "modified Diederich analytic "scale and is not returned until the end of the course. At that time, students are required to rewrite the original and the grade for this revision is the course's final exam.

Informational Handouts

Kevin's instructional clarity was enhanced by the specific verbal and written information which he provided his students. For example, written instructions and models were distributed for each major assignment. Familiarizing students with each other was a primary objective of the first essay. The assignment became a "feature focus" and used interviewing; students received a day-by-day syllabus outlining the unit and
an informational handout on essential interviewing skills. This written
information was verbally reinforced before any prewriting actually began.
Kevin followed a similar procedure when he assigned an "I-Search" paper.
This assignment, first developed by Ken Macrorie, was introduced with a
specific handout describing the goals and objectives of the essay. The
handout was again reinforced by Kevin's verbal elaboration. All major
assignments began with an informational handout where clear and specific
objectives were detailed. This handout would then begin a prewriting
cycle where much quality class time was devoted. This cycle included
several activities that acted as catalysts for more thoughtful and ex-
tended writing.

Other important informational handouts included "Keeping a Journal"
and "Journal Do's and Don'ts." Journals were evaluated on "quality over
quantity" and "introspective effort." Kevin also emphasized that journal
entries should "show not tell" and include variety and what he termed
"completeness." Students were required to bring their journals to class
each day and to "make at least three 20 minute entries per week." Kevin
wanted the journals to be real and expressive for his students. He
would, therefore, "comment on a particular entry" if a student marked
"COMMENT in large letters at the top of the page beside that page number."
He also provided his students with the option to mark "do not read" if
you do not want me to read a particular entry." For Kevin's students,
the journal was a device to generate thinking and an authentic voice. In
turn, the journal assisted in developing Kevin's credibility as a trusted
audience.
Prewriting Activities

During the observation period, two major instructional units dominated the class time. One unit focused on description and the other on comparison. The culmination of both units was an essay. Numerous prewriting and peer editing activities preceded the completed essays. To teach writing as a process requires time and patience, especially as students revise and teachers interact at different intervals of the process. Kevin would always begin his writing units with an introduction of goals and objectives, a work schedule noting when prewriting and drafting were to be completed, and informational handouts explaining important concepts. From this introduction, prewriting would begin with exercises designed to focus thinking and generate ideas for the essay. In the description unit, the class completed exercises emphasizing the senses: touch, taste, smell, hearing. When these exercises were completed, three topics for descriptive papers were distributed. These topics included "prompts" for a "jot list" that would evolve into "a quick first draft." All three topics related to a place or location important to the student. The three topics were different in that one dealt with an indoor location, another an outdoor location, and the third one, "a place and situation in which you found yourself." Each student had considerable flexibility to develop a rough draft from the topics' broad guidelines. This flexibility was typical of Kevin's assignments. He always presented a variety of writing options to his students and permitted them, indeed encouraged them, to discard the topic which did not provoke thought or generate any enthusiasm for writing.
A similar instructional strategy was applied to the comparison unit. The unit was initiated by discussing an article in a local magazine which listed the "best" and "worst" in a variety of categories. As a group, the class then brainstormed for a "best" list of its own. Commensurately, the reverse of this brainstormed list would constitute the "worst" categories. The two classes generated sixty items and the list was printed and distributed to each student. Prewriting for one potential paper had begun. The other potential paper introduced students to the literary analysis. Two poems were used for this exercise: Robinson's "Miniver Cheevy" and "Richard Cory." "After reading the poems and thinking about them," the students were asked to answer eight questions that would lead them to a comparison of the two literary works. Prior to answering these questions, the class discussed the handout, "Study Questions for a Poem." These questions prepared the class for the specific questions related to the Robinson poems. Both handouts methodically forced students to think about poetry and then to think even more specifically about the two poems which they read. This clearly deductive strategy was again typical of the prewriting period in Kevin's classroom that always preceded drafting. Even before any writing occurred, students were immersed in "prewriting thought" that focused the assignment and personalized it for the student. Much of Kevin's effort during the prewriting period was directed at linking the student and a writing topic, a connection intended to eliminate some of the artificiality of the classroom and writing so often generated in it.
Peer Editing Forms

Peer editing is a significant instructional tool in Kevin's writing classroom. The editing forms varied depending on the assignment and the draft being considered. For the narration paper, one form consisted of open-ended questions and directions that were discussion guidelines for the writer and reader. One question asked, "Where do you find something that doesn't work?" Another direction stated, "Then ask the author what her/his intentions were." The final questions were somewhat more focused: "Does the paper have an effective opening"? Does it capture the interest of the intended reader"? A much more specific, additional editing form, was also used for the narration essay. This form emphasized to the class that the writing process was now at the stage where closure was required:

You brainstormed several ideas, you wrote several drafts, you decided to work on one draft, you rewrote it, you wrote new leads for it, you rewrote it emphasizing the paper's strengths, and now you're almost finished with the whole process.

The form was designed for two readers and most prominently focused on the draft's content and substance. When returned to each writer, this form concluded Kevin's process pedagogy for this assignment.

Two editing forms were also implemented for the "focus on a feature" assignment. These forms were identical but were applied at different points in the drafting sequence. Students were required to make two major revisions for the feature essay. Each of these two mandated drafts were edited. The initial draft was edited and became a more
sophisticated second draft. The more sophisticated second draft was again edited prior to the final draft. The "focus feature" editing form was simple and consisted of questions relating to subject focus, development, organization, lead opening, and mechanical proficiency. To distinguish one form from the other, each was color-coded.

The description paper had yet another variation for peer editing. This brief form was designed to have students focus on troublesome mechanical problems: ineffective fragments, run-ons, awkward sentences, misspelled words, and punctuation and capitalization errors. The form also asked the editors:

1. What would you change about this paper to make it more effective?
2. What stands out in this paper as already being ineffective?
3. What letter grade would you give this final copy?

The information from the student editors was assimilated by the writers and considered as final draft revisions were made. After this final draft was graded and returned to the student, the process was not over. Each student then received "a corrected error sheet" on which final draft errors were categorized and corrected. This sheet was a required assignment and was turned in with the next graded assignment. After two papers and two sheets had been completed, Kevin assigned "personal exercises" for those students who had "patterns of error" as determined by the error sheets. These exercises provided additional and
individualized instruction for those students with the same recurring surface errors.

Teacher Evaluated Essays

Kevin submitted an evaluated essay as a specimen for analysis were typical of the mode and content of his instruction (Appendix R). One of the essays concretely illustrates the implementation of "writing process" in the classroom. The student assembled a packet of materials that included her prewriting effort and her various drafts. The drafts are genuine. They reflect significant revisions, some risk-taking and experimentation. The writer, for example, changes her opening, her "lead," to generate more reader interest and to more accurately reflect her subject. Her focus becomes more refined as she revises and assimilates the editing advice from her peers. The paper began with an interview of Tomika, a classmate in the writer's class. The writer formulated ten questions and elicited answers to these questions from her subject. The questions and answers formed the prewriting for the essay. An unfocused first draft was written and evaluated by a peer. Another draft was then prepared and yet another. Another peer edited this most recent draft. A final draft was then prepared which Kevin evaluated. In his evaluative comments, Kevin wrote:

The paper is fully developed, has a good sense of direction, and some stylistic devices which give it a real "voice." In other words, this was a good piece of writing.
I especially liked your use of one word 'sentences.' They were effectively used.

In actuality, the paper received three grades, one for prewriting and two for the final draft's content and mechanics. A "corrected errors sheet" was compiled from the final draft and the total process was finally complete.

This assignment, which came early in the semester, forced the student into prewriting and drafting. Quite clearly, Kevin tried to structure the process so that students reacquainted themselves with its important stages. Assignments later in the semester required fewer drafts and were less prescriptive. Kevin made an instructional choice that placed considerable emphasis, and value, on prewriting and revision. This choice shaped much of his writing instruction and was mirrored once again in the ardor with which he characterized himself as a "born again" process teacher.

Like Fran, Kevin had "evaluated" this essay at different intervals in its development. Other students had also responded to it and evaluated its mechanical and content effectiveness. Kevin's comments on the final draft focused, therefore, on more sophisticated elements of the writer's work. He discussed the paper's "voice" and the "one word sentences." He commented on "stylistic devices." He had not thwarted the writer's development by marking and discussing errors which peers and the "corrected error sheet" would help to correct. The writer could then concentrate on legitimate revision. And she did. Kevin's instructional priorities made writing an act of serious thinking not a rote exercise to be learned and applied.
Document Content Analysis: A Summary

The documents from the high performance class teachers varied in content, form, and organization. Nonetheless, common instructional objectives linked the teachers and their content and mode of instruction. The documents revealed that the teachers shared the following objectives:

1. Informational handouts were distributed to clarify, amplify, and restate important instructional content.
2. The content most emphasized throughout all the documents related to various stages of the "writing process."
3. Many of the documents emphasized revision.
4. Peer editing forms were designed to meet the objectives of individual assignments.
5. A positive writing environment was developed through planned activities and assignments.
6. Journals and evaluated essays fostered the teachers as trusted audiences for their students.
7. None of the documents were exercises which required rule-governed information relating to grammar, punctuation, or the conventions of standard edited English.
8. Skills related to grammar, punctuation, and the conventions of standard edited English were taught at different intervals in the drafting process and by using the students' own work as the focus for instruction.
9. Numerous documents emphasized the importance of writer's voice.
10. The documents revealed a wide variety of activities designed to sustain student interest and motivation.

11. A teacher-reader evaluated the final draft by writing comments that were reader-responsive but always writer-directed. This final evaluation contained several reader responses that accumulated and were assimilated at different intervals in the writer's composing process.
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For too long the focus of writing research has been on one element of a process at the expense of another. The text was analyzed but the process which created it was not. More recently, the writer's composing process has been examined, but the classroom context and instructional strategy that may have influenced that process have been excluded from the examination. This study explored the multiple factors that constitute the classroom writing experience. Inherent in this exploration was the assumption that the writer could not be removed from the instructional context. Additionally, the study assumed that the classroom writing experience is a dynamic synthesis that integrates a writer's composing process with a particular content and mode of instruction. Thus this study explored the multiple factors that produced high performance writing. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to identify the composing processes most frequently applied by high performance writers and to determine the content and mode of instruction in their high performance class groups. The dynamism of this interaction is frequently diluted when a researcher isolates one of these components and then attempts to apply generalizations applicable to them all.
This study combined the writer, the teacher, and the writing environment in a detailed, descriptive analysis. The frame for this analysis was high performance writing and the content and mode of instruction that produced it.

Summary of the Study

At the conclusion of the 1984-85 school year, the Columbus Public Schools completed the third year of a writing project which tested an entire class population in tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. For each year of the project, approximately 4,000 participants wrote essays that were holistically scored by trained readers. These essays were in response to prompts that had been pilot tested in each of the three years. For most of the project participants, three essays were written and scored from 1982-85. These essay scores represent valuable data in tracing the writing development of high school writers. For each year of the project, the holistic scores were grouped by teacher and class and listed on computer printouts. The mean score for each class group and teacher were also tabulated. In addition, mean scores for each of the sixteen participating high schools were tabulated. For the purpose of this study, scores from the 1983-84 school year were used to identify high performance writers and writing classes. Since essays were infrequently scored 1, "high performance" was defined as a holistic score of 1 or 2.

The students and teachers selected for the study were in two classes which ranked at or near the top of all the participating classes in the 1983-84 project. A class was defined as a group of eleventh grade students with no less than ten students with scored essays. Of the
201 eleventh grade classes tested during that year, these two classes ranked one and four and were in the top 2.5% of the entire population. These rankings were established by low mean scores because of significant clusters of high performance writers. Of the remaining three high performance classes, one did not meet the minimum testing frequency of ten scored essays. When the low frequency classes were eliminated, three remained. Two of the three classes were the subject of this study.

Students in each of these two classes who scored a 1 or 2 on the 1983-84 sample were identified as "high performance writers." A total of seventeen eleventh grade students were identified. Of these seventeen, five received a score of 1 and twelve received a score of 2. Of the entire eleventh grade population, less than 2% of all scored essays received a 1 and less than 7.7% received scores of 2.

In one of the two high performance classes, nineteen students participated in the sample and nine were identified as high performance writers. In the other high performance class, fifteen students participated in the sample and eight were identified as high performance writers. In both classes, approximately 50% of the students were identified as high performance writers. The teachers of these two classes were observed beginning in January 1985 and concluding in April 1985. During this same period, both teachers were interviewed extensively regarding their teaching philosophies and the mode and content of their writing instruction. The seventeen high performance writers were interviewed to determine the mode and content of instruction which influenced their successful composing processes. In addition, multiple observations were made of the two high performance classes. The two high performance class
teachers assembled documents representative of their writing pedagogy. These documents were analyzed to reinforce the data collected from the observations and interviews. These accumulated data provided considerable insight into the content and mode of instruction which most influenced the composing processes of high performance eleventh grade writers.

Findings

**The Composing Processes of High Performance Eleventh Grade Writers**

The seventeen students were interviewed and asked, "From beginning to end, how would you describe the process you follow to create a piece of writing?" This was one of two primary, unstructured questions asked during the interviews. A variety of probes were used to elicit additional information for clarification, critical awareness, amplification, or refocus. The interviews ranged from 20-50 minutes and were conducted during the school day in one of several quiet, private locations. The student and the interviewer were the only participants in each session. The findings for this study describe important similarities in the composing processes of high performance writers.

In addition, the study includes findings that describe the content and mode of instruction that influenced these processes. Mode of instruction refers to the "configuration of variables characteristic of certain teacher/classroom relationships and activities" (Hillocks, 1984, p. 141). Content of instruction refers to the substantive informational modes. Content of instruction is often determined by views of learning, previous learning experience, and philosophy of language. Content of instruction is "what we teach" and mode of instruction is
"What we do." According to Hillocks, the three dominant modes of instruction are: (1) presentational, (2) natural process, and (3) environmental. The presentational mode emphasizes the teacher as presenter of knowledge about writing and includes the study of models, specific assignments and exercises, and feedback coming primarily from teachers (1984). The natural process mode provides a low level of structure and is non-directional about the qualities of good writing. The environmental mode is characterized by clear and specific objectives, materials and problems selected to engage students with each other in some aspect of writing, and activities conducive to high peer interaction.

Through the teacher and student interviews, the observations, and the document analysis, the content and mode of instruction were determined for the two high performance class teachers. Thus, the findings of this study describe the composing processes of seventeen high performance writers and important similarities in those processes. In addition, the findings report the content and mode of instruction that integrated with the students' composing processes to produce high performance writing. Thus the findings of this study first describe similarities in the composing processes of high performance writers. Then the content and mode of instruction are described that the two high performance class teachers applied.

Composing Processes: High Performance Writers

The findings from the student interviews established a number of similarities in the composing processes of high performance eleventh grade writers as self-reported by them.
1. All seventeen students described writing multiple drafts, usually two or three and as many as five. For these writers, revision was the essential stage of their composing process and determined the success or failure of their final written products.

2. Seven of the seventeen students described a quiet period of thinking which was required before any actual writing could take place. The seven students described this solo thinking as a time where the topic and self came together to form an idea strategy that made writing possible.

3. Ten of the seventeen students referred to a "jot list" as a prewriting strategy. Four students used the term "writing process," three the term "brainstorming," and four referred to some form of "freewriting." These data indicated that these high performance writers had been trained to apply the "writing process" and were taught this application through common terminology.

4. Five of seventeen students described the importance of personalizing a topic in order to write effectively about it.
Content and Mode of Instruction and Writing Performance

The findings of this study indicate that content and mode of instruction are the most important factors influencing high performance writing. This conclusion evolved from the following data.

1. In answer to the question, "What teacher from grades 9-12 has had the most influence on your writing development?", fourteen of the seventeen high performance class teachers named one of the two high performance class teachers. This overwhelming response is a significant finding since most of the high performance writers confirmed the class mean data which, based on class scores, had identified the superior content and mode of instruction of these two teachers.

2. Another significant finding additionally corroborates the class mean scores and the student interview data. In a totally unexpected finding, data from all three years of the writing assessment revealed that ten of the seventeen students improved their 1983-84 test score from the previous year's assessment. All the high performance writers were students in the two high performance classes at the time of the 1983-84 sample. Of the remaining seven high performance writers in these classes, three did not take the test in 1982-83 so results could not be compared. The other four high performance writers had identical scores for both samples, a high performance score of
2. In sum, of the fourteen students who took the writing test in tenth and eleventh grades, ten improved their scores in eleventh grade and four maintained a high performance. Therefore, all fourteen high performance writers either improved or maintained their performance while in the Intermediate Composition class of one of the two high performance class teachers. Furthermore, eleven of the same seventeen high performance writers were tested again as twelfth graders in 1984-85. Ten of eleven of these twelfth graders maintained the high performance score which they had received as eleventh graders. These data overwhelmingly suggest that the two eleventh grade Intermediate Composition teachers' content and mode of instruction had a meaningful impact on the writing development of the seventeen high performance writers. Fourteen of the seventeen high performance writers credited the content and mode of instruction of the two eleventh grade Intermediate Composition teachers for their successful writing development.

3. Another finding corroborates the relationship of content and mode of instruction to writing performance. Twelve of the seventeen high performance writers had received at least one course grade of "C" or lower in one tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grade English
course. Eight of the seventeen students had received a grade of "D" or "F" in one English course in either tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grade. These data suggest that many of the high performance writers were not always high performance students in high school English courses. Further, the data suggest that English course grades may not be a valid predictor of high performance high school writing. These data do suggest, however, that high school students can successfully apply effective instructional content in a controlled writing situation.

Effective Content of Instruction

The observations, interviews, and document analyses identified the content of instruction for the two high performance class teachers. The content of instruction refers to the substantive information presented within the execution of a particular teaching mode. The content most often described by the two high performance teachers and most often by the high performance writers is listed below.

1. A structured and formal presentation of the "writing process" to include prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing was most frequently mentioned by students and teachers alike. For the purpose of instruction, this process is presented and, to some extent, is applied as a linear model. As the writer develops, both teachers and students describe an
evolution where the process application is increasingly recursive.

2. The high performance writers adjusted their composing processes to conform to the content of instruction presented to them by the high performance class teachers. The writers attributed these adjustments to their writing success and described them as the prewriting and revision sub-processes embedded within the instructional writing process but not always a part of their own composing processes. Thus an important distinction should be made between the "writing process" as instructional content and "composing process" as actual writing. As instructional content, the "writing process" was helpful to the writers because it exaggerated elements of their composing processes that were dysfuctioning or had become unsuccessfully disconnected from the writing act.

3. A major emphasis on prewriting activities highlighted the teachers' instructional content and was often noted by the students as an effective tool for improving their writing.

4. The teachers taught revision as a major writing skill and differentiated between editing for error, "getting it right," and revising, "checking it out." Revision was presented as a process within the total writing
process and the skill applied for making significant textual alterations.

5. The two teachers taught and used in class consistent terminology to describe the writer's work. This terminology communicated to the students as writers and included such terms as jot listing, drafting, revising, and editing. In addition, the teachers responded to student writing as readers while addressing major rhetorical aspects of the text in comments that discussed the effective or ineffective elements of the writer-reader communication.

6. Not one student mentioned grammar instruction as important to their high performance writing. Neither of the two teachers devote quality class time to grammar or rule-governed exercises emphasizing the conventions of standard edited American English.

7. Peer editing is widely applied and accepted by the high performance writers and their teachers as a useful activity to foster writing improvement. Peer editing is also used as a helpful activity for eliminating the surface mechanical errors that often plague high school writers and for teaching the skills when and if they are needed to eliminate those errors. This content of instruction is individualized and presented within the context of peer editing.
8. The two teachers applied in practice the content of instruction which they described. The students also described the teachers' content of instruction as the teachers actually applied it in their classrooms.

**Effective Mode of Instruction**

Hilllocks defined the mode of instruction as "the configuration of variables characteristic of certain teacher/classroom relationships and activities, particularly the role played by the teacher and the kinds of activities in which students engage" (1984, p. 141). In applying this definition, Hilllocks listed three dominant modes of instruction that he used to review research studies in his meta-analysis of experimental research studies. These modes included the presentational, natural process, and environmental. A fourth mode, individualized, was also included in the Hilllocks analysis but was not relevant to this study because "students receive instruction through tutorials, programmed materials of some kind, or a combination" (1984, p. 146). Of the three most prevalent modes, Hilllocks described the presentational mode as "undoubtedly the most common mode of instruction in composition" (1984, p. 143). However, in his meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies from 1963-1982, Hilllocks found that "clearly, the environmental mode is responsible for higher gains than the other modes" (1984, p. 147). In his meta-analysis, Hilllocks reported that "the environmental mode is over four times more effective than the traditional presentational mode and three times more effective than the natural process mode" (1984, p. 160). According to Hilllocks, the environmental mode is characterized by clear
and specific objectives, materials and problems selected to engage students with each other, and activities conducive to high levels of peer interaction. In addition, this mode minimizes lecture and teacher-led discussion and the "concrete tasks of the environmental mode make objectives operationally clear by engaging students in their pursuit through structured tasks" (Hillocks, 1984, p. 144).

Prolonged observations, student and teacher interviews, and document analyses were used to classify the mode of instruction for each high performance class teacher. The combined data from these multiple sources established important findings regarding effective modes of writing instruction.

1. This study supported Hillocks' findings that the environmental mode is the most effective one for composition instruction. Both high performance class teachers applied the environmental mode of instruction in their classrooms.

2. The mode for the two teachers was identified by their clear and specific objectives for each assignment, their wide range of materials and problems selected to engage students, and their activities designed for high levels of peer interaction. The application of principles and peer feedback were key elements in their teaching repertoires. In sum, the two high performance class teachers relied on structured problem solving activities and balanced their instruction by using a variety of classroom
resources. These resources included the student, the teacher, and supplemental teaching material.

3. Within each instructional mode, a range exists whereby different teachers apply the same mode but to varying degrees. For example, the two high performance teachers were explicitly identified as using an environmental mode. Yet one teacher was more presentational than the other and one applied more "natural process." This finding reveals that a range exists within each instructional mode.

4. Writing performance is affected by a mode of instruction. The high performance eleventh grade writers most frequently described the environmental mode as the instructional strategy most responsible for their writing improvement. Specifically, these eleventh grade writers described effective instruction as providing critical but positive evaluation, providing assistance for generating ideas, permitting the freedom to think and write creatively while responding more to the thought than the form in which it is written, designing a variety of assignments that facilitate learning objectives, providing opportunities for peer editing, and formally teaching writing as a process but encouraging individualized and idiosyncratic application of that process in practice.
Speculations

In addition to the findings of this study, the data suggested other implications not directly related to the research problem but useful as speculations for further consideration and exploration. These speculations can be summarized as

1. Composition teachers who practice an ineffective mode of instruction can nonetheless help their students improve their writing by teaching the writing process as content. Many of the high performance writers described teachers whose modes of instruction were ineffective but who presented writing as a process. As a result, no damage was done to the students' writing development but much value was placed on learning a "system" that could be applied to classroom writing.

2. Consistent terminology and theoretical application may have an extremely beneficial effect on writing performance. Many of the high performance writers used the same terminology when they discussed their composing processes. Many of these same writers indicated that "writing process" had been taught to them in ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. This schoolwide teaching strategy may have significantly influenced the sixteen high school mean scores. For example, the high school which was the setting for this study had the lowest mean score, and was
Table 4
Mean Scores for the Sixteen Columbus High Schools 1982-83*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Rank</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These scores are based on a 4 point holistic score, a 4 is low performance and a 1 is high performance

**Because one teacher taught all participating students, one high school was not ranked.
the highest performance school, in all three years of the Columbus/Ohio State University Writing Project.

3. Teaching clarity may markedly influence both the content and mode of instruction. The two high performance class teachers consistently projected instructional clarity through explicit verbal and written instructions, daily reviews, written syllabi and course objectives, and pertinent models and illustrations.

4. The high performance class teachers rarely used writing textbooks in their classrooms. Instead, both teachers relied extensively on materials created by themselves and others. Writing textbooks, especially for the secondary schools, have not kept pace with the widespread research in composition. Textbooks which emphasize a "process approach" to instruction are often too generic and eliminate the idiosyncratic elements of individual composing which process pedagogy tries to encourage and perpetuate, especially if they work. The teachers viewed their own "process" text as an artificial and often prescriptive writing guide. The "text bias" so prevalent among composition students often makes even the best textbooks minimally effective in the writing classroom even though a "writing process" would be preferred to one which emphasized product.
Implications of the Data

The data from this study overwhelmingly indicate that content and mode of instruction have a significant effect on the composing processes of high performance eleventh grade writers. Furthermore, the study suggests that the environmental mode is a more effective instruction strategy. This finding, although applicable to high school writers, is consistent with Hillocks's meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies which found that the environmental mode was three times more effective than the other ones he explored.

Also, the data from this study emphatically underscores the legitimacy of the "writing process" as pertinent and, indeed, valuable instructional content. This content may be presented as a linear sequence or a recursive process but is useful to students in either instructional form. The recursive nature of the process naturally evolves as the writer develops and becomes more adept at thinking, planning, writing, and revising. A process pedagogy, at the very least, promotes sustained writing practice and eliminates many of the time-consuming and often unproductive repetitive exercises that dominate many high school writing classrooms. Even if a teaching mode is ineffective and students are bored and dissatisfied with a class, a process pedagogy may still extend, not retard, a student's writing development.

The data from this study suggested an even more powerful implication. When the environmental mode of instruction combines with writing process content, high performance writing can be nurtured, developed, and eventually sustained. Additionally, this study emphatically confirms that, at a minimum, high school teachers should thoroughly
inculcate in their students the knowledge of writing as a process. High school teachers who devote substantial classroom time to grammar instruction, the conventions of standard English, and other surface language features contribute to a problem they seek to remediate. Not one of the seventeen high performance writers cited grammar, punctuation, or usage instruction as important to their writing instruction. The two high performance class teachers repeatedly emphasized that the results of their writing instruction dramatically improved when quality time was shifted from the product of writing to its process. Those teachers who persist, either stubbornly or naively, in teaching writing as a rule-governed, prescriptive act do considerable disservice to their students.

Finally, the study's data suggest an important implication too often ignored: Effective writing instruction is a blend of mode and content of instruction. "What we know" often determines "what we do." The "doing" is nearly as important as the "knowing." When the two high performance class teachers started "to know" more about current writing research, they began "to do" more things differently in the classroom. Their new knowledge directed them to a reassessment of the resources in their environment, the classroom, and to establish a new balance between student participation and their own. The teachers discovered that the students themselves were a natural source of knowledge and could also be teachers as well as learners. Even more important, the teachers' new knowledge helped them to accept the students as writers and to communicate with them accordingly. In turn, the students learned to respond as writers and to communicate with each other in the same way. Developing the environment for this important writer-to-writer communication may be
the teacher's most important task. To foster this environment, the two high performance class teachers created activities, thoughtfully evaluated essays, and gave their writers time to comfortably complete the writing process. The results are hard to ignore. Fourteen of the seventeen high performance writers cited one or the other of these two "transformed" teachers for the high school instruction that was the most significant to their writing development and success. In 1983-84, the Columbus Public Schools and the Ohio State University tested an eleventh grade population consisting of 4,000 students and 201 classes. These same two "transformed" teachers taught two of the top ranked classes in the entire population, classes with the 1st and 3rd lowest mean scores. The implication from these data is clear: high performance writing is influenced by high performance teaching.

Recommendations for Additional Research

Composing and teaching are both dynamic, complex processes. When the two processes blend, a new one is formed from this integration. This study linked the primary components of the classroom writing experience: the writer, the teacher, and the writing environment. The study focused on those factors which create high performance writing. The study would not have been possible without the data provided from the holistic scoring of large numbers of essays. To identify populations useful for research, holistic assessment has become a realistic balance between naturalistic and empirical research approaches. It provides quantitative data from a naturalistic context. Identifying research sources from holistic assessments provides many research opportunities. The data from the Columbus Public Schools/Ohio State University Writing Project
confirmed numerous research questions. These questions would be applicable whenever similar data would be available while questions emerged which additional research could usefully answer.

The high performance writers were remarkably consistent in the terminology they applied to descriptions of their composing processes. Is there a relationship between high performance writing and a teacher's ability to communicate relevant and meaningful terms that illustrate and explain the composing act? Do these terms characterize the act so accurately that they in themselves are perpetually instructive? The consistency among the seventeen high performance writers also suggested another question related to the entire school setting. All of these writers were students in a school which had the lowest mean score of the sixteen high schools that participated in the project. This outstanding mean score made the school, in essence, a high performance writing high school. Can universally shared content and/or mode of instruction influence the writing performance of an entire school? In comparing a low and high performing school, what factors contribute to the mean scores for each?

Another unexpected finding in the study was that many of the high performance writers were not always high performing students in high school English courses. Many high school students are placed in writing courses based on their total performance in a particular English course. What is the extent of the relationship, therefore, between writing performance, high or low, and grade point average or grades in previous English courses? Can a holistic score be a valid indicator of success
or failure in a writing course or an English course whose primary focus is literature?

A number of the students also described teachers who they characterized as "ineffective" but who taught important elements of writing. A comparative study of the same content but different modes would be valuable. For example, the high performance writers often selected their eleventh grade writing teacher as their most influential but sometimes complimented their tenth grade teacher for his "process content." The students were thus critical of the mode of instruction but complimentary of the teacher's content.

Five of the seventeen students described in some way the importance of "personally connecting" with a writing assignment. The cognitive and affective processes that establish a connection should be explored. In addition, the relationship between "personally connecting" with a topic and writing performance has wide implications for the credible execution of a large holistically evaluated sample. For example, how many students typically "connect" or "disconnect" from a topic administered to a large group and how are writing performances affected accordingly?

Many writing teachers in America devote considerable class time to the "thesis" as an organizational device. Yet only two of the seventeen high performance writer's described the importance of a thesis as a useful prewriting tool. Does the writing process in itself help the writer discover meaning that a thesis may well prohibit? And does this meaning naturally evolve into a thesis which concludes rather than initiates the substantive writing?
More research should explore the actual effect of documents, handouts distributed in the writing classroom, to a student's writing performance. What specific documents are useful to students? Which ones are more valuable than others? Which ones confuse or even distort or interfere with a writer's performance. Many teachers indiscriminately distribute large numbers of these handouts. They include everything from supplemental information to lists of vocabulary words. What type of document information is valuable to a student's writing development and what type is not? What type of text is valuable to writing development and which type is not?

Of course, any study of one extreme provokes interest in the other. Most typically, the question that arises is "Does a relationship exist between mode and content of instruction and the composing processes of low performance writers? What content and mode of instruction are applied by low performance class teachers? Another interesting question would focus on the low performance writer in the high performance class. Are these writers unresponsive to mode, content, or another unrelated factor?

All of these research questions probe the teacher and student writer in the classroom setting. Holistic assessment has made it possible to identify students as "high performance writers" or settings as "high performance writing schools." Such an identification is statistical, some would say quantitative. The exploration of writers and teachers in their natural setting is demanded by the problem the research seeks to solve. This essential fieldwork is surely an exercise in what many term "qualitative" or "naturalistic" research. To be too qualitave or too
quantitative and to see the sanctity of one to the exclusion of the other is to deny the intrinsic and extrinsic complexities of both. The classroom is a microcosm of this complexity and the actors in it. The outcomes of this study are clearly rooted in the naturalistic paradigm. Yet, its outcomes, and ones to follow, should be rooted in the scientific, positivist notion that statistical data can begin to locate "truth" even though field study will confirm its multiple realities.
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APPENDIX A

A Proposal for The Ohio Writing Program
A PROPOSAL
FOR
THE OHIO WRITING PROGRAM
PILOT PHASE

* * * * *

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
IN COOPERATION WITH
THE COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Principal Investigators:
Sara S. Carnes, Assistant Professor, English
Frank O'Hare, Professor, English
E. Garrison Walters, Assistant Dean, College of Humanities
Frank J. Zidonis, Professor, Humanities Education

May 14, 1982
Purpose. This proposal is for a pilot program that would lead to a larger, more comprehensive composition outreach effort. The pilot would accomplish two things: 1) It would establish an Institute to train twenty high school teacher-leaders to impart to their colleagues (and students) innovations in curriculum design, pedagogy, and classroom management that focus on writing as process rather than product, in accordance with recent advances in research on writing; and 2) it would establish a testing center for the grading of essays written by all high school juniors in Columbus. The grading in turn would have three purposes: a) to serve as the basis for determining the general level of writing competence in each tested school population; b) to serve as a guide to high school English teachers in evaluating their curricula and pedagogy; and c) to become the basis for more refined testing through which high school juniors can be advised individually of their deficiencies and the specific improvements required to bring their writing to the level necessary for direct entrance into college work.

The grading itself would have two unique features: 1) it would be done by the twenty teachers in the Institute as part of their training; and 2) it would employ the method known as "holistic grading," which has been used extensively at Ohio State and is superior to machine-graded, multiple choice SAT and ACT tests in predicting writing ability.

Holistic grading employs multiple graders of actual writing to ensure
reliability; it can be accomplished rapidly and at relatively low cost; and it can become the basis for both analytic and "primary trait" grading, through which the individual students' particular strengths and weaknesses can be identified.

The pilot differs from the larger project in that the latter proposes a) to test juniors in most of the larger high schools in the state of Ohio; b) to provide analytic and "primary trait" testing in order to provide specific advice for students and to evaluate the total effectiveness of the Institute program; and 3) to attempt a broader attack on the "writing crisis" by training high school teachers of other subjects to become effective teachers and evaluators of student writing. This approach, which has been used elsewhere, is known as "writing across the curriculum." The larger proposal also includes the establishment of an Early English Placement Center (EEPC) which would assume responsibility for grading student essays and analyzing results.

**Operation and Timetable**

**Spring 1982.** The twenty teachers who will form the Institute's first class will be selected by the project directors in conjunction with officials of the Columbus school district.

**Summer 1982.** The twenty teachers will participate in an intensive four-week workshop led by the Institute Director, Professor Frank O'Hare. The workshop, English 692 and English 694, will carry six hours of graduate credit and will meet for four to five hours a day five days a week. One focus of the workshop will be on the teachers' own writing skills, since there is substantial evidence to suggest that writing teachers
need to write and that experienced teachers who are themselves writers are the best teachers of other teachers.

The other focus will be on instructional strategies that have proven effective in helping secondary school students improve their writing skills. Among these are a) sentence combining strategies that go beyond the sentence into "chunks;" b) a variety of invention strategies; c) new ways to structure the writing class and to improve students' re-writing and editing skills; and d) the development of inexpensive writing labs. Few teachers are aware of recent developments in writing instruction, and both the Bay Area Writing Project and the Huntington Beach Project have demonstrated that writing instruction can be improved when teachers become knowledgeable about recent theory and practice. With knowledge come authority, independence, and commitment.

**Autumn 1982.** The twenty teachers will participate in a weekend or evening course, English 692.02 (three hours of graduate credit), which will be held in conjunction with school-based inservice workshops and demonstrations, and which will a) reinforce during the school year the skills developed in the summer, b) train the teachers as consultants to their own colleagues, and c) train the teachers in holistic grading. The course will be taught jointly by Professors O'Hare, Garnes, Helgeson, and others.

**Winter 1983.** The twenty teachers will participate in a laboratory course, English 692.03 (three hours of graduate credit), in which, under the supervision of Professor Sara Garnes and staff, they will complete the grading of 4,500 student essays.
Spring 1983. Results of the winter testing will be provided to schools in time to assist teachers and students in the development and selection of courses for the senior year.

Summer 1983. The Principal Investigators will write a report and deliver it to the funding agency, the University, and the Columbus Public School District.
APPENDIX B

Results/Columbus Writing Project
TO: Tenth Grade English Teachers

FROM: The Columbus Writing Program/The Ohio State Early English Placement Project

DATE: May 31, 1983

The essays written for the Columbus Writing Program/The Ohio State University Early English Placement Project have been read and scored, and the individual scores are being sent to the student writers. The overall city results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay Score</th>
<th>Number of Essays</th>
<th>Percentage of Essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (high)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (low)</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (inappropriate or no response)</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unrecorded scores | 125   | 3.0 |
| TOTAL:            | 4141  | 100.0 |

We have results available for each class; if you would like to know the results for the class(es) you teach, please call 422-4856 and arrange an appointment with Professor Sara Garnes.
APPENDIX C-D

Computer Printout
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henson Stephanie L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGillen Stephanie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation Lora L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Susan L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Stephanie K</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Lora F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Nora C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Perry R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Anthony L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Pat D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman John F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Michelle R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeller Minna M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths Kelly K</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Patrick O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson Steve J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Charlotte J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Matthew P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons Keith L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: GPA values are approximate and may vary.
To the teachers: Please read this document carefully and then use it as a "script" during the two days of the Writing Sample. It is very important that all students be given the same instructions. You should read everything printed in upper case letters to your students, verbatim, at the appropriate time.

Preparing for the Writing Sample
Friday, December 3:

1. Check your packet. You should have materials for 35 students: computer answer sheets, essay booklets, writing assignment sheets, and question sheets. You should also have extra pencils for students who forget to bring pencils or pens.

2. Write your name and your class period on the label on the outside of your packet. Return all materials in this packet to the main office of your school; packets will be collected on Wednesday, December 8.

3. Check the identification code number of your packet. You will need to write this number on the board on Day One. Write it now in the blank provided on page 3 of these Instructions. Note: There will be a different packet and identification number for each class you teach.

4. Plan to have at least five dictionaries in your room for students' use during both days of the Writing Sample.

5. Announce to the students that they will be doing the Writing Sample on Monday and Tuesday. They should bring a supply of paper (loose
sheets, not a notebook) and a pencil to class on Monday. Finally, ask students who have social security numbers to have the number readily available on Monday.

6. If any students are absent on either day of the Writing Sample, let them participate in the day’s activities. Since their material will be incomplete, their samples will not be evaluated. Instructions for incomplete materials are on the last page.
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Administering the Writing Sample
Monday, December 6 (DAY ONE):

1. Write your packet identification code number on the blackboard and check to make sure dictionaries are available in the room.

2. Say: IS THERE ANYONE WHO DOES NOT HAVE A PENCIL? Give pencils to students who do not have them.

3. Say: TODAY WE ARE GOING TO BEGIN A WRITING PROJECT. YOU WILL HAVE TWO DAYS TO WRITE. TODAY YOU WILL USE YOUR OWN PAPER TO PLAN YOUR ESSAY. YOU MAY WRITE NOTES, LISTS, OUTLINES--WHATEVER PREWRITING IS USEFUL TO YOU. TRY TO PREPARE A ROUGH DRAFT TODAY. TOMORROW YOU WILL REVISE YOUR ROUGH DRAFT AND WRITE A FINAL COPY IN THE ESSAY BOOKLET PROVIDED. YOU ARE FREE TO USE A DICTIONARY BOTH DAYS. Tell the students where to find the dictionaries.

4. Say: BEFORE YOU BEGIN THE WRITING PART OF THIS ASSIGNMENT, YOU NEED TO FILL IN THE COMPUTER ANSWER SHEET WITH A PENCIL.

Distribute computer answer sheets and question sheets. FIND SIDE ONE OF THE COMPUTER ANSWER SHEET.

5. Say: NOW, LOCATE THE SPACES FOR YOUR NAME ON THE UPPER LEFT SIDE OF THE PAGE. PRINT YOUR LAST NAME IN THE SPACES, ONE LETTER TO A SPACE. Pause and allow students to finish writing their last names. NOW, LEAVE ONE BLANK SPACE AND PRINT YOUR FIRST NAME. Pause. IF THERE ARE ADDITIONAL SPACES AFTER YOUR FIRST NAME, LEAVE ONE BLANK SPACE AND PRINT YOUR MIDDLE INITIAL. Pause and allow students to finish their names. Anticipate that some names may be too long to fit in the number of spaces provided. Tell students with those names simply to write in as many letters as there are spaces. If students have
hyphenated names, tell them to leave no space between the two parts of the names.

6. Say: NOW RETURN TO THE FIRST LETTER OF YOUR LAST NAME. IN THE COLUMN BELOW FIND THE CIRCLE CONTAINING THAT LETTER AND BLACKEN IT. BE SURE TO FILL UP THE CIRCLE COMPLETELY. IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, ERASE IT WELL. **Allow time** to complete this task. **NOW BLACKEN THE APPROPRIATE CIRCLE UNDER EACH OF THE OTHER LETTERS OF YOUR NAME.** When students are finished, continue.
APPENDIX F

Responses to Students
OSU/Columbus Writing Program: Responses to Students

1: You have received the highest possible holistic score on the essay you wrote for the OSU/Columbus Writing Program. Although the score is based only on one sample of your writing, if you continue to write as effectively as you did on this assignment, you should be able to do very well in freshman composition courses that you may enroll in at The Ohio State University. In fact, you may eventually be able to receive examination credit for freshman composition. Continue to write frequently and enroll in the most challenging writing courses available to you in your junior and senior years of high school.

2: You have received a high holistic score on the essay you wrote for the OSU/Columbus Writing Program. Although the score is based on only one sample of your writing, if you continue to write as you did on this assignment, you should be able to place into freshman composition courses, bypassing remedial course work, should you enroll at The Ohio State University. Continue to work on all aspects of writing—from thesis statement and essay development to editing and proofreading. Enroll in appropriate and challenging writing courses during your junior and senior years of high school.

3: You have received a relatively low holistic score on the essay you wrote for the OSU/Columbus Writing Program. Although the score is based on only one sample of your writing, if you continue to write as you did on this assignment, you may be required to take one quarter of basic writing (remedial writing) before enrolling in regular freshman composition, should you enroll at The Ohio State University. Continue to work on all aspects of your writing, from thesis statement and essay development to editing and proofreading. Enroll in writing courses in which you will write essays frequently during your junior and senior years of high school. By writing frequently and by responding to your teachers' comments on both the content and form of your essays now while you are in high school, you may be able to place into regular freshman composition bypassing remedial writing courses at the university level.

4: You have received the lowest holistic score on the essay you wrote for the OSU/Columbus Writing Program. Although the score is based on only one sample of your writing, if you continue to write as you did on this assignment, you may well be required to take two quarters of basic writing (remedial writing) before enrolling in regular freshman composition, should you enroll at The Ohio State University. Begin working on all aspects of your writing, from stating a thesis effectively and developing your essays to editing and proofreading. Enroll in writing courses in which you will write frequently during your junior and senior years of high school. By writing frequently and by responding to your teachers' comments on both the content and form of your essays now while you are in high school, you will decrease your chances of needing to enroll in
remedial courses at The Ohio State University or at any other post-secondary institution.

5: You have received a holistic score of five on the essay you wrote for the OSU/Columbus Writing Program. While holistic scores of one through five indicate readers' evaluations of essays, a score of five shows that readers were unable to score your essay. Such a situation arose for several reasons.

(1) an essay booklet was blank, or nearly so; readers were unable to evaluate your writing because so little of it appeared on your essay booklet; or

(2) an essay did not respond to the topic; while the assigned topic called for a narration of a moment you wished could be relived, your essay did not answer that topic.

ESL tag: Add to student's holistic score this message if they have filled out 7B:

1: No special statement.

2: Although you indicate that English is not the first language you spoke at home, your essay indicates that you can compete well with native speakers of English.
APPENDIX G

Instructions to Table Leaders
INSTRUCTIONS TO TABLE LEADERS

Duties of Table Leaders

I. Leading Discussions of Sample Essays
II. Spot Checking Readers at the Table
III. Maintaining Discipline at the Table
IV. Conferring with Head Readers
V. Reading Essays

I. A. At the beginning of each session and after every break, we will begin the reading by discussing sample essays which have already been graded. This will be done separately at each table. You, as leader, will ask readers at your table to read papers designated by the Head Reader and to write down their scores. Then you will poll the readers, one paper at a time, and record each score on the Calibration Form.

Instructions for filling out Calibration Form:

1. Model. Here you will record the paper's score as agreed upon by Head Readers and Table Leaders. (Note: when you record spot checks or readers, there will not be an already decided score to record in this blank.)

2. Paper. Here you will record the paper's number or letter designation. All sample papers have letter IDs but when you spot check readers' papers, you will put the paper's official number in this blank.

3. Readers. You will designate one column for each reader, including yourself. Put the reader's number at the top of the appropriate column.

4. Write your name where it says Table Number at the top of the sheet and record the page number.

5. Keep these sheets in the folder marked "Table Leaders' Records."

B. When readers disagree, you will lead the discussion about the paper, remembering your goal is to bring all readers to see what features of the paper caused the table leaders to grade it as they did.

C. You will not change readers' initial scores (before discussion) on the Calibration Sheet, but you will want to encourage some readers to change their minds about a particular paper.
II. Spot-checking Readers at the Table:

A. After the readers have commenced reading, you will spot-check for accuracy and agreement by reading papers that have already been read. The procedure is as follows:

1. Select a paper from the top of a reader's "read" stack.
2. Record its number on your Calibration Sheet.
3. Read it and record your score under your reader number.
4. Record the reader's score under his/her reader number.
5. Compare the scores. If they are different, discuss the paper with the reader. You should explain as clearly as possible why you chose the score you did, perhaps by referring back to model papers, but do not require the reader to change his/her score. In fact, leave the paper with the reader to reread and rescore.
6. The reader will put the paper in his/her "read" stack.

B. It is important that readers feel they are autonomous and make real choices. Therefore, you must be tactful and gentle when you discuss graded papers on which you have disagreed. Reference back to the agreed-upon models is the best way to handle this "calibration". Your message is not "You're wrong," but "your score doesn't seem to follow our agreed-upon models."

III. Maintaining Discipline at the Table:

Maintaining an orderly and quiet atmosphere may be difficult at times, particularly because this group of readers knows one another so well. It will be your responsibility to keep your readers "in line" without exerting too much obvious pressure. You will need to think about how best to do that. It is probably not wise to insist upon absolute quiet; still we want to maintain a "library-like atmosphere" and you should suggest that necessary talking be done at a whisper and that readers not discuss papers among themselves. On the other hand, four-hour sessions are long and even when they are interrupted by breaks for food, coffee, or discussion, readers are apt to get "antsy," and you will have to use your judgment about maintaining order. Readers should not move around, though some readers may want to stand in place occasionally. We expect, however, that bathroom and coffee trips will come only at designated breaks.

IV. Conferring with Head Readers

Table Leaders will meet individually and in groups with the Head Readers, usually to discuss sample essays for upcoming sessions or to discuss procedural matters. You should, however, feel free to consult the Head Reader anytime about scoring or any other problem.
V. Reading Essays

When you are not busy with your chores as Table Leader, you will read essays like the other readers.
APPENDIX H

Assigning Essays to Readers
INSTRUCTIONS

Assigning Essays to Readers

1. Table leaders will now be responsible for assigning essays to readers.

2. Before you begin reading today, make a list of the readers' numbers at your table and keep it in front of you.

3. As you need essays for your readers, pick them up from the table marked "Unread Essays" (as you have been doing).

4. Check the note clipped to each stack you pick up. It will have two reader numbers on it, those of people who have already read the essays.

5. Remove from the stack the slip with reader numbers on it.

6. Check your list of reader numbers.

7. Assign the stack of essays to anyone at your table except a reader with one of the two numbers on the slip.
APPENDIX I

Distributing Essays to Tables
1. Prepare essays for first reading:

Read by packets, alphabetically by school name, numerically within schools.

Write table leader's name on master list and on each packet.

Remove essays from envelope and check numbers on essays against numbers on envelopes, making sure essays are in complete consecutive order. (If some numbers are missing, mark those numbers on master list and envelope front.)

Distribute essays, giving the essays from one envelope to one reader (five sets of essays per table—one set per reader). Place stack of essays in front of readers (according to diagram).

2. Read essays:

Reader writes reader's number and score on scoring slip (yellow for first reading, blue for subsequent reading).

Reader turns read essay face down on reader's right.

3. Collect essays:

Workers collect read essays, making sure each has a score and a reader number. Workers return essays to the appropriate packet, in numerical order. Workers check number of essays against numbers written on front of envelope to make sure all essays are returned to packet.

Table leaders randomly select essays from readers for calibration. Leader reads essay, then marks leader's and reader's scores on calibration form. If the scores differ, leader discusses conflict with reader (follow instructions to table leaders).

When leaders have discussed a calibrated paper, they will place it at their left. Workers collect these essays from table leaders' left.

4. Prepare essays for second reading:

When all essays from a packet have been read and collected, workers place essays in packet; packet and master list have table leader's name marked on them. (The yellow slip will not be stapled up until later to allow leisurely rereading.)

Return essay packets to original box, in alphabetical and numerical order.
5. Second reading:

Note name of table leader on packet and on master list.

Write a DIFFERENT table leader's name on packet and on master list.

Note: yellow sheet must now be folded and stapled.

Distribute essays as described above in (1).

6. Collect read essays as described above in (3).

7. Finishing reading:

Workers unstaple folded yellow slip and compare scores.

If scores do not match, worker notes on master list previous table leaders and selects one of two remaining tables for third reading. Then, worker prepares blue slip with handwritten essay number and staples it on top of re-stapled yellow and blue folded sheets.

Worker gives essay to reader or leader for third reading.

8. Recording scores:

When third readings are completed, or when the first two scores match, worker finds computer sheet for each essay.

Worker locates reader's number on computer sheet.

Worker records score (1, 2, 3, or 4) in appropriate spot after reader's number (31 through 50, 91-93).

Worker will record all scores by reader number.

Worker records actual score in blank (8) on computer sheet. (We will use data from reader's scores to determine reliability of readers and of the entire project. The actual score is for the record.)

Worker returns essays to the appropriate packets.

The computer sheets will be placed in a box marked, "ready for processing" (depending on advice from programmer).

9. We will keep essays for future use.

10. Computer sheets will go to programmer for processing.

NOTE: Calibration readings with handwritten numbered blue sheets will be going on periodically.
APPENDIX J

Preparing Essays for Third Reading
INSTRUCTIONS

Preparing Essays for Third Reading

1. Take packet from box of essays that have been read twice. (If you come across essays that have already had three readings, give the whole packet to Suellynn.)

2. Remove essays and yellow scoring sheets from envelope. (If no scoring sheets are loose in the envelope, they will be folded up and stapled to the essay booklet, in which case unstaple them and unfold.)

3. Check scores for each essay. (Use the stamped or handwritten numbers to match scoring sheets and essays.)
   a) If both scores match, slip both scoring sheets inside the booklet and turn it face down.
   b) If the scores are different, remove both scoring sheets and stack them face down. Write the essay number in the upper right-hand corner of a new blue sheet; then staple that blue sheet to the essay and turn the essay face down. Keep the essays and scoring sheets in order.
   c) Keep the essays for which both scores match separate from those which need a third reading.

4. When you've checked all the essays for one packet, slip together the loose scoring sheets (which should still be in numerical order). Return everything except the essays which need a third reading to the envelope. Then clip together the essays which need a third reading and attach to them a note with the number of the two readers who have read them.

5. Take the essays to the table marked "Unread Essays"; take the envelope to the boxes marked "Ready for Coding" and file it in numerical order by essay number.

Preparing Essays for Fourth Reading

1. Suellynn will pick up essays that have been read, check to see which need fourth readings, and give others to Richard for return to packets to send to coding.
APPENDIX K

Processing Essays
INSTRUCTIONS

Processing Essays from "Essays Read" Table

1. Pick up a stack of essays from table marked "Essays Read." (Most of these essays will have been read three times.)

2. Locate the appropriate packet the essays belong in; it will be filed by essay number in Richard's room.

3. Check to see if each essay now has two matching scores:
   a) Put essays in numerical order; do the same for the scoring sheets.
   b) Locate the previous scoring sheets (in the envelope or stapled to the essay).
   c) Match each scoring sheet to its essay according to the stamped or hand-written four-digit number.
   d) If at least two scores match, place all scoring sheets for that essay inside the essay booklet and proceed to Step 4.
   e) If no two scores are the same, prepare the essay for fourth reading:
      1) Write the essay number in the upper right-hand corner of a new blue sheet.
      2) Put the blue sheet on top of all other scoring sheets and staple them to the essay booklet.
      3) Put these essays on Sara's and Susan's table.
   f) Then return all other essays to the packet and file the packet by numerical order in Richard's room.

4. Remove all other essays from the envelope.

5. Put all essays in one stack in numerical order.

6. Determine whether you have all the essays that belong in the envelope:
   Check the numbers on the essay booklet. If they are not consecutive, check the envelope for a notation regarding the missing number(s), e.g. "1622 pulled for tng." If there is such a notation for each missing essay, you have accounted for all the essays your packet is to contain. Proceed to Step 7.
If there is no notation for any of the essays your packet is to contain (or if the notation says the essay is "missing"), put all essays inside and refile the packet in Richard's room.

7. Put all the essays inside the envelope and file it by essay number in the boxes marked "Ready for Coding."
APPENDIX L

Informational Handouts (Fran)
Mythology Survey: Syllabus

I. Course Overview: Philosophy and Objectives

You are probably more familiar with mythology than you realize. All our lives we try to come up with explanations for why things are the way they are. This is, very basically and simply put, the purpose of myths - they give people ways to comprehend the universal mysteries that have always been a part of humankind and its condition. Myths explain natural phenomena, human emotions, and our "monstrous" tendencies. They explore the subconscious and answer important questions that can still only be answered by stories that express the deepest wisdom and insight that the human race has accumulated over thousands of years.

This course will examine the way myths began and why they began, the basic universal mysteries humans try to solve, the best known myths, heroic tales and epics. As often as time permits, we shall look at myths cross culturally so that we may see the way various cultures perceive these same mysteries. In this way we shall study the ways we are different than other cultures and like some others.

By the time the semester ends, we shall have studied many of these ideas:

- How the earth was created
- Why we are here - our purpose
- Why we need heroes (and anti-heroes)
- Basic human concerns - Love, hate, courage, joy, jealousy, hope, despair, aging and death.
- Cycles - Patterns of repetition - Human and natural - The seasons, aging, war, rebirth.
- Monsters, demons, fears, the dark unknown
- Good and Evil
- Courage vs. cowardice - What that means in different cultures and at different time periods.
- Life and death - Mortality vs. immortality
- Explanations for natural phenomena

Since this is obviously pretty "heavy stuff" you will need to keep up with your reading and pay attention in class. (Points are awarded for participation in class discussions, etc.)

(A course which "covers" all Greek and Roman myths must be structured in a broad survey style. Please do not expect in depth study of any particular myth in this course.)

II. Classroom Materials:

1. Text - Mythology - Edith Hamilton (E.H.) This is your assigned text; however, I recommend, for the college bound student, buying a copy of this book as it is a valuable resource for mythological allusions.
Supplementary Texts - The following texts are available only as class sets and must stay in the classroom.

Math The Mythmaker - Kewkes (M.M.)
The Hero and The Anti-Hero - Rollins (H/AH)
Myths and Modern Man - Stanford (M.M.M.)

2. Notebook - I recommend a three-ring binder. I supply supplementary hand-outs. These should be kept, along with all homework papers, timed writings, quizzes, tests and notes, in your notebook. Date all materials and keep in chronological order. A charge of 5 cents a sheet is charged for any replacement hand-out.

3. Hand-Outs - All are important. Keep in notebook - dated. I base the final exam on old tests, quizzes and major hand-outs and notes.

4. Pen/Paper - Obviously, a daily must. Often you will be required to take notes, do a timed writing, or get information from a recording, filmstrip, or film. I sell pens for 25 cents each.

5. Highlighter - Highly recommended. Yellow, pink, etc. Use to highlight handouts and notes. Do not use highlighter in any text.


7. Miscellaneous - You may be asked to buy simple materials for classroom use such as 3x5 cards, posters, poster board, etc.

(Please turn to the next page)
III. Breakdown of Study for First Nine Weeks:

WEEK

1. Introductory handouts and Readings; Oral Tradition; Mythology Defined; Videotape: "The Greeks In Search of Meaning."

2. Classical Allusions; Greek Maps; (finish) Introductory Material; Timed Writing (Underworld/concepts of Death); Greek and Roman Gods and Their Primary Functions.

3. Theogonies (Myths of Creation) - Greek, Sumerian, Chinese, Hindu

4. Gods of Earth - Grain and Wine; "Rape of Persephone"; Osiris-Egyptian God of Vegetation.

5. (finish) Gods of Earth; (begin) Hero Myths; Characteristics of the Hero; "Pegasus and Bellerophon"; "Daedalus and Icarus"; "Phaethon."

6. Hero Myths; "Theseus"; "Perseus."

7. Hero Myths; "Herakles"; "Gilgamesh" (Babylonian.)

8. (finish) Hero Myths; (begin) "Quest of The Golden Fleece." Concept of the Inner Quest.

9. Continue Quest.

IV. Breakdown of Points for First Nine Weeks: 1000 Pts. Score

1. Tests (2) 125 pts. ea. ...................... 250 pts. 
(Introductory including Theogonies; Heroes) Objective.

2. Quizzes (3) 25 pts. ea. ...................... 75 pts.

3. Timed Writing (1) 100 pts. ................... 100 pts.
(50 pts. for attached notes)
(50 pts. for finished writing)

* 4. Mini-Project (1) 15% Option .................... 150 pts.
DUE MARCH 4, MONDAY - MUST BE APPROVED
SEE "TEAR-OFF" Below.
IV. (cont'd.)

5. Myth or Option (l) ....................... 250 pts.
   DUE MARCH 8, FRIDAY. (Essay; Personal Journal
   relating to mythological motifs; Short Story with
   underlying mythological motifs; Poetry collection
   w/myth motifs)

6. Class/Home Assignments................ 125 pts.

7. Participation/Discussion............... 50 pts.

1000 pts.

* Mini-Project - Any creative project of 3 hrs or so. Drawn from studied
   mythological motifs. Some examples: 1.) Computer Program; 2.) 3 or 5
   drawings (or any interpretive art piece); 3.) Parody of Creed/Roman,
   etc. character; 4.) Collection of mythological allusions used in modern
   day -- in architecture, events, writings, etc. Or, collection of
   allusions used in poetry; 5.) Comparative myth study - written or chart
   form; 6.) OTHER?????? Be Creative!!!

For my mini-project, I will ___________________________________________. I
understand this is due Monday, March 4th.

Name ___________________________ Date ____

This form is due Monday, Feb. 4th.
For Your Information:

1. Bonus Points: Sometimes given in class. Up to 50 pts. Must be in class to obtain.

2. Make-Up Tests and Quizzes - Essay style. Must be taken in rm 217 on a study period. Must be made up your first day upon return to school and will be given only if you have an excused absence at that time.

3. Tests - Announced a week in advance. Usually 50 items. I will have "study sessions" during lunch periods 4 and 5 on the day before the test. Bring your lunch and cram together!!!!

4. Quizzes - May be unannounced, but I usually "hint" at them.

5. This syllabus, a reflection of your input, is, necessarily, tentative due to class interruptions, etc. I'll try to cover everything listed, but may have to make changes. You will be notified of such changes as we proceed. So, have your syllabus in your notebooks which should, of course, be brought to class daily.

6. Let's have a great nine weeks!!!!!!
Directions: You'll have 20 minutes to finish the writing in class. You may use brief notes (not a rough draft) taken previously. Use a separate sheet of paper for your writing.

Consider the criteria below before writing. You must fulfill all these criteria to get 50 pts.

After the time is up, have two student-readers use the criteria to check off their responses and add comments.

Topic: Page 39 in E.H. describes the Underworld as conceived by the Greeks and Romans. For this writing, consider the Greek concept only. (Exclude Virgil's description – Roman.) Also, consider the excerpt below from Homer's Odyssey. + Info. from La Rousse - "Underworld" Then, compare (likenesses) and contrast (differences) the concepts of Hades-Hell presented in the Greek version to two of the other versions we discussed in class. (E.g. Egyptian, Hindu, Babylonian, Judeo-Christian.) You are welcome to explore another culture's concept of death/afterlife other than the ones discussed. Handout in class.

Excerpt: The Greek hero, Odysseus, on his way home to the Greek island of Ithaca from the battlefields of Troy, undergoes many perilous adventures. In order to receive instructions about getting home, Odysseus must journey into the Underworld to talk with the Greek prophet named Teiresias, who had been the holy man of Thebes. Odysseus must induce the ghost (shade) to come to him by killing sheep and filling a pit with their blood. All spirits had an irresistible craving to drink blood. (end of preface)

from theOdyssey of Homer Book Eleven "A Gathering of Shades"

"........................ With my drawn blade I spaded up the votive pit, and poured libations round it to the unnumbered dead: sweet milk and honey, then sweet wine, and last clear water; and I scattered barely down. Then I addressed the blurred and breathless dead, vowing to slaughter my best heifer for them before she calved, at home in Ithaka, and burn the choice bits on the altar fire; as for Teiresias, I swore to sacrifice a black lamb, handsomest of all our flock. Thus to assuage the nations of the dead I pledged these rites, then slashed the lamb and ewe, letting their black blood stream into the wellpit. Now the souls gathered, stirring out of Erebos, brides and young men, and men grown old in pain, and tender girls whose hearts were new to grief; many were there, too, torn by brazen lance-heads, battle-slain, bearing still their bloody gear. From every side they came and sought the pit with rustling cries; and I grew sick with fear. But presently I gave command to my officers to flay those sheep the bronze cut down, and make burnt offerings of flesh to the gods below-to sovereign Death, to pale Persephone. Meanwhile I crouched with my drawn sword to keep the surging phantoms from the bloody pit till I should know the presence of Teiresias."
Criteria for Scoring Timed Writing #1. To receive 150 pts., you must get a check for each criterion. After two student-readers have checked off the "yes" or "no" responses and added comments, hand the papers in. Attach student scoring to your timed writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reader #1</th>
<th>Reader #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Concept of Greek Hades is compared completely to two other culture's versions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Concept of Greek Hades is contrasted completely to two other culture's versions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The arguments presented are within the context of the work chosen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The writer shows s/he understands the work chosen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics, though not perfect, do not hinder meaning. The writing is understandable. Sentence structures are mostly nonfragmented. There is a sense of planning and organization in which ideas are adequately developed and arranged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Reader #1: (Your name) ____________________________

Comments: Reader #2 (Your name) ____________________________
Writing A Literary Analysis

Well... first... the bad news. There is no magic. There is no "one-correct-and-foolproof-method-for-writing." There is no "easy-to-follow-sure-fired-well-sequenced-step-by-step process" in writing a literary analysis. The thought processes involved are too abstract to have such concrete lassos thrown around their necks.

Now... second... the good news. It can be done. And once you have finished your many jot lists, outlines and drafts, you will have conquered a very high level task -- that of critically thinking and writing about a work of literature. You will feel proud and satisfied that you were able to focus inside a work of art.

Okay... so I said there was no magic. True, but there are strategies which can and do help if you use them to serve your individual needs. Conversely, you need to ignore (or adapt) these strategies, and, hence, develop your own, if these strategies do not help you to write your paper.

So... following is a list of suggested strategies. Note that no matter how you get there, step #16 is necessary (for points too) and so on for the subsequent steps, particularly rough drafts, and, of course, the final paper.

Here we go... (Darn, this typewriter skips)

1. Examine several stories, novellas or plays. Skim them for literary merit and personal interest. Check out intriguing titles. Stay away from mysteries or stories with a lot of action, but little inherent message or meaning. Check out the "Short Story" section of the library. Drama section too. In room 217, there are also shelves of these materials.

2. Select a genre, and read it thoughtfully. Concentrate. (You will read two genres if doing a comparison/contrast.)

3. Make a thorough jot list of ideas. These ideas may be about the characters, setting, conflicts, symbols, or anything else. Your list will probably be a combination of key words, phrases, or even entire sentences. Jot everything down - no matter how "silly" or irrelevant these ideas may seem. Let one idea flow into another. Jot. Hot. Jot. (You could do this on 3x5 notecards.)

4. Look at your jot list after it has "cooled" a day or two.

5. Now, reread your genre, noting as you go along more ideas on your jot list or notecards.

(Over)
6. Try to group your ideas into categories using numbers. For example, six or seven of your ideas (or notecards) may be about a symbol used in the story. You might label these #1. Possible themes might be #2. Character analysis notes might be #3, and so on.

7. Choose one category of ideas. Let's say "theme." You'll probably have more than one underlying idea noted for the story. Make a separate jot list of possible themes. (Or do this on a separate series of notecards.) At this point, don't discard any of your other notes because they could support your theme. Example: Your notes on symbols might later come in handy to help you discuss how the theme is conveyed.

8. Narrow a theme to one. This may result from pulling together several like ideas from your random list. At this point, your theme may yet be a word, phrase, or even a sentence. It must be developed, now, into a thesis sentence or statement. Built into your thesis statement is an implied outline of the general ideas to be developed and supported in the analysis.

9. Write several possible thesis statements. It is customary to begin analysis papers in one of the following ways:

   a. **Topic Statement**  
      Ex. ................ In "A Rose For Emily" Faulkner dramatizes the idea that love manifests itself in more than one form.

   b. **Direct Statement**  
      Ex. ................ A person can love, and yet destroy the object of that love.

   c. **Analogy**  
      Ex. ................ Any obsessive love, like that of Mark David Chapman for his idol John Lennon, can destroy the recipient of that love.

   d. **Personal Definition**  
      Ex. ................ Love can be wonderful, generous, giving, selfish, possessive, jealous, desperate, or obsessive. Clearly, a person can love in more than one way.

   e. **Suspenseful Question**  
      Ex. ................ When one is driven to desperation by the need for love, what should one do?

After writing several possible thesis statements for your genre, ask a reader (or the teacher) to see if you're on the right track.
10. Don't begin your paper by:

   a. Using a dictionary definition.
   b. Restating the plot. ("My story was about...")
   c. Telling the reader who the author was or his/her birthplace.
   d. Refering to the title of your paper.
   e. Using a personal point-of-view. ("I think that...")
       Instead, use third person point-of-view.
   f. Using sweeping generalizations. ("All love is....")

11. Narrow your choice down to one thesis statement made up of one or two sentences. Remember, a thesis statement is an idea stated in general terms; the specific evidence will be presented in the body of the paper. A thesis is usually inherent in a genre; it is not usually directly stated in the work. You have to "dig" for it.

12. Write your thesis statement on a separate sheet of paper. (At this point, it would again be valuable to have a reader, including the teacher, look at the theses.) Underneath the thesis, sketch out a page or so of rough plans (or a rough outline). This outline becomes the framework upon which you "hang" the supporting ideas for your thesis. Each paragraph after the thesis should be developed by offering specific evidence for the truth of the statement. Do not veer from your thesis. Let it be your guide for coherence.

13. In making a rough outline, ask yourself, "What ideas, actions, words of characters (quotes), characters' interactions, or thoughts prove my thesis?"

14. Jot all supporting evidence down in random order, or on separate 3x5 cards. (Here, 3x5 cards work very well.)

15. Group your cards into like categories. You may see that you have three or four major ideas that support your thesis. These may be labeled "A" "B" "C". And so on.

16. Now, construct your outline (a page or so) in an orderly way. Rewrite your thesis statement on top of another sheet of paper. Underneath your thesis, write down points A, B, C. (Leaving space under each letter.) Then, underneath each letter, write down the quotes (and page numbers where the quote appeared in the work) and other supporting evidence. For example: Let's say your theme is "Love can destroy as well as heal." Point "A" says that (in your story) a child's love heals. Your supporting evidence underneath point "A" explains where and how in your story that child's love did heal, and whom it healed. Quotes are necessary here. Example: "When Joshua folded himself into his grandfather's arms, the old man swelled with a love he could not explain, nor had thought existed." (p. 10)

***Note. This step is the first point at which you receive a grade. Turn in your thesis and rough outline for points.)

(Next page)
17. After receiving comments from your reader and a teacher, you may find you'll have to go back to steps 1-16, or part of them. If not, then go ahead and write a first draft, following your outline. Note places, as you write along, where additional evidence may be needed. (The first draft is graded too.)

18. Have a classmate (reader) or two look at your rough draft. A critique sheet will be provided at this point to help. Discuss the filled-out critique sheet thoroughly.

19. Rewrite your paper into draft #2. (This draft is graded too.) Answer these questions as you go along?

   a. Is each paragraph after the general statements made up of evidence to support it?
   b. Is each idea clear and does it logically lead into the next?
   c. If the individual sentences were written on separate cards and shuffled, could the original order be reconstructed by the reader?
   d. Is everything said as simply as possible? Can any unnecessary words or phrases be eliminated? Have I used exact words? Active verbs? Have I written tightly?
   e. At the end of my paper, have I finished with a punch, or a whimper? Have I merely repeated what I already said, or have I ended with a good, solid quote or analogy?

20. Hand in draft #2 for teacher comments after letting a reader or two check it out.

21. After completing mechanics exercises (for example, how to correctly quote literary works) write your third and final (finally!) draft. Answer the following questions first:

   **** a. Do my connecting words and phrases (transitions) logically and grammatically go together?
   b. Are there any unnecessary repetitions of words?
   c. If words or phrases are quoted directly from my genre, have I used quotation marks or indentation properly? Have I noted the page number of the quote?
   d. Are my verb tenses consistent? (You may discuss the events of the story either in present or past tense, but it must be consistent.)
   e. Are my pronoun references clear?
   f. Have I spelled all words correctly?

   (Next page)
g. Have I used commas correctly?

h. Is each sentence complete, or do I have run-ons?
(Avoid the dreaded comma splice!) (Effective sentence fragments are okay.)

i. Do I have any dangling participles?

j. Do I have any misplaced modifiers?

k. Have I used formal diction rather than slang or colloquialisms?

***** In reference to letter "a" above, here are some helpful ideas for expressing the relations between ideas, sentences, or paragraphs.

for additional ideas: and, furthermore, in addition, moreover, likewise, also, too.

for contrasts: but, in spite of, yet, still, however, on the contrary, in contrast, on the other hand, despite, nevertheless.

to express results: so, therefore, thus, hence, accordingly, as a result, consequently, in consequence.

22. (COULD THIS BE Catch 22?) Finally, type your paper. It should be double spaced (except for quotations over 5 lines). Leave inch and 1/2 margins at the top, bottom and sides. The paper should be at least 4 typewritten pages, or more. (No more than 7.) Attach a cover sheet with a clever title of your story/paper 2-1/2 inches from the top. Put your name, the date, and the class name and period in the bottom right hand corner of the cover page, leaving 1-1/2 inch margin at the bottom and right side.) Attach all jot lists, outlines, notecards, drafts, etc., in order from first to last. Hand in your work, and SMILE! You're done........... and you survived!
SOME GUIDELINES FOR KEEPING A READER'S JOURNAL

1. Use clear heading for each entry. Include day, date, time. Put entry # at top of entry along with the title of the work you are discussing.

Example:

Sunday, Nov. 15
9:00 pm.

#1

"The Devil and Tom Walker"

2. Each entry should be at least 20 minutes long, or about 1-1/2 pages.

3. Write in blue or black ink, or VERY DARK pencil.

4. Use, upon occasion, the "Suggestions For Reader's Journal" handout. This handout contains ideas for writing about characters, settings, etc. It even has ideas for library projects and creative-type entries.

5. Though the entries should be based upon readings from the contract you are currently using, you are encouraged, upon occasion, to compare this era to contemporary society. Or, compare yourself to the era. Ex. Am I a romantic? A realist? (For mythology) Am I a quester? A hero? Who is my hero?

6. Don't forget to comment on audiovisual filmstrips and videotapes. Handouts, too.

7. Part of the grade depends upon how well your writing covers a "spread" of the readings on the contract. The more readings you cover, the higher your points.
8. The highest percentage of the grade, however, depends upon how much in depth you get in your analysis of character, events, etc. Or, how creative your approach to the subject matter. A person who, for example, does an excellent job of relating a current magazine article to his/her reading from the contract, will be given a higher score than a person who does a superficial and unimaginative entry based solely upon the reading itself.

9. For a creative touch, add illustrations that relate to your subject. Cut out pictures from magazines, or do some line drawings. Anything that adds interest and creativity to the journal.

10. See attached examples. These are from American Lit. I. class. Beth Harrington's (from the "Revolutionary Era" discusses her idea of an American. David Solove's (from the Romantic Era) discusses the character of Tom Walker and the Devil from W. Irving's story. Each student looks at the work critically, yet creatively.

HAPPY WRITING
"The Devil and Tom Walker"

by Washington Irving

In "The Devil and Tom Walker" Tom Walker is an allegory for, mainly, greed. He desires wealth so much that he would bargain with anything, even his soul. In the end, the devil comes to collect his side of the deal. Poor Tom Walker must hand his life over to "Old Scratch." In this way, Tom also represents the marked sinner; Tom Walker has sinned, and no matter how hard he tries to cleanse himself, he is marked (scarred) for life. And the devil exacts his dues, not caring an ounce about how often Mr. Walker went to church. The character of Tom Walker brings into view two morals: 1.) Excessive greed and lack of compassion can be hazardous to your health (if not fatal) and, 2.) "Once a sinner, always a sinner."

As for the devil, he is an analogy for evil. Yet, in this story, the devil does not appear to be terribly wicked, nor evil incarnate. Rather, he seems to enjoy himself, to have fun, in a sort of taunting manner. He is like the spider luring the fly into the web as he lures Tom Walker into selling his soul. In this way, the devil is also an analogy for temptation, that force which twists men's souls out of proportion. The base overall moral (didactic massage) of "The Devil and Tom Walker" as it is for any other tale with a Faustian motif, is that man should not
sell his soul, should not forsake his reasoning, compassion, love, and
humanity, in order to achieve a materialistic goal.
APPENDIX M

Evaluated Essays (Fran)
Thanks for typing!

\[
\frac{76}{84} = \frac{A}{}\]

MISSISSIPPI ROYALTY
Bliss & Tate

Andy,

Sorry there are so many comments inside. (I got carried away.) They are meant to help.

Andy Stewart
("Storpy" files)

\[
\frac{20}{70} \quad \frac{70}{76}
\]

Note for part III
MISSISSIPPI Royalty

The characters the Duke and the King play an important role in Mark Twain's "Huckleberry Finn." Through their Twain lets Huck see civilization and mankind as [Twain said it], the characters play an important part in Huck's growing up.

The meeting of the Duke, the King and Huck was a hint of later encounters - they were running from a crowd the two had offended. Huck saw them "...tearing up the path as tight as they could kick it." Huck, against his better judgment, tells the two how to escape the irate mob chasing them and takes them to Jim and his raft. At the raft Huck is told that one of the two men he helped was an actor among other things - his profession is to deceive others for profit by being someone else. This is a foreshadowing of events to come.

The twain's performance of Romeo and Juliet sums up their characters completely. As they do not fit into the roles of Romeo and Juliet, they do not fit into the identities they give to Huck and Jim - one a duke, the other a king - as their true identities. The King is "...about seventy or eighty and has a bald head and very grey whiskers. He had an old battered-up slouch hat on and a greasy blue wollen shirt, and ragged old blue jeans with flaxen stuffed into his belt top, and a chimney-gallus...and has a big, fat rusty-looking carpetot." Even in the very elaborately of costume and makeup, he would not pass for "...a fourteen-year old girl. He 111. The Duke ...as about thirty.
and fresher about its bravery as the king. He is somewhat more suited to his role as someone than the king is to his roles. Twain seems to be saying that civilization is gullible. It fell for the Duke and the King's roles and deceptions. Huck, however, is not a matter of civilization and knew that they "...weren't no kings nor lies at all, but just low-down humbugs and frauds."

Other examples are the revival meeting and Doctor Johnson's confrontation of the royal pair. Even though there is evidence against their stories, people believe them and get cheated out of their money. When the Doctor accuses the Duke and the King of not being the late Mr. Wilks brothers — a deception the royal pair used to cheat the inheritors out of their inheritance — and presents evidence contrary to their story, the people refused to believe him, telling him that "they'd proved themselves near forty times over..." Of course the two had done such thing, keeping with Twain's theme.

When presented with a rational argument, people want to follow the truths that the Duke and the King gave them. At the revival meeting the King assumed the role of a retired pirate out to "save the souls" of other pirates. In spite of this thin and foolish story, the people gave up their money willingly and gladly. Huck felt that all of this "...was enough to take a body ashamed of the human race," suggesting that before Huck parted with the Duke and the King, the royal pair said him. This was completely beyond Huck's comprehension, after all he had left behind the thousand dollars to escape his father. He realized that civilization, though centered on money, will in it's rest to lose it.
The Duke and the King give Huck a sense of the ugly reality between "borrowing" as he first begins the beginning of the story and stealing, what the Duke and the King tell him, so he tries to realize something when caught up in one of the royal pair's lies. "I'm least if it don't look to me like the truth is better, and actually safer, than a lie."

Huck's final realization of civilization is when he decides to "go to hell" and tries to rescue Jim. He questions the logic of teaching slaves a religion that forms on slavery. Idea out of place for them.

In the end Huck realizes that "citizenship" is not useful cruel to one another." At the start of the adventures with the Duke and the King, he is tolerant of them as he is tolerant of civilization at the start of a story, giving in to each's whims like wearing shoes and going to school and church and giving the royal pair his bed. At the end of his adventures with the Duke and the King, Huck reflects, "I didn't want no more trouble with their kind. I'd seen all I wanted of them and wanted to get entirely shut of them." Here he is talking about both civilization and the royal pair. This is shown at the end of the novel when he leaves again because Aunt Sally was going to "adopt me and civilize me and I can't stand it. I been there before." Huck wants no more of civilization and the people like the Duke and the King it produces.
APPENDIX N

Course Evaluations (Fran)
Be honest!

**Exercise:**

Write your overall comments on the writing process, both positive and negative. Include any constructive criticism you have to offer.

**Improvements:**

Conclude by stating what you believe would have improved the writing process and the quality of your work.

---

**Feedback:**

Teaching Strategies

Teacher's comments: 

- Enhance interpersonal communication strategies.
- Increase student participation.

---

**Reflection:**

On your writing experience: 

- Strengths
- Areas for improvement

---

**Suggestions:**

Leave any additional comments or feedback here.

---

**Grading:**

Your score is...
Be honest!

Directions: Below you will find categories with课文 first essays of writing. For each category, write how you feel about the essay and recommend how it could be improved.

Ex: Reworking helped me to produce better essays.

Vocality study would be better ifm... Recommend improvement.

**CATEGORY ONE:** The Writing Process: (Five stages - Prewriting, Outlining, Revising, Editing, Publishing)

1. Planning
   - The outline
   - The essay

**CATEGORY TWO:** Types of Assignments: (Journals, papers, self-evaluation, teacher evaluation, student evaluation, college application responses, teacher’s exercises, letters to pen pals, peer evaluation, etc.)

- I find it would be better if I could have a teacher to write with, and have more freedom.

**CATEGORY THREE:** The Atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling" in room, class size, student/student rapport, teacher/student rapport)

- My teacher is very fair and I feel she is a good administrator.

**CATEGORY FOUR:** Teacher: (Teacher’s role and what is expected in my education)

- My teacher is very fair and I feel she is a good administrator.

**CATEGORY FIVE:** Texts and Handouts: (Writing To Be Read, How To Do An E-Search, Description Packet, etc.)

- I have to speak to your pen pals, what should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!!

* Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Was the grading fair?

*I'll miss ya.*
Be honest!

EXEMPLARY LETTER - STUDENT EVALUATION

Directions: Below you will find two pages which concern the grade I received in the class. For each category, write your overall evaluation (for more)
which explains how you feel about how well you learned the subject. If you recommend constructive criticisms, recommend how to study more improved.

Ex: Rewriting helped me to produce better essays.

Vocabulary study could be better if....... *measures I implemented.

CATEGORY #1: The writing Process: (Five stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing)

Haven't seen how to evaluate your progress in my

CATEGORY #2: Types of assignments: Journals, papers of setting, narration, opinion, I-search, vocabulary, college application response, mechanic's exercises, letters, term paper, ..... *evaluation, 10% options, etc.

CATEGORY #3: The atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling" in writing these items: student/student support, teacher/student support.)

Most of the time I read while I read and my

parts because I didn't know anyone else or anyone value
their opinion. Maybe you should take a few days to

VOLUNTEER #1: Teacher;

I feel you have a lot of work in the area of improving my

writing, I've tried to keep in touch personally with your students.

CATEGORY #4: Notes and handouts: (Writing To Be Read, How To Do An I-search; Description Packet, etc)

Learning from your own mistakes is the best way.

PS..... I have to speak to your gem next. What should I tell them about the letter
writing experience??? Help!!!!!

you should be writing your own letters...

and more open.

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score.
Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Use the wording [**] (Gen)
Be honest!

Vocabulary study could be better if............. -recommend improvement-

CATEGORY ONE: The Writing Process: (Five stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing)

TEXT

CATEGORY TWO: Types of assignments: (Journals, papers if setting, exam, oral, research, vocabulary, college application responses, mechanics exercises, letters to the editor, poem evaluation, short story, etc.)

it was very exciting to the write a large variety of
assignment types. I enjoyed the in class peer
conference, and realized the growth in my own
writing ability.

CATEGORY THREE: Class Atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling" of class: class size, student, student rapport, teacher/student rapport)

I have enjoyed the atmosphere of the class. It is much more involved than some classes have
allowed good relations to just occur in a lecture
with the teacher.

CATEGORY FOUR: Teacher:

I have enjoyed the help that the teacher has given me. Each teacher has helped me learn about writing
while the class goes on.

CATEGORY FIVE: Texts and handouts: (Writing to be read, How to Do an Interview, Description, Packet, etc.)

The handouts were helpful, but I seem to have

UNEXTENDED TO BE READ FROM A very useful

PS.... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience?? Help!!!!!!

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Was the scoring fair? (or)

S'te mean ya. -
Be honest!
Keith F. Sowus

Category: Writing - Personal Evaluation

Directions: Write one paragraph explaining which aspects of the writing process you enjoyed the most. Be specific. For more, think back to the past and write about it. Include constructive criticism. Recommend how it could be improved.

Ex. Revising helped me to produce better essays.
Vocabulary study could be better if... 

Category II: The Writing Process: Five Stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing

Ex. I wrote my best drafts to be used as a demonstration of my writing process. I found that revising was the most helpful. I learned from my mistakes and made improvements.

Category III: Types of Assignments: Journals, papers, letters, reports, projects, essays, and reviews. They gave me an excellent chance to practice mechanics and spelling. They were fun, and I enjoyed the process.

Category IV: Class Atmosphere: The class was very active, and we had a lot of fun. We had discussions and debates. The teacher was very engaging, and we always looked forward to coming.

Category V: Texts and Handouts: They helped me with my writing skills. I learned a lot from them. I read them carefully and took notes.

PS.... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience?? Help!!!
Tell them what I enjoyed most about writing letters to my pen pals. Tell them that they were heartwarming.

Let's your letters to disagree with me about your class were more rigorous. Right? Except why do my notes in the scoring box? (Sir)

[Signature]
Be honest!

Melinda Gupta

Read this sheet to find it registers high cruel to the idea of writing with the class. For each category, write in specific statements which explain why you feel that it contributed. If constructive criticism, recommend how it could be improved.

1. Writing helped me to produce better essays.
   2. Writing did not.

MATERIAL CONT: The writing process: Five stages - Preparing, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing.

I really helped me to have a better paper. Preparing - many, many hours went into this. It was very satisfying to have my work turned in.

MATERIAL CONT: Test assignments: (Writing, papers on setting, character, plot, analysis, vocabulary, college application, response to mechanical exercises, letters, pen pals, etc. Evaluation, 'A' options, etc.)

I really like my final paper. It was satisfying to write and come up with a final paper, unlike it usually was never write as much before getting in this class.

MATERIAL CONT: Class atmosphere: (Including overall feeling, in room size, time, student-teacher rapport, student-student rapport, etc.)

I really liked. No one criticized in a negative way. Everyone seemed to really work hard.

MATERIAL CONT: Test assignments: (Writing, papers on setting, character, plot, analysis, vocabulary, college application, response to mechanical exercises, letters, pen pals, etc. Evaluation, 'A' options, etc.)

I really like my final paper. It was satisfying to write and come up with a final paper, unlike it usually was never write as much before getting in this class.

PS... I want to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!

I think maybe I helped my peers get a slimmer of what high school life may be as we are putting pen to paper.

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score.

Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Are the scoring easy?!

Yes, I'm very satisfied with my score.

SEE YOU -
EXPERIENCE WRITING - COUNTER-EVALUATION

Directions: Below you will find categories with questions. Feel free to write (or more) than the spaces provided. For each category, write an essay (or a letter) explaining how you feel, or what you learned, about yourself by reading the constructive criticism. Recommend how it could be improved.

Ex. Rewriting helped me to produce better essays.

Vocabulary study could be better.

RECOMMEND IMPROVEMENT

CATEGORY 1 | The writing Process: (Five stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Re-writing, Editing, Publishing.)

"Good but sometimes it was changed out too long.";

CATEGORY 2 | Types of assignments: (Journals, papers, lab reports, letters, etc.)

I did everything.

RECOMMEND IMPROVEMENT

We done all mechanics exercises were too simple.

Barbara, the editor and I, used the journals and the opinion paper the most.

CATEGORY 3 | Atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling," in your class: time, student/student support, teacher/student support)

TIC - Atmosphere was fine.

CATEGORY 4 | Teacher: I think you did a great job. This is the first English class that made me want to write, and not to have to write. I loved reading your entries.

CATEGORY 5 | Texts and handouts: (Writing To Be Read, How To Do An Excerpt, Description Packet, etc.)

I felt the book was a joke. You and everything better we hardly used. The dito's you gave were no way.

Ps... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter we writing experience??? Help!!!!!!!

It was fun but that's about it. I enjoyed reading them.

Here's your chance to disagree. It's about your final exam score.


I'll miss ya -
Be honest!

Directions: Below you will find a topic which concerns you (and I) from the class. For each section, write the specific statements (or more) which you feel how you will or how you learned to better it. If constructive criticism, recommend how it could be improved.

Ex. Revising helped me to produce better essays.

Vocabulary study could be better if........... recommend improvement.

CATEGORt VI: The writing Process (Five stages - Pre-writing, Drafting, Revising: Editing, Publishing)

CATEGORt VII: Types of assignments: (Journals, papers of setting, narration, opinion, search, vocabulary, college application responses, mechanic's exercises, letter, to pen pals, poet, evaluation, "CS" options, etc.)

The mechanic exercises were not family.

Doing out writing the papers were quaff

COMMENTS: The hereafter: (Including overall "feeling" in your class, your student, student rapport, teacher/student rapport)

I was not come by the same he made

Only about critiquing honestly

SUGGEST TONE: Teacher: Very good! I have to... 

CATEGORt VIII: Texts and handouts: (Getting To Be Read, How To Do an "CS" Search/Description Packet, etc.)

This was 1st by 1st

PS..... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score.

Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Was the scoring fair? Can you see it was pretty good. I was only 1 point lower than the 90th percentile.

Ill miss ya.
Dear [Name],

I hope this message finds you well. I wanted to reach out to you about the writing experience that we had in the past semester's writing class. I believe that it was an excellent opportunity to improve my writing skills and prepare me for future endeavors.

I would like to share with you some reflections on the various aspects of the class. As you know, we had a variety of assignments that tested our writing skills in different ways. I found them to be very challenging and rewarding. I think that the constructive criticism that we received was a key factor in helping me improve my work. I really appreciated the feedback that I received from my peers and the professor.

I also think that the writing process was well thought out. The stages of prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing were very helpful in guiding me through the writing process. I think that I learned a lot from these stages and I plan to use them in the future.

In terms of the atmosphere of the class, I found it to be very supportive and inclusive. The professor and the students were very approachable and willing to help me when I needed it.

Overall, I think that the class was very beneficial to me. I believe that it has helped me to improve my writing skills and has given me a better understanding of the writing process. I am grateful for the experience and look forward to using it in my future endeavors.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
Be honest!

Directions: Below you will find categories which correspond to a list of criteria which explains how you feel, or what goals you have. For each category, circle the number that best describes your feelings. If a criterion is applicable, recommend how it should be improved.

Text: Writing helped me to produce better essays.

Category 1: Writing helped me to produce better essays.
- It gave me new ideas on what could be improved.
- Journals helped me release my feelings.
- They capture the events throughout my day.

Category 2: Here is a perfect
- Class size. Not too cluttered or many. The students are also set.
- Class well and help each other with their assignments.
- Ms. Smith is a very good teacher. She takes time out to tell you what mistakes and what you need to improve.

Category 3: Texts and handouts:
- Class structure. Help me to solidify the concepts.
- Would be worth it for me. To make it use the book to much so I'd.

PS... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!!

* * *

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Was the scoring fair? (Yes)
Be honest!

EXPOSITORY WRITING - OUTLINE EVALUATION

Directions: Below you will find a rating on the overall quality of writing. For each category, write how the assigned material (or more) helped you feel about the essay. If a constructive criticism, recommend how it could be improved.

Ex. Rewriting helped me to produce better essays.

Vocabulary study could be better if......

Recommend improvement.

CATEGORY ONE: The Writing Process: (five stages — Prewriting, Drafting, Rewriting, Editing, Publishing)

CATEGORY TWO: Types of assignments: (essays, papers, speaking, oratory, public speaking, vocabulary, college applications, research, mechanic's exercises, letters, in class, pre-evaluation, test options, etc.)

I felt: no improvement.

CATEGORY THREE: Teacher: (as a group, my student, student rapport, teaching, student rapport)

I felt: no improvement.

CATEGORY FOUR: Teacher: (as a whole, my student rapport, teaching, student rapport)

I felt: no improvement.

CATEGORY FIVE: Texts and handouts: (Writing to be read, How to Do Research, Description, Packet, etc.)

PS...... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!
Be honest.

Clarence Wills

Dr. Breaneil worked to produce better essays. Vocabulary study would be better if recommend improvements.

MATERIAL IV: The Writing Process: (five stages: Preparing, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing)

I liked the writer because I like local authors.

MATERIAL II: Types of Assignments: Journals, essays, research papers, book reports, in-class exercises, letters, etc. I learned evaluation, the literal, and what is meant sometimes.

The class size was

Student to Student was alright. Teacher & student were mutual; I feel that I did the best I could in some way.

The handouts were helpful somewhat.

I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience? Help!!! That we enjoyed doing it and that we would always come to the school for a visit with you.

Here's your chance to disagree with about your visits, even more. Higher? What? Our of what is the scoring 0? 80?
Lee Cockram — Be honest!

EXPOSITORY WRITING - SUMMARY EVAETUATION

Directions: Below you will find categories and specific types of comments about the class. For each category write one specific statement (or more) which explains how you feel. Until you leave this note write it. If a constructive criticism, recommend what it could be improved.

Ex: Rewriting helped me to produce better essays. General study would be better if ......... recommend improve...

CATEGORY NO: The writing Process: (Five stages - Pre-writing, Brainstorming, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing)

I learned about most of the various stages before this class. I learned a little more about what a helpful way writing...

CATEGORY NO: Types of assignments: (Journals, papers of setting, narration, opinion, research, vocabulary, college application questions, mechanics, exercises, letters to pen pals, research evaluation, 'E's points, etc.)

I enjoyed doing all the different types of writing at the same time of writing. The journals helped me writing the most. I was taught me to write my feelings.

CATEGORY NO: The atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling" in room, class size, student/student support, teacher/student support)

It's the best! The atmosphere was relaxed and fun yet we were serious and getting work done. I'm going to miss the small class size and the whole thing next year.

CATEGORY NO: Teacher: I think your the best teacher I've ever had. You know that your doing and are willing to take the time to explain until we get it.

CATEGORY NO: Texts and handouts: (Writing to be read, How to Do an I-Search: Description, We didn't need much in the book, but what we did read helped me some what in this writing. The handouts helped me most.

FS...... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!!! We enjoyed it and it helped

ad out and writing (learning how to make conversation on paper to someone we've never even seen before).

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Was the scoring fair? (If)

I think it was very fair. No disagreement.

I'll see ya
Be honest!

**Exercise:** Below you will find integrative ideas. Your task is to write an essay about these ideas. You may use more than one idea to write your essay. If your essay is not original, it will not count. If you wish to write a creative essay, please do so.

- Reflecting helped to produce better results.
- Reflecting study will be better if.
- **recommend improvement.**

**Activity 3:** The writing process: Five stages - Brainstorming, Outlining, Writing, Editing, Publishing.

**Activity 4:** Types of assignments: Journals, papers of setting, narrative, self-assessment, self-evaluation, vocabulary, college application research, mechanical exercises, letters, self-analysis, self-evaluation, self-assessment, self-evaluation, etc.

**Activity 5:** The atmosphere: [Including overall feeling] in spend. It is time, student, student support, teacher, student support.

**Activity 6:** Teacher: [ ]

**Activity 7:** Texts and handouts: [Writing To Be Read, How To Do An On-Search, Description, Packet, etc.]

**PS...** I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!!

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score.
Highest? Lowest? Why or why not? Use the scoring criteria.

*Note:*

I'll mean.
Be honest. I am not.

EXPRESSIVE WRITING - JOURNAL EVALUATION

Directions: Below, you will find categories which concern three areas of criticism about the class. For each category, write the specific statement (or more) which explains how you feel, or what you learned in that category.

If you receive constructive criticism, recommend how it could be improved.

Ex. Rewriting helped me to produce better essays.

Vocabulary study would be better if... Recommend improve....

CATEGORY ONE: The Writing Process: (Five stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing)
This helped me to accumulate the best paper I could.

CATEGORY TWO: Types of assignments: (Journals, papers of setting, narration, opinion, research, vocabulary, college application responses, mechanic's exercises, letters to pen pals, peer evaluation, 10% options, etc.)

Great topics - enough individual ideas and enough teacher ideas.

CATEGORY THREE: Three Atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling" in room - class size, student/student rapport, teacher/student rapport)

Fine - I liked the small class.

CATEGORY FOUR: Teacher:

You really know what you are talking about.
I like the way you spend time on each individual.

CATEGORY FIVE: Texts and handouts: (Writing To Be Read, How To Do an I-Search, Description of text, etc.)

Writing To Be Read book really didn't help me but, the handout explains things well.

PS... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them to do the letter? Writing experience?? Help!!!!!!

It worked out well yet. It would of been nice to of seen them.

X

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam grade.
Right? Wrong? Try or say not? Yes the scoring? As?

Will mean ya.
Be honest!

Directions: Help you all find integrated with others, needs of theme, with titles. For each story, write one specific sentence (or more) with explanation how it feels, is not just related with this story. If constructive criticism, recommend on what could be improved.

Ex. Reading helped me to produce better essays.

Vocabulary could be better if... RECOMMEND IMPROVEMENT

STAGE 1: The editing Process: Five stages - Pre-writing, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing.

STAGE 2: Types of assignment: Narrative, expository, persuasive, research, personal. Research, research, research, research, research, research.


STAGE 4: Evaluation, evaluation, evaluation, evaluation.

STAGE 5: Evaluation, evaluation, evaluation, evaluation.

THREE PHASES: Including overall "feeling" in each student: student support, teacher: student support.

Very nice: small and detailed, not too many errors. Good share of common times.

EXERCISE 1: Teacher: The theme was expected, which was nice. Is there more about your own personal times.

STAGE 5B: Texts and handouts: "Writing to be Read" How to: Do an essay? Description. 

EXERCISE 2B: I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!!!!

EXERCISE 2B: Is there any chance to disagree with me with your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? via the scoring... 

Here's your chance to disagree with me with your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? via the scoring...
Be honest!

DESCRIPTION: Below are all four categories which involve

the class. For each interaction write the specific steps
and explain how you feel in each. Then learn and:

(a) constructive criticism, recommend how it could be improved.

Ex: Writing helped me to produce better essays.

Category if fit would be letter of......

RECOMMEND

CATEGORY ONE: The writing Process (Five stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing).

CATEGORY TWO: Types of assignments: Journal, papers of reflection, narrative, kinect, research, vocabulary, college writing responses, mechanics exercises, letter to parent, peer evaluation, "if options, . . .

CATEGORY THREE: The atmosphere: (including overall "feeling" in class. Is the class student, student rapport, teacher student rapport.

CATEGORY FOUR: Teachers: (What do you like about the course? What would you change?

CATEGORY FIVE: Texts and handouts: (Writing To Be Read, How To Do An In-class Description Packet, etc.)

PS...... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!?!?!?!!

Have you ideas to disagree with me about your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Miss the scoring up...

Write
Directions: Tell you will find categories with a box next to each category. Each section will include a specific type of writing (or more) which explains why you wrote it and what you learned from it. Use constructive criticism, recommend how it could be improved.

Ex. Re-reading helped me to produce better essays. Vocabulary study would be better if.......

Recommend improvement.

CATEGORIE 1: The writing Process: (Five stages - Prewriting, Drafting, Revising, Editing, Publishing)

CATEGORIE 2: Types of Assignments: (Journals, papers of setting, narrative, opinion, research, vocabulary, village evaluation forms, teacher's exercises, letters to pen pals, formal evaluation, book reports, etc.)

CATEGORIE 3: Class Atmosphere: (Including overall "feeling" in general; real time: student/teacher rapport, teacher/student rapport)

CATEGORIE 4: Teacher:

CATEGORIE 5: Texts and handouts: (Writing to be read, how to do an E-search; description packet, etc.)

PS.... I have to speak to your pen pals. What should I tell them about the letter writing experience??? Help!!!

Here's your chance to disagree with me about your final exam score. Higher? Lower? Why or why not? Was the testing fair?}

I'll miss ya.
APPENDIX 0

Building A Writing Environment (Kevin)
1. Do you write more than one draft of a piece of writing? Why, or why not?

2. What does "revising" a piece of writing mean to you?

3. Are you willing to read your writing to other people?

   Who do you read it to?

   Do you ever read a piece of your writing to anyone before it's finished?

   Do you reread your writing?

   If so, what do you reread it for?

4. What do you think the characteristics of "good" writing are? Is your writing "good" writing? Why, or why not?
Day Eight: Continue interviewing. Have you been interviewed yet?

For homework, have students make a list of five students that they might like to interview in more depth. Collect these. Decide on interview pairs. Have students write a journal entry on one person who fascinated or surprised them in some way with an answer to an interview question.

Day Nine: Complete interviewing. Introduce the idea of focus. Use the sample from Look, Homeward, Angel (see appendix). Or present two articles on the same person. One should be a news article focusing on facts, the other should be a feature article focusing on an aspect of personality. Have students deduce the articles' focuses. (see appendix)

Day Ten: Have paired students begin their in-depth interviews. Instruct students to keep a focus in mind while interviewing. Review interviewing techniques. Instruct class to look over class interview notes.

Day Eleven: Complete in-depth interviews.

Day Twelve: Have the students write a rough draft about the person interviewed. (See appendix for sample writing plan.) Place rough draft in writing folder for possible use as a final narration paper.

("Focus on Us" is a modification of a lesson plan devised by James A. Allen of Upper Arlington High School and The Ohio State University.)

Day Thirteen: The in-class activity and homework are pre-writing exercises leading to a rough draft for possible use as a final narration paper.

Memory Writing: The purpose of this exercise is to encourage student writers to use their best resource - themselves - as the material for narrative writing and to impose some controls on that material.

Week 3 Pre-writing #1

Tell the students that as they do the exercise they are to concentrate on capturing the essence, the particular detail and feeling of each incident and not to be concerned with grammatically perfect or complete narratives.

The students are to reflect upon their past, with the following instructions:
You are to go back in time to capture four incidents in your life. Each incident maybe important or trivial, but it should be one that stands out in your mind. Record it as briefly as you can, but make it as real as you can.

1. Go back in time 24 hours. Remember one incident from yesterday. Record it.

2. Go back in time a week and remember something you were doing on this day seven days ago. Record it.

3. Go back a year for this one and record an incident you remember from about the same time of year. Concentrate on the particular details.

4. Now concentrate really hard and go back as far as you can. Record your first clear memory.
APPENDIX P

Informational Handouts (Kevin)
KEEPING A JOURNAL

I. So, what's a journal? Well, it's kind of like a diary and kind of not like a diary. In a diary one usually recalls and retells daily events. In a journal one speculates about those daily events - thinks about them - rehashes them. In a journal one questions oneself, probes her innermost thoughts, question her values and beliefs. Therefore, a journal is more introspective than a diary. A journal should help one to come to know herself better, to be more comfortable with that "new" person one discovers. A journal, then, is a process of self-discovery and self-recreation. Best of all, journals can be enormously therapeutic as well as just plain fun. A journal helps the serious writer become a much more fluent, articulate, thoughtful writer, and, after all, that's what this course is all about.

Journal entries may be introspective. The mind is used to write these entries but you should capture what is in your heart or in your soul. Write about your dreams, goals, aspirations, desires, wishes, loves, hates, problems, joys, promises, anger, jealousies, griefs, epiphanies, doubts, voids, fulfillments.

Journal entries may be analytical. Examine what you read and observe. Ask yourself who, what, when, and where, why and how 0 and stress the why. The people, events, or ideas can be silly or solemn. Why are there platypuses? Why are there people dying of starvation? Why does John Irving always have bears in his novels?

Journal entries may be "creative" (all writing is creative). Write poems, experimenting with form (e.g. limerick, haiku, ballad, sonnet), sound devices (e.g. alliteration, consonance, onomatopoeia), and figures of speech (e.g. simile, allusion, symbol). Write the beginning of a short story. Write in dialogue like a play. Take a prose entry and rewrite it in one of these "creative" modes.

The journals are not graded for grammar, punctuation, or usage. However, this doesn't mean that you should be totally haphazard with your mechanics. The main purposes, then, of a journal are to: (1) get you writing freely, easily - this allows you to regain your natural voice, (2) discover what you know, to discover ideas. You might use these ideas for formal paragraphs in class, and (3) analyze and get to know your world and yourself better.

II. Requirements

A. Have a separate notebook for your journal. Use if for journal keeping only. Bring it to class with you daily.

B. You must number each entry. Mark your number at the top of each page. Your first entry will be #1, your second #2, and so forth.
C. Write the day, date, and time (beginning and ending) on each entry.

D. Make at least three 20-minute entries per week. This should be about ____ pages of writing. You may write more.

E. How valuable your journal will be will depend upon how seriously you decide to write the truth as you see it. Avoid writing glib answers that never penetrate the surface of your life. Rather, strive to dive deep down inside yourself. One way to insure such depth writing is to see that you write more than just what happens to you. A person's life isn't what happens but rather is a reaction to what happens. Therefore, concentrate your writing upon how you feel, think, and behave in your relationships to the people, places, and events around you. This is what is meant by introspection.

F. If you definitely want me to comment on a particular entry, mark it COMMENT in large letters at the top of the page beside that page number. If you do not want me to read a particular entry, mark DO NOT READ in large letters at the top of the page next to that page's number.

G. Write at different times of the day. Writing at the same time every day gets you into a "mood rut." Different times of the day offer quite different perspectives.

H. You are also urged to carry with you at all times a small notepad. This is to jot down a word or phrase during the day when you can't do an entry. Later, you can use your notepad as a reference tool when you do have time to write.

I. DO NOT begin an entry with the words "Today, I...". Why? Because this particular leader causes you to be far too general and vague in your entry. It will cause you to summarize the day like a brief sketch instead of focusing in on a moment and/or feeling.

III. Evaluation and Due Dates:

A. Evaluation stresses quality over quantity. Evaluation will be based upon the following:

1. Introspective Effort

2. Attempt to SHOW not TELL your experiences (detail/description)

3. Completeness

4. Correct Heading - Must have for entry to count

5. Following Do's and Don'ts

*6. Variety of Entries - Examples?
3. Due Dates: No late journals accepted. Turn in your journal during the class period that it is requested. Remember, you must bring your journal to class with you every day.

"Look sharply after your thoughts. They come unlooked for, like a new bird seen on your trees, and if you turn to your usual task, disappear; and you shall never find that exception again; never, I say— but perhaps years, ages, and I know not what events and worlds may lie between you and its return."

Ralph Waldo Emerson
Description Paper: Paper A

Directions: Reflect upon a time in which you remember an INDOOR location very vividly. This location could be - your house as a child, your bedroom, your family's summer place, your grandparents' home, a hospital, a police car, a music concert, a play, a church revival, a bus ride, a plane trip, a restaurant - the choices are practically limitless. The place you remember should have some special memory; and the place should be rich in sensory detail. When you have decided upon the location, go on to the next part. (Do not take more than five minutes to decide; choose a place and begin writing.)

List location:

List SPECIFIC sights you remember. Record the visual details (colors, shapes, sizes, ...)

List SPECIFIC sounds you remember.

Describe how (an) object(s) in that location felt. Use touch related words.

Describe the smells and/or tastes you experienced in that location.

After this jot list is finished, write a quick first draft. The purpose of the paper is two-fold: 1) to convey why that place is special, and 2) to describe the place using as many sensory details as possible.
Description Paper: Paper B

Directions: Reflect upon a time in which you remember an OUTDOOR location very vividly. This location could be — a farm, a fishing lake, a pre-dawn walk in the woods, an outdoor church service, a lightening storm while standing on a pier, a walk in the fog, an overnight camping trip, an outdoor music concert, a football game — the choices are practically limitless. The place you remember should have some special memory; and the place should be rich in sensory detail. When you have decided upon the location, go on to the next part. (Do not take more than five minutes to decide; choose a place and begin writing.)

List location:

List SPECIFIC sights you remember. Record the visual details (colors, shapes, sizes, ...)

List SPECIFIC sounds you remember.

Describe how (an) object(s) in that location felt. Use touch related words.

Describe the smells and/or tests you experienced in that location.

After this jot list is finished, write a quick first draft. The purpose of the paper is two-fold: 1) to convey why that place is special, and 2) to describe the place using as many sensory details as possible.
Description Paper - Paper C

1. Recall the worst (or best) smell you have ever smelled.
   What was it?
   Where was it?
   What was happening right before you smelled it?
   What happened immediately after the smell was gone?

2. Recall the worst (or best) taste you have ever tasted.
   What was it?
   Where was it?
   What was happening right before you tasted it?
   What happened immediately after the taste was gone?

3. Recall the worst (or best) object you have ever touched.
   What was it?
   Where was it?
   What was happening right before you touched it?
   What happened immediately after you touched it?

4. Recall the worst (or best) sound you have ever heard.
   What was it?
   Where was it?
   What was happening right before you touched it?
   What happened immediately after you heard it?

From one of the four answers above, write a rough draft describing the place and situation in which you found yourself. The final paper is a narration paper, in the sense that it tells a story. The description paper should include vivid sensory imagery and make a special place come alive again for a reader.
SAMPLE: "Best of" list (student generated)

1. best film
2. best radio station
3. best jeans
4. best actress
5. best actor
6. best shopping center
7. best class
8. best high school
9. best horror story
10. best horror film
11. best horror book
12. best season
13. best vacation spot
14. best ice cream
15. best movie theatre
16. best movie -- comedy
17. best pizza
18. best amusement part
19. best day of the week
20. best radio morning show
21. best car
22. best fast food
23. best rock group
24. best video
25. best fancy restaurant
26. best soap opera
27. best video game
28. best sitcom (presently on T.V.)
29. best "old" sitcom
30. best dramatic T.V. show
31. best cartoon
32. best yogurt
33. best excuse to give a teacher for work not turned in
34. best all purpose excuse
35. best T.V. news team
36. best car dealer
37. best health club
38. best after school hangout
39. best cookies
40. best T.V. commercial
41. best soft drink
42. best cologne -- women's
43. best cologne -- men's
44. best school cut spot
45. best dog
46. best sport
47. best newspaper comic strip
48. best comedian
49. best game show
50. best national sportscaster
51. best local weatherman
52. best candy bar
53. best recent concert in Columbus
54. best time of the day
55. best sports shoe
56. best computer
57. best junk food
58. best discount store
59. best job
60. best place of employment
APPENDIX Q

Peer Editing Forms (Kevin)
Focus on a Feature Writer's Name:
Revising and Editing Sheet Reader's Name:

1. Is the paper focused on one feature?
   - consistently
   - usually
   - about half
   - no
   - If the paper is not consistently focused on one feature, what words/phrases/sentences are off track?

2. Is the essay well-developed? In other words, are there enough examples to convince you that the focused feature is "true"?
   - well developed
   - some development
   - few examples

3. Is the paper well organized? Does it have a beginning, middle, and end? Does it seem to have a direction?
   - yes, it has a natural flow and direction; well organized
   - has an acceptable organization
   - the ideas do not flow one into the other
   - If the paper is not well organized, can you suggest an order of ideas for the writer?

4. Does the essay have a lead that grabs you? Does the first sentence (or two) get your attention?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If "no," please suggest a more powerful lead:
5. Are there any ineffective fragments? any run-ons? If so, place a checkmark (√) in the right margin beside the sentence.

6. Circle any words which you believe might be misspelled.

7. Are there any errors in punctuation? If so, place an asterisk (*) in the left margin next to the line in which the error is found.

8. Are there any usage errors? If so, write the line number of where those errors are found:

9. What is at least one strength of this essay? (Use the back if necessary.)
1. Ineffective sentence
   A) Original sentence
   B) Corrected sentence

2. Spelling errors
   A) Original spelling
   B) Corrected spelling

3. Punctuation errors
   A) Original error
   B) Corrected error
1. The paper should contain personal voice. The reader can "hear" the writer. Because of the natural voice, the paper has a style all its own. Use the following code to help the person create more personal voice, if necessary:

- **yes, voice is found here**
- **no; but voice could easily be used here**

(To the writer: if the paper lacks voice, read the draft aloud. Make it read so that it sounds like you.)

2. All sentences should be polished. All sentences should work, should be effective. No ineffective fragments, comma splices, or run-ons are allowed. The syntax (word order) is effective. Use the following guideline to help you evaluate the paper for sentence structure:

See pages 174-180 for help in judging the following features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNMS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The essay has emphasis through word order.
(Where word order could be improved write "WO" in the margin)

The sentences are polished with punctuation
(Where effective sentence fragments are used, write "SF -")
(Where ineffective sentence fragments are used, write "SF +")
(Where an effective sentence fragment could be used, write "SF ->")

Sentence(s) is(are) polished and effective through use of the semi-colon
(Where semi-colon is correctly used, write a very large ";" in the margin)
(Where a semi-colon could be used, write a very large "; ->" in the margin)

Sentence(s) is(are) polished and effective through use of the colon
(Where colon is correctly used, write a very large ":" in the margin)
(Where a colon could be used, write a very large ": ->" in the margin)

Sentence(s) is(are) polished and effective through use of the dash
(Where dash is correctly used, write a very large "-" in the margin; and a " - ->" where one could be used)
You brainstormed several ideas, you wrote several drafts, you decided to work on one draft, you rewrote it, you wrote new leads for it, you rewrote it emphasizing the paper's strengths, and now you're almost finished with the whole process. Today you are to trade papers with someone and have them judge your paper on the features on which it will be graded. If you have the time, you may quietly ask the reader where, why, and how to correct a low score on a particular feature. The final paper should be your best work. On Monday you should turn in everything that led to the final, neatly written draft. Remember, you may accept or reject any advice you receive. You are in control of the paper.

Scoring Guide of Narration Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Exceeds Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Reader 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reader 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * indicate errors of spelling, punctuation, and usage on back of this sheet; on the final revision, place a checkmark (in pencil) on the line where an error occurs and number checkmarks (1, 2, 3, ...); indicate on the back what error occurs on the checkmarked line.
APPENDIX R

Evaluated Essay (Kevin)
1. How do you usually describe the party atmosphere for me?
2. What do you enjoy doing at parties?
3. What might stop you from going to a party?
4. What might encourage you to go to a party?
5. What was the best thing that happened to you at a party?
6. What was the worst thing that happened at a party?
7. Would you tell me what makes a party fun?
8. How do you enjoy a party? — tell me about it without giving.
9. If your parents approve of you being at parties, tell me how they encourage you to live the party life.
10. What is your opinion about partying and behavior at parties?
Jomika Walker left school a little over 2 hours ago. It is now 5:00.
No one can find Jomika. I have searched the music by shouting a sonic tone down the
street. If I want to guess, I would say that Jomika is probably there, too, doing the
same thing. Jomika thrives on the music and all the parties that go with
the music. Jomika has a great time wherever she is or whatever the occasion.

When Jomika enters the
door for a party, it better have loud music
and a huge dancing floor. Jomika is
* Fuchsia and Birthday party until but it
fit Jomika the best. Keep up with "easy"
Spends very well. The only time anyone will
clap Jomika sitting down is if she needed
a coke or two to go home. Jomika's momentum
is a such a "high" while the music is playing.
Jomika learns to change Jomika. Food will
necessitate, then isn't anytime to eat.
Cashed that is the best style.

Jomika explains that will be succeed.
A successful night. A lot of love letters.

tries to extend it to extend party until a
party of all night. Jomika uses to have you.

Now, I suppose, it is worth to keep a

The music. When the last is of nice

and time is done, among the music.

in the room, Jomika seems to be in the room.
She is able to peek her 'men' by bending down the bed. She is enjoying school. Domika is a sweet girl too. She gets letters and looks forward to her day of having a good time too. It may be rainy but she still plays in the rain. She doesn't mind any bad weather or any feelings broken hearted. Just don't expect her to look for a date to eat later on at more places.

Domika's 'high' is still glowing radiantly, but it's new-time for them. It's Dad's to remember her at least 24 hours. The 'Ricky River' isn't far. Under the 'River' there's a sound. The sound can only last 10 to 20. The body needs fresh air even to make her feel possible. Everyone needs to a fast food joint to get all down her underwear and feel. Domika usually does her automobile, but sometimes even she'll tell her at a place to eat. Domika has just had another terrific night and is satisfied with the musical atmosphere. It's now time to head home to sleep the needed rest she really wants.

When the house is quiet

Domika can feel the coolness of her water as she walked for the first to the house. Feeling good and ready to be home. It's more she's sat quietly and look at water, nothing but feeling, nothing but happiness.

...a feeling of it is nice. So she took care of the house, the house, and...
Long you leave off. She simply forgot
her books with her content. Should to
have them. Such a good "alike"? Isn't it?
No real big trouble. Tomika escaped her
room by the skin of her teeth. Now she
heads for her room to rest for another
night.
Focus on a Feature: Revising and Editing sheet

Writer's Name: Beth Hawkins
Reader's Name: Charlotte Acas

1. Is the paper focused on one feature?
   - consistently
   - usually
   - about half
   - none

2. If the paper is not consistently focused on one feature, what words/phrases/sentences are off-track?

3. Is the essay well-developed? In other words, are there enough examples to convince you that the focused feature is something writers should be familiar with?
   - well-developed
   - some development
   - few examples

4. Is the essay well-organized? Does it have a beginning, middle, and end? Does it seem to have a direction?
   - yes, it has a natural flow and direction; well organized
   - has an acceptable organization
   - the ideas do not flow one into the other

5. If the paper is not well-organized, can you suggest an order of ideas for the writer?

6. Does the essay have a lead that grabs you? Does the first sentence capture the reader's attention?
   - no
   - yes

7. If "no," please suggest a more powerful lead.

5. Are there any ineffective fragments? any run-ons? If so, place a checkmark (✓) in the right margin beside the sentence.

6. Circle any words which you believe might be misspelled.

7. Are there any errors in punctuation? If so, place an asterisk (*) in the left margin next to the line in which the error is found.

3. Are there any usage errors? If so, write the line number of where these errors are found.

9. What is at least one strength of this essay? [Use the back if necessary]
לא ניתן прочитать текст изображения.
It is 5:45 on a Friday night.

Just a little over six hours before I
woke up last night with the eerie
fear that time had run out, I
woke up to the realization that I
had the weekend...meaning freedom. The
Friday Night Feast. Only one catch: it was
now impossible to take any special day to
truly make it count and leave an
impact. Then there's the fact that the
balmy night was left at home with the
7:00 AM wake-up call. I knew I'd
couldn't go to any of my birthday parties
as there were just too many that I
didn't want to attend. But there
are many great trusty friends who could
fill this void with their presence. The
night was set to be a fun, relaxed, and
easygoing night. I decided to ask
what the rest of the evening should look
like. In the end, the outcome was
a night filled with laughter,

"It's like a big family!" I repeated,
and I was right. The rest of the
night was filled with stories,
laughs, and good times. It was
a night to remember.
A good cause: China and a beautiful view.

Each plate with gumphs don't cut it. He's climb a pagoda, a tree, in water
and braving the to keep comfortable.

And proving to the best how

Yonghe could come to be lustian the

Sin's de还记得 a group a group.

And something terrible a word seem to matter,

About to.COM the has no complaints of failure. It's been the weight in most of the

Time. He feels the kids to decide the two.

With the. But the fact to be

Not much the will of the great. It looks

For playing preference with deep sense.

1100 AM in the morning. He the theatre

Start sitting at the right. To the right.

Head it to a possible spread. Under

Get one clock down. Someone says to

Discuss it. An indestructible could get

Waiting around a bit. Everyone always feels

Excited after a trifling party. Not like to

Someone had to back home. He's almost like

To eat. He's kept to be able

The end one. Others must consider.

These can't be a possible spread.

He has to go. He can't expect to

They have the big seed. The seed

He's almost like to be able.

The end one.
Tomeka walked over to the class as she
was all time favorite song was "I Am" by the
Monkees. Tomika loved to attend parties
and dance, especially when the music was
good. One day, she decided to plan a party.
Tomika asked her friends if she could
throw a party on their first night home.
Tomika wanted to invite the Monkees to
the party. She also wanted to invite her
cousins and some of her friends. Tomika
was excited about the party and she
planned it for the next weekend. She went
to the store to buy food and drinks for
the party. Tomika was happy with the
plan and she couldn't wait for the party
to start. She invited her friends and
cousins to the party and they all agreed
to come. Tomika was excited about
the party and she couldn't wait for it
to start.
I thought she was "humane" by letting me 
produce some interesting one, 
their lives to the fullest would be Touch's 
statement to the world. And one day he 
related that the life that she has been 
spent for only 
20 or 20 months, "the opposite" to be doing 
his daily requirements that are in the 
person's needs. He is now good health 
consists of: the hamburger and the feast, 
the light 
breakfast and she will often go without 
the dinner. This is usually a "bland" 
meat. He can only consume the atmosphere 
and with no 
interference. Sometimes, when it gets to 
be a good time, maybe it's music. To which 
I immediately reply that they better 
be quiet, sit down and watch some 
commercial TV show that Touch had just 
created. The food is usually bland, and 
Touche 
said he is "better" than his old 
self. The food 
appears more understandable and sympathetic 
any way. He, the life has been continued.
It is 8:00 on a Friday night. No one has been able to get in touch with
Simone yet, a guest at CATS. If asked
when she is, a friend would probably
explain that she is at a party. Simone loves the
very little attendances on these calls.
Sometimes she will arrive to make it last. So
she anything there. Simone much more
relaxed and content with a crowd of
strangers than staying alone at her
house. She tries to spend as little as
possible that during at home, which
is quite often, is a party or a refuge
from home. The family always goes nowhere.
Simone has a difficult time
trying to get some peace and quiet around
her house. She comes home from a long
5-hour CATS day; she wants to simply
check-out for awhile. It's impossible.
It hasn't been but 10 mins. since she
entered when her mother calls for her.
Simone has to sit up and clean up
the bed, even though she didn't
make it. And then she spends little
time to really see what she is
wearing. She gets dressed and has left
the thought of helping her. Simone's room
is quiet and peaceful.
out the whole clear picture from Somika.

That's how group starts, a parental
plan that shouldn't be overlooked.

Brothers and sisters claim
to be a real antagonist to Somika.
She has no real problems, but somewhat
suffering from "Sibling Glorification," or commonly
called "The Boss" that in every once
and awhile with her brother. She had a
problem with it. Her brother thinks that
the Boss and Somika chooses like a
regulation, but his rule isn't as ruthless.

He allows Somika enter her mom's room
since they both now they do certain
other healthy exercises. Somika's
nappy doesn't bother her. They are bright
and obedient always to Somika's
demands. He usually sleeps through
most of the family discussions. Somika
depends on her mom, "She really does
care."

To contrast her family
life, Somika spends a lot of time in the
her buddha. pillows help Somika in
staying seated. She tries really hard to
not believe cold meditation and work along with roll-n-roll. But if
this atmosphere where Somika can
be content,
Focus on a Feature
Revising and Editing sheet

1. Is the paper focused on one feature?
   - [ ] consistently
   - [ ] usually
   - [ ] about half
   - [ ] no
   - If the paper is not consistently focused on one feature, what words/phrases/sentences are off track?

2. Is the essay well-developed? In other words, are there enough examples to convince you that the focused feature is "true"?
   - [ ] well developed
   - [ ] some development
   - [ ] few examples

3. Is the paper well organized? Does it have a beginning, middle, and end? Does it seem to have a direction?
   - [ ] yes, it has a natural flow and direction; well organized
   - [ ] has an acceptable organization
   - [ ] the ideas do not flow one into the other
   - If the paper is not well organized, can you suggest an order of ideas for the writer?

4. Does the essay have a lead that grabs you? Does the first sentence (or two) get your attention?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - If "no," please suggest a more powerful lead:

5. Are there any ineffective fragments? any run-ons? If so, place a checkmark (✓) in the right margin beside the sentence.

6. Circle any words which you believe might be misspelled.

7. Are there any errors in punctuation? If so, place an asterisk (*) in the left margin next to the line in which the error is found.

8. Are there any usage errors? If so, write the line number of the error(s) are found.

9. What is at least one strength of this essay? (Use the back of this paper.)
The paper is fully developed, has a good sense of direction, and some stylistic devices which give it a real "voice." In other words, this was a good piece of writing.

I especially liked the way you use one word "sentences" they now effectively sound.

Pre-writing A
Final paper A/A
Intermediate Composition
Paper # 1
Title: Featured Focus Paper

1. Ineffective sentences
   A) Original sentence: none
   B) Corrected sentence:

2. Spelling errors
   A) Original spelling:
      [example text]
   B) Corrected spelling:
      [example text]

3. Punctuation errors:
   A) Original error:
      [example text]
   B) Corrected error:
      [example text]
4. Capitalization errors
   A) Original error
   B) Corrected error

5. Usage errors
   A) Original error
   B) Corrected error
   A) She doesn't want any bad feeling or any broken heart.
   B) She doesn't want any bad feeling or any broken heart.

6. Other:

Examine final draft. Note errors in sentences, spelling, punctuation, capitalize and usage. Write out the original error and then correct it. Turn in this sheet within a week after receiving the evaluated paper. Refer to this sheet when edit each new draft. Turn it in, along with each new "Corrected errors sheet," with a final draft.
Joni made no effort to
encourage her daughter to
participate in the music,

Something was
missing. Joni was aware
of the music, but it did not
seem to affect her. She
was not interested in the
music, but it did not
bother her. Joni was
distressed by the
general atmosphere, but
she did not want to
interfere.

When Joni met the
teacher at the
school party, she
immediately noticed
her presence. Joni was
distressed by the
teacher's attention, but
she did not want to
interfere. Joni was
distressed by the
general atmosphere, but
she did not want to
interfere.

Casual, that's the cool style
Joni always uses. She always
wears casual clothes,

A perfect example is today,
when Joni went to school
wearing her favorite casual
outfit. She always
wears casual clothes,

A perfect example is today,
when Joni went to school
wearing her favorite casual
outfit. She always
wears casual clothes,

A perfect example is today,
when Joni went to school
wearing her favorite casual
outfit. She always
wears casual clothes,

A perfect example is today,
when Joni went to school
wearing her favorite casual
outfit. She always
wears casual clothes,
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Jemima, she is able to read her "From the Window" through the heat, the summer, the
other. Jemima is a little girl too. She
was tired and she stood on the path
taking a good time out, but they be so gay, but
still blind on the scene. She does not think
and she was happy. Jemima sobs and
with deep regret. She was torn to be
back later on it. No one was

Jemima's parents still
visiting plentifully, hut it's nine-tine. So
Mom and Paul is to celebrate her sixties on
Saturday. The "pretty little" start not for
Saturday. They will need to eat. The recipe can
only last it for. The body needs their services
toable to her first position. Everyone needs
to a fast food joint to make them
homemade and joyful. Jemima needed more
last possible, but sometimes even not feel
will not live to a place to eat. Jemima
has just had another terrible night, and
was satisfied from the musical atmosphere.
It's now time to head home to sleep. The
children were tired and ready.

10 pm the house is quiet.
Jemima can still hear the "cycling wheels
water as she listens to the deep to the
town pool. Feeling out one decides to stay
home. Sometimes the desert quite makes a
little comforting Jemima doesn't make it
home until 6:00 AM! She could expect some
the family to be up by now, and she has happened
out to check. But to worry. The house was
once more let me off, the & empty, pray
be, fought for the other. It is only
time, such a crooked c
he was by reason. Strange adopted c
 unreal in the other’s Ruth. The one
impossible for me, time to later another.