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Chapter I
The Problem

Introduction
Research on the writing process began over two decades ago with the work of D. Gordon Rohman and Albert O. Wlecke whose interest in creativity restored invention to its rightful place as one of the canons of rhetoric. Janet Emig's work followed in 1971 and initiated a decade of intense research on composing processes, much of which will be referred to in this chapter. So wholeheartedly have we embraced writing as a process (at least in our research, if not in our classrooms, a discrepancy I will discuss below) that we are in what Lester Faigley, Roger Cherry, David Jolliffe and Anna Skinner call the "third generation" of process research (9). Investigations into the nature of the writing process necessarily spawned investigations into the nature of revision because it is a dominant part of composing—what acts comprise it, when does it occur, who does it (and who does not), how and when is it done? In the decade of the eighties, revision is a continuing focus of research, partly because of the complexity of
the subject; we do not know all there is to know. Many different types of research have been done—taxonomic, developmental, quantitative, and observational, the last under both test conditions and naturalistic ones. The writers have ranged from children to adults, from inexperienced students to professionals. And the goals of the research have ranged from describing the revision of writers at work to building theoretical models, usually of the cognitive processes involved in revision. Some studies are pedagogical and aim to improve the writing and revising abilities of students. This study of revision

1) isolates a single group of writers, basic ones at a four-year, public, open-admissions institution;

2) uses the methodology of case histories and the naturalistic setting of a classroom in which the researcher was the teacher;

3) analyzes the texts these writers produced in order to examine their abilities to develop concepts through revising their own writing; and

4) comments on evaluating writing-in-process with the aim of improving instruction.

Decisions about the subjects of the study, the methodology, the focus on texts and concept development, and the pedagogical goals are the result of several problems in the research concerning basic writers and the teaching of revision. This chapter will discuss
these problems and summarize the relevant research; then it will outline the plan for the succeeding chapters.

Broadly, the problem areas are the following:

- how we define revision,
- how we evaluate it,
- how we define basic writers,
- what the research reports about the revision of basic writers,
- what the critical-thinking ability of basic writers is, and
- how basic writing courses are taught.

I will discuss each of these in turn.

Defining Revision

Fundamental to anyone's definition of revision is the element of change: when a writer revises, something in the text changes. (See Richard Gebhardt, "Changing and Editing" for a good discussion of revision as change.) Another notion inherent in the definitions, though not explicit in all, is that of comparing: when a writer makes a change, he or she compares what exists in the text to something else. (Elsa Jaffe Bartlett overtly uses the concept of comparisons to discuss revision.) I am purposely vague at this point because specifying that which changes or which two things form the basis of comparison leads one to different views of revision. Specifying when change occurs also leads to different definitions, and explaining what motivates change is another problem of definition, because the
sources of motivation are many and may be nebulous. It is probably necessary to specify all of these in a complete definition of revision. In fact, this list itself is not complete; it omits, for example, the relationship of revising to thinking, a subject I will discuss separately below. The scholarship defining revision, however, began with incomplete definitions and is working its way to more complete ones, culminating at present in the relatively complex model of revision proposed by Linda Flower, John Hayes, Linda Carey, Karen Schriver, and James Stratman. Although my purpose here is not to construct a complete definition of revision, I will pull from previous research the salient characteristics necessary for a working definition. My discussion will draw on the work of others and build up a definition piece by piece; along the way I will point to problems in definition. My later discussion of the revision of basic writers will include some specific features of revision that are not discussed here.

When the interest in the process of writing became widespread, the first important definitions of revision attempted to designate it as an on-going part of composing, not as a sub-process that occurs only at the end. Revision is not, as Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte advise us, "a tidying-up activity" (400) or, as
Nancy Sommers says, "a stage that comes after the completion of a first or second draft and one that is temporally distinct from the prewriting and writing stages of the process" (1980, 378). Ellen Nold proposed a simple model of composing (1981) that includes three parts: "planning the solution, carrying out the plan, and reviewing the results" (68). Essential to this model, Nold explains, is the integration of revision with the whole composing process: "planning, transcribing [carrying out the plan], and reviewing are not one-time processes. As their texts grow and change, writers plan, transcribe and review in irregular patterns" (68), not in regular stages. Revision is not, as Ann Berthoff explains most forcefully, "a definite phase but . . . [rather] a dimension of the composing process" ("Recognition, Representation, and Revision," 551). When revision is seen as a dimension of composing rather than a distinct phase isolated from others, two corollaries accompany it. One is its recursiveness, and the other, its role in invention.

If revision is not a stage occurring at the end of composing, it occurs throughout the process. To explain its pervasiveness and cyclic recurrence, scholars define revision as recursive:

It is probably true that any observable behavior such as composing must unfold linearly over time, but inasmuch as we are
able to see significant recurring patterns in a linear sequence of events, we can hypothesize that the composing process is both linear and recursive (Sommers, 1979, 47).

Sommers continues: "Such an understanding of composing yields the conception of the writer moving in a series of non-linear movements from one sub-process to another . . . ." (1979, 47). Other scholars have adopted the notion of recursiveness—Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte, Sondra Perl, Linda Flower and John Hayes, to name a few.

The role revision plays in invention leads to a consideration of two separate matters—the differentiation of revision from editing and proofreading and the heuristic function of revision. "For many years," Faigley and Witte explain, "teachers saw revision as copy-editing, a tidying-up activity aimed at eliminating surface errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, and diction" (400). Textbook views were the same. Conceived of in this way, revising is primarily a way of being correct. It involves making the text adhere to relatively arbitrary conventions and has nothing to do with invention. Much research continues to consider changes in the surface features of texts to be revision rather than editing or proofreading, as they might be called. For example, research like Faigley and Witte's that quantifies
revision counts all the changes in texts and calls them all revision. Faigley and Witte, however, do not restrict their definition of revision to changes at the surface level. They make their taxonomy more sophisticated so that they can differentiate between the correction of error or stylistic infelicities and other kinds of revision by distinguishing between revisions "that affect the meaning of the text and those that do not" (401). (Faigley and Witte designate these two categories "meaning-changing" and "meaning-preserving.")

Other research, for example on the revisions of young children, also considers surface-level changes to be revision, perhaps necessarily because such matters as basic as orthography figure so heavily in what children are trying to master. Bartlett studied what she called revision by examining children's abilities to detect and correct ambiguous pronouns and syntactic problems. She constructed texts that caused decoding problems for readers. For her, revising is changing texts so that readers can decode them, much like eliminating surface errors in grammar, punctuation, and diction. Revision that concentrates on the surface features of texts is, usually, more like editing or proofreading. It involves standards of correctness and is performed at the end of composing; these changes have no role in invention.
However, differentiating between changes that affect only the surface of a text and those that affect its conceptual level (content or form) is very difficult to do because the surface and the conceptual levels of texts are related. Even though there are changes that will affect only the surface level of texts, the single distinction between surface and conceptual changes is insufficient to differentiate revision from proofreading and editing, as we must.

When we consider the heuristic function of revision, we are better able to distinguish revision from editing and proofreading. An extensive body of scholarship exists on writing as discovery, writing as a process of discovering what one means. When writing is seen like this, revision becomes one of the processes through which writers create meaning; revision is a means of invention. Janet Emig's "Writing as a Mode of Learning" is a classic example of this view, and Donald Murray is another of its most vocal proponents. Says Murray, "revision is not just clarifying meaning, it is discovering meaning and clarifying it while it is being discovered" (1981, 33). A review of the writing-as-discovery literature is not necessary here because of its familiarity to most readers. The research on this subject has numerous pedagogical offspring, a sure sign
of the familiarity of writing as discovery.

Fundamental to the view of revision that emerges from the above discussion is the fact that revision addresses global features of the text, not just surface ones. When one performs this recursive, meaning-making process of invention, one necessarily attends to more global concerns than words and sentences. One must attend to paragraphs and beyond: the development of ideas, the coherence of sentence to sentence, paragraph to paragraph, and beginning to end. Although we assume that revision concerns global matters, showing how this is so is one of the greatest problems in revision research: global changes often involve more text than word or sentence changes; consequently, they are less manageable. The effects of global changes are more complex than surface ones. Global changes involve much more extensive knowledge on the writer's part; knowing spelling and punctuation rules is not necessarily a simple matter, but knowing the purpose of one's essay, what readers need to know, and what rules govern the use of evidence, for example, extend dramatically the realm of knowledge that figures into a writer's ability to revise—and hence in researchers' attempts to examine the process of revision.

When revision becomes more than editing, it is a
much more complex phenomenon to investigate. Another complicating factor is the role that writers' intentions play in this process. We know that when writers make changes, one of the comparisons they make is between the text and their intentions. But knowing how intentions work to guide writers is difficult.

Many writers, scholars, and researchers acknowledge that a writer's intentions play a role in revision. Nearly a decade ago, Gabriel Della-Piana wrote that revision is "making the poem more consonant or congruent with one's image of what the piece of writing is intended to accomplish" (106). Scholars investigate the role of intentions in the revision of literary giants; for example, Susan Wolfson examined Wordsworth's revisions. Writers themselves discuss the role of their intentions in guiding revision; for example, Louise Wetherbee Phelps, Elizabeth Cowan Neeld, Harry Brent, and C. H. Knoblauch in *Writers on Writing* all discuss the shaping that goes on when they compose and, to various degrees, the role of their intentions in that shaping. Models of revision include the role of a writer's intentions; for example, Nold creates a hierarchy that moves from concerns with conventions to concerns with intentions (1982). Flower et al. (1986) describe in detail several places where a writer's
intentions enter into the process of revising: when one sets goals for a text, defines a task, detects and defines problems, represents those problems to himself, and chooses strategies for solving the problems. The existence of writers' intentions in such a variety of scholarship testifies to the importance of intentions in revising, regardless of how difficult intentions may be to research. Put into models of cognitive processing and "operationalized" in terms such as "activating condition/action rules" (Flower et al., 1986), the role of a writer's intentions in revision is entrenched, circumscribed, and made predictable.

Even though model designers like Flower et al. (1986) and Nold would probably argue differently, I consider one important feature of a writer's intentions missing from their models: the paradox of how intentions can guide revision even when they are incomplete. Knoblauch addresses this paradox: "How do I know that something I've said is not yet exactly what I mean even though, in a certain sense, I don't yet know what I wish to mean--and can't know until I've found satisfying language?" ("How I Write," 141). Knoblauch enumerates several means by which he, as a writer, knows that he needs to reword a passage or revise it in order to bring a text more in line with his intentions; yet he
concludes that some mystery remains:

sometimes I just 'know' that the language in front of me doesn't adequately convey some meaning I'm quite sure exists even though I haven't yet expressed it. Perhaps the knowledge comes from having read, spoken, or written some other formulation of the idea, vaguely recollecting it as richer then than now. Perhaps it comes from lived (rather than verbalized) experiences of something I'm trying to describe (as here where I try to explain my composing by recollecting occasions when I've engaged in it): my 'understanding' of the experience itself seems fuller somehow than the statements I make about it (141).

Fulfilling one's intentions in writing is concurrent with the process of discovering and creating meaning.

Two essays help us understand the sense of disjuncture between intention and fulfillment, "The Process of Creative Discovery" by Sondra Perl and Arthur Egendorf and "Understanding Composing," by Perl alone. Perl and Egendorf examine "the process through which inchoate musings develop into articulated products," a process they call "creative discovery" (263). This process is "a reflective act in which symbols arise out of inchoate experience" (251). To explain this process, Perl delineates two kinds of structuring that comprise it, "projective" and "retrospective" ("Understanding Composing"). Projective structuring involves making texts intelligible to readers (368), and certainly for this kind of structuring, writers will have plans, goals, and the like that constitute intentions. (Flower
et al.'s intentions tend to be of this sort.) But it is writers' intentions during retrospective structuring that are of most concern here. When structuring retrospectively, writers pause and review, returning to something to inform them about what to do next. Sometimes they return to the texts they have created, sometimes to key words in the topic, and sometimes to what Perl calls a "felt-sense" (365). She defines this sense by drawing on the philosopher Gendlin: it is "the soft underbelly of thought... a kind of bodily awareness that... can be used as a tool" (365); it is the "internal criterion writers seem to use to guide them when they are planning, drafting, and revising" (365). It is the "focus of writers' attention" during revision; it occurs when writers look for guidance about how to proceed; they return "not to any words on the page nor to the topic but to feelings or non-verbalized perceptions that surround the words, or to what the words already present evoke in the writer" 364). This felt-sense is what Knoblauch used to tell him that the meaning he wanted to convey had not yet been created in written language.

This sense will also tell writers when to begin: when people "make the decision to write, it is after they have a dawning awareness that something has
clicked, that they have enough of a sense that if they begin with a few words heading in a certain direction, words will continue to come which will allow them to flesh out the sense they have" (365). One's felt-sense of meaning steers one's composing. Perl goes on to say, however, that the felt-sense "is unifying, and yet, when we bring words to it, it can break apart, shift, unravel, and become something else" (365). Although the felt-sense is mercurial, changeable, and fragile, it is a tool for revision. A paradox exists here, one that is not adequately captured in systematic representations of revision, no matter how much they try. Consequently a study of revision, particularly one that focuses on inventive functions, cannot ignore this amorphous, nebulous felt-sense. Perl writes that documenting this recursive return to a writer's felt-sense is extremely difficult, but it is important to attempt because from it "we can evolve even richer and more accurate descriptions of composing" (366).

From the discussion above, a definition of revision emerges:

- it is a dimension of composing, not a stage,
- it involves the conceptual level of texts, not just the surface,
- it is guided by more extensive concerns than correctness,
- it addresses global matters,
- it is a means of invention and can result in discovery, and
- it is guided by writers' intentions in ways
that are paradoxical.

This definition is the one I will use in this study.

How We Evaluate Revision

Regardless of how many inroads writing-as-discovery techniques have made into our classrooms, they have not been accompanied by an adequate understanding of revision as invention nor by adequate techniques to evaluate draft compositions—how to comment on writing-in-progress rather than edit written products (Sommers, 1982; Butturff and Sommers). Berthoff asserts that "revision is poorly taught, or is not taught at all" because teachers do not understand the thinking processes involved in composing (1987, 547); in other words, even though teachers may pay lip service to invention, they do not know how to integrate it with revision. Murray illustrates how teachers "kidnap" first drafts from the writers and "work . . . with them in ignorance of the writer's intentions"; they "remove responsibility for making meaning from the writer. . . . [and] writing becomes trivialized, unchallenging, unauthoritative, impersonal, unimportant" (1981, 34). Knoblauch and Brannon also discuss the ineffectiveness of most teacher comments on student papers (1981), and Nina Ziv differentiates two roles teachers may assume
when they read student writing—that of evaluators or facilitators. Most of us read as evaluators and edit first drafts; then students do not revise. What we should do, instead, is read as interested adults (Ziv) and establish a dialogue between ourselves and our students (Ziv, Erika Lindemann). We do not evaluate draft writing very well because we do not know how to read it. Phelps has described the kind of reading that we must do as "archaeological" (1979), reading below the surface of students' texts to help them discover their intentions, their germinating ideas, the patterns implicit in their topics.

Edward White, in his recent book, *Teaching and Assessing Writing: Recent Advances in Understanding, Evaluating, and Improving Student Performance*, argues that the problems in evaluation stem from a product-centered approach to texts and models of reading based on New Critical approaches to literature rather than poststructuralist ones:

> Writing is, as every sensible person knows, a product (in most cases) as well as a process .... But the theory of reading, and hence of writing, that defines writing as only or even principally a product distorts the teaching of writing. It turns the writing teacher into only a judge of texts and limits teacher intervention (and hence value) to the end of the writing process, where such intervention is not likely to do very much good for the essay at hand (88).
A product-centered approach to evaluation operates at the end of composing, just like revision when it is truncated into editing and proofreading. Unfortunately, most of our classroom practices evaluate all pieces of discourse as if they are final products. Even in classrooms where writing is purportedly taught as a process, evaluation is not effective because teachers do not know how to guide the revision process:

the strange paradox of revision [is that] professional writers revise constantly, while naive and untrained writers, whose need . . . is much more severe, almost never revise. . . . Instructors spend endless hours meticulously marking papers . . . with irrepressible and unwarranted faith that conventional teacher comments on present papers will affect the writing of future papers. . . . When we look at this situation, in all its busy futility, the pressing need for teacher sophistication becomes inescapable. Even serious students fail to revise, by and large, because they do not know how to evaluate their writing; since they see nothing to be changed (until the arcane and incomprehensible grading process), they see no need for revision, and hence they do not revise. Since the grading process normally remains not only mysterious (it is even written in quaint symbols) but irrational (one teacher praises the same things another teacher condemns), most students find revision futile: Who knows what the teacher really wants this time? So revision waits until after the teacher has commented, if revision occurs at all, and then the new work responds only minimally to teacher corrections, often making things worse rather than better (7).

Teachers do not know how to teach revision, and one of the major stumbling blocks is that they do not know how to read archaeologically and to perceive student
accomplishment rather than failure (Podis and Podis). I find teachers again and again reading and judging student writing in apparent ignorance of the fact that a text's raggedness may be a sign of accomplishment rather than failure. Weaknesses in a composition may be fragmentary surface evidence of a writer's deeper level of mental activity (Podis and Podis). Teachers' inability to perceive students' success in weak drafts is an understandable result of a product-centered approach to writing and New Critical literary theory, but it is an unfortunate one. If we read rough drafts and respond to them with product-centered evaluative comments, we fail, generally, to teach students how to revise and close to them one avenue through which they may expand their ability to think critically and become more independent writers. Relearning how to read and respond to student writing may be one of the more sophisticated stages in teaching ourselves how to teach writing as a process.

Definition of Basic Writers

After the publication in 1977 of Mina Shaughnessy's landmark work, *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*, we thought we knew who basic writers were. Their writing was error-ridden (though
their errors were often intelligently made); they could generate little prose when they entered our universities, sometimes only a few lines; their ethnic backgrounds were varied; the preparation for college offered by their cultural, educational, and class backgrounds was inadequate; and they were foreigners in the strange land of academia. Since 1977, we have found out that all of what Shaughnessy wrote was true, but it was not true about all basic writers, as I will discuss shortly. In the years since Errors and Expectations, the number of basic writing programs has increased (Lynn Troyka, 1987). Ohio State's program did not begin until after the book's publication, for example. Consequently, more of us have seen more (and different) basic writers than we had in 1977. After I elaborate on some of the broad characteristics attributed to basic writers, I will focus on more specific ways of describing them (personality traits, features of their writing, and institutional definitions of basic writers) that make us less certain of our generalizations than we were in 1977. The generalizations, which I will now discuss more fully, are are not wholly inaccurate (generalizations never are) and give an overview of our attempts to define basic writers.
In 1982, Troyka ("Legacies and Literacy") characterized basic writers much as Shaughnessy did, a similarity that is not surprising since Troyka's experience with them is, like Shaughnessy's, at the City University of New York. Troyka groups the non-traditional students at her two-year college under four headings. She writes that they are "highly gregarious and social" (256) and that their need for friends in order to "feel relaxed and safe enough to learn" (256) makes them feel estranged in the "cool, detached atmospheres of our colleges" (257). Her students are also "more comfortable in an oral rather than a written mode" (258), like Shaughnessy's students who could generate very little written language. They are also "holistic thinkers. They perceive the world as a whole, not as a combination of separate parts" (258). In the "language of cognitive styles," they are labeled "global" thinkers who learn best with a "'top-down' model of language processing "that moves from the whole to the parts (259); that is, they "need deliberate guidance to learn to analyze separate parts of a whole" (259), much like Shaughnessy's students whose punctuation sometimes reflected rhetorical units rather than sentence boundaries (30). Last, Troyka describes her students as "ambivalent about learning" (260). They
feel that learning may estrange them from their friends, their families, their pasts—and they fear this estrangement. In her remedy for this estrangement, Troyka echoes Shaughnessy's humanistic attitudes toward basic writers: these students should, Troyka writes, receive instruction in "warm, encouraging classroom atmospheres . . . with informed, innovative teaching strategies that will help all students to meet the expectations they have set for themselves" (261). We recognize Troyka's students because of their similarities to Shaughnessy's, even if we do not always see them in our own classrooms. Those of us in the Midwest, for example, will not see the degree of ethnic diversity that Shaughnessy and Troyka did (Troyka, 1982, 253).

Patricia Bizzell summarizes three current approaches to defining basic writers by explaining what happens when these writers come to college. One approach says that basic writers "precipitate a clash among dialects" (294); this approach underlies the classroom drill on surface features of the language (popular in a great majority of basic writing textbooks) as well as the arguments about bi-dialectalism (made most notably by James Sledd). Proponents of the second approach claim that basic writers "face a clash . . . of discourse forms" (295) between the conventions familiar
to them—of "soap operas or grammar-school history lessons on 'great men'"—and the "'genres' of academic writing" (295). This approach leads Bizzell to question the extent to which such conventions are surface features of texts: do they "generat[e]" or "merely convey . . . certain kinds of complex thinking" (295), a version of the questions raised by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis about language—do forms prescribe thinking or does thought generate forms. This thorny question leads Bizzell to the third approach to basic writers—that they are "engaged in a clash of ways of thinking" (296), a matter I will return to later, in a slightly different form, when I consider the cognitive abilities of basic writers.

Bizzell's means of answering the questions raised is to subsume the three approaches under one category because, she maintains, each of the three is too narrow. She asserts that we need to conceive of basic writers as entering a new language community when they enter college, an "academic community that is . . . [one] united almost entirely by its language" (296). She explores the expectations of this language community by using William Perry's scheme of cognitive development. At the pinnacle of Perry's scheme is the ability to think in relative rather than absolute terms, the habit
of examining ideas and reflecting upon one's self, and an almost existential view toward faith. While Bizzell acknowledges that this view is culture-bound, she takes Perry's highest kind of thinking as the exemplar of the "world view that college demands" (298) and shows the clash of cultures that basic writers may experience upon entering college. The breadth of this view may help us understand better, as we must, the estrangement of basic writers from the academic community, the alienation that both Troyka and Shauqhnessy referred to in different ways. The "salient characteristic" of basic writers, Bizzell maintains, "is their 'outlandishness'--their appearance to many teachers and to themselves as the students who are most alien in the college community" (294). Regardless of how basic writers at various institutions differ in their ethnicity and the features of their writing, they will all be considered "outlanders" at their own institutions.

Definitions in such broad strokes may be useful, but George Jensen criticizes such general characterizations because they obscure a diversity among basic writers and, especially, overemphasize their faults (54). He contends that the "field of composition may be developing its own reification fallacy" (53) about the characteristics of basic writers. He implies
that the subjects of previous studies were parochial, and he criticizes various researchers who "peg isolated personality traits to the basic writer" (53), for example Andrea Lunsford, Perl, and Sommers. From these scholars, he explains, emerges a "gross characterization of students in basic writing classes . . . [; the] composite characterization is of a gregarious writer who talks but does not think, who has difficulty developing concepts, is overly concerned about correctness, likes to please the teacher, and prefers the basic five-paragraph theme" (54). Even though he does not discard all of these traits, Jensen's own research demonstrates the inadequacies of our current descriptions of basic writers. He collected their responses to a personality inventory test, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, "used previously to discuss individual writing processes" (54). His subjects included students at his own school, Georgia State University, and at the University of Illinois at Chicago. From the results, he concludes that "the characterizations of the basic writer found in the literature are inaccurate because they are overgeneralizations from what seem to be biased samples" (59), and, further, that "they cannot adequately account for the diversity found in even a single program, class, or sample" (59).
Jensen's research on personality types surveyed a larger population than did much of the earlier research on basic writers and indicates one direction in which research must go to correct the oversimplification of our early definitions: we must expand the range of our sample populations beyond the limits of our own classrooms and geographical locations. Troyka (1986) recently conducted research in a similar direction and with a similar reach: she piloted a national survey of diverse institutions (two-year and four-year colleges and universities that represented the West, Northwest, Midwest, South, Southeast, Northeast, and Canada). Her goal was to define basic writers on the basis of the writing they produced. To accomplish her ends, she collected writing samples of high, low, and middle-level basic writers. Representatives of each school ranked their own students' essays. When Troyka then had these essays rated holistically, she found the rankings at institutions differed from the rankings given to the whole group. One interpretation of this result is that the national pool of basic writers includes a greater range of writing than at any one particular institution; hence a ranking of high, middle, and low at Ohio State, for example, would probably include a different range of writers than the national sample, which is more diverse.
Consequently, basic writers are institutionally defined, and, when described, must include reference to the context of their own institutions.

Another pertinent result comes from Troyka's study—in the failure of one of her aims. She writes that she had intended at the outset of her study to "come up with useful labels for subsets within basic writing . . . . [labels, for example, like] oral based and non-textured . . . [or labels for a] progression of difficulties from within the sentence to among sentences" (11). But, Troyka explains, "None of . . . [the labels] worked . . . . The complexities of differences within and among the three groups is fascinating, but not given to facile rubric" (11).

Jensen seems to be right: we have oversimplified the definitions of basic writers, their uniformity nationally, their personality types, and the characteristics of their writing. The further conclusion seems to be that we cannot easily define basic writers even though we can readily identify them at our own institutions. As we attempt to arrive at a national consensus of the characteristics of basic writers, if such consensus is possible, we must in our studies carefully describe the particular writers about whom we make conclusions. (Descriptions of the writers
in this study will be found in Chapter III, "The Class." The examples of their writing in Chapters IV and V further identify them.) Discussions below about the writing performance of basic writers, specifically, how they revise, will consider again this question of definition because it figures into our assessment of their abilities.

How Basic Writers Revise

Given the difficulties in defining basic writers that are now coming to light, comparisons of the poorer writers in previous research may result in the comparison of unlike things. Particularly in revision research, the group of "unskilled" or "inexperienced" or "beginning" writers (these are some of the terms used to describe the poorer writers) may be a diverse lot. For example, Richard Beach and Lillian Bridwell conducted their research on high school students. Flower and Hayes compared college students and professional adult writers as did Sommers and Faigley and Witte. From the main revision research, then, the category of poorer writers is a mixed one. Consequently, some comparisons among other studies and between them and this one are difficult to make. An example will illustrate further: Sommers' college students were freshmen at Boston
University and the University of Oklahoma; their SAT verbal scores were between 450 and 600. The students in the present study were college freshmen at Ohio State with ACT verbal scores equivalent to 370 and below on the SAT. Does that mean that the students in this study were poorer writers than Sommers's? Possibly, insofar as the test scores measure writing ability, a measurement they do not make very well (Edward White, 1985). If basic writers are those who must complete "pre-college, remedial" work before they are prepared for college-level courses, are the subjects in this study more like high school students? Possibly, but the current state of research does not allow us to make such comparisons. We are left with collecting what is written about the lower-level students in any study and determining if their performance matches or differs from the students we are investigating. We must make comparisons--and draw contrasts where we can.

I will, however, consider the research about poorer writers and revisers to pertain to basic writers. Since so little revision research explicitly describes basic writers--Perl being one of the handful who look at them--such a strategy is absolutely necessary. It is not as dangerous as it might be because much similarity exists among the results of these studies, regardless of
who constituted the poorer group. A survey of revision in college freshmen conducted by Susan Wall and Anthony Petrosky confirms similarities between basic writers and the revision research about poorer writers. Wall and Petrosky report that basic writers spend less time on their papers, have fewer strategies for invention, pause less during composing, plan less, and revise less. They care most about revising "as a chance to try out a new approach when the first one does not work out" (118), a telling commentary on their success as writers. We will see how these characteristics are discussed in research on revision.

Under the working definition of revision that I constructed above, the performance of basic writers could be described very simply and this section complete in one sentence: basic writers do not revise (Perl, Sommers, Faigley and Witte, Richard Beach, Lillian Bridwell, Sharon Pianko, C. K. Stallard). They edit or sometimes simply recopy a draft to make it neater (Sharon Crowley). They make changes in the surface of a text—at the word or sentence level or correct mechanics. Sommers calls their definition of revision a "thesaurus" one (1980) because they "perceive words as the unit of written discourse" (381) and believe "that the meaning to be communicated is already there, already
finished, already produced, ready to be communicated, and all that is necessary is a better word 'rightly worded'" (382). They do not conceive of writing as discovery (meaning for them exists before writing even begins). (Wall and Petrosky find an exception to this in one group of their basic writers.) They have no terms for understanding or discussing revision (Beach and Sara Eaton) nor strategies for making global revisions (Beach and Eaton, Carol Sweedler-Brown, Perl, Sommers, Beach, Bridwell, Nicholas Coles, Nold, 1981). In fact, Perl (1980a) shows that basic writers interrupt their composing to attend to the surface features of texts, so that attention to the local interferes with the global. Beach and Eaton have shown that one characteristic of the inability to attend to global matters is the inability to perceive or construct a "larger frame or context" for their writing: when asked "What is this paragraph supposed to do in terms of the whole paper?" (162), they could not answer. Instead of describing the function of different sections of drafts (what does this part do), they wrote content summaries (what does this part say).

Why basic writers do not revise is a question with many answers. Some answers concern where in the process they derail. In general, revision research suggests
that the less successful revisers lack the ability to
detect the need for revision, and they lack strategies
for making changes. The ability to detect a need for
change presupposes an ability to evaluate one's writing
(an accurate assessment is important) and to compare it
to something else—one's intentions (Knoblauch, 1980),
memory (Nold, 1981), conventional expectations about
form (Myra Kogen), readers' needs (Flower, 1981), and
the like. This process of evaluation is one basic
writers are unable to perform well (Beach and Sara
Eaton). Flower et al. (1986) break down the process of
evaluation into three kinds of reading that it requires:
reading to comprehend ("build[ing] a mental
representation of the text," 23), reading to evaluate
(reading to test for problems, 23), and reading to
define problems ("reading beyond evaluation to
diagnosis," 25). From a different angle, Murray (1978)
also discusses how writers must read their texts. They
must "perform a significant kind of reading when they
read their own writing in process. Writers must achieve
a detachment from their work that allows them to see
what is on the page, not what they hoped will be on the
page" (95). This kind of reading will not be easy for
students who are not skilled readers (David Bartholomae
and Petrosky), nor even, as Thomas Newkirk explains, for
students who are: "revision requires a type of critical reading ability that even students . . . who are evaluated as good readers . . . do not possess" (59).

The Flower et al. (1986) model delineates three more sets of revision processes. Using one of them, writers diagnose problems. To do so, they must represent the text and their intentions to themselves. Representing the text requires a different kind of reading than discussed above; through it, one creates a "rich mix of written texts, and unwritten gists, plans, goals, and possibilities" (28), a mix that some do a poor job of creating (Beach and Eaton). Newkirk has shown that writers fail to diagnose problems accurately because they bring "inappropriate criteria" (50) to their work. For example, they bring to writing a rule of conversation: take turns and recognize when your turn is up so that you do not bore your listeners. Consequently, one of the reasons for the poor development of ideas in their writing is a fear of boring their readers (55). This rule of conversation applied to writing leads students, of course, to do exactly the opposite of what they should.

The Flower et al. (1986) model delineates an additional set of processes to select strategies and a final subset for producing text which includes the
decision either to "rewrite" or "revise," (24), a confusing set of terms. "Rewrite" means to compose fresh text and "revise" means to reword or otherwise change what is already written. (Both fall under the working definition of revision in the current study.) The intricacies of the Flower et al. model of revision help us realize the many points at which a writer's revising processes may derail and leave her unable to change her texts, let alone improve them.

Another answer to why basic writers fail to revise comes from a different source than their failures in the process: their classes do not teach them how to revise. The above discussion about evaluation has shown how teachers' inability to read leads to their failure to teach revision. How they design their classes does also. In their 1978-79 survey of college composition classes, advanced to basic, Wall and Petrosky found that in the high school classes of three-fifths of all the students, "revision was either seldom or never discussed" (110). Further, the "vast majority of these students have not been given . . . role models to serve as examples of how experienced writers revise and how they talk about and value revision" (113). Without direct instruction or good models, it is unlikely that students will undertake the complex task of revision on
their own.

It is possible to argue that since the Wall and Petrosky study, high school classes have changed. In fact, in my own city there has been much reform in writing instruction at the high school level over the last few years. Such reform in curriculum does not guarantee, however, that teachers know how to read and evaluate writing in progress or how to teach revision as invention. Furthermore, reform at the high school level, while it may be a hopeful sign, is undercut by the results of a more recent (1986) survey of basic writing classes in college. From their survey of two and four year schools, Christopher Gould and John Heyda found that "basic writing teachers seem to select for emphasis . . . [those instructional techniques] that we consider the most [purely] instrumental" (13): these include the

emphasis of product over process, neglect of invention in favor of editing, a simplified linear model of composing, a conception of writing as an instrument for encoding an impersonal objective reality independent of the writer (as opposed to an intellectual activity that generates new knowledge or meaning), the belief that good writing communicates this objective reality clearly and accurately, and the assumption that thought is separate from and antecedent to language (10).

Such emphases neglect, as Gould and Heyda point out, instruction that fosters critical thinking and
critical inquiry; it presupposes a view of literacy that is more limited to the functional. This instrumental view of composition also makes impossible the kind of revision defined in this study. It opposes revision in every way: by emphasizing product over process, by emphasizing editing, by favoring linearity rather than recursivity, by failing to conceive of writing as discovery, by ignoring the writer's role in constructing meaning, and by simplifying the interaction of thought and language.

This instrumental kind of writing instruction may at least teach writing, instruction which may be missing from some basic writing classrooms if textbooks are an indicator of instruction. Of the basic writing textbooks that publishers routinely send to my office, at least half continue to be workbooks and exercises that offer drill on error-correction, not writing at all. The situation in many of our basic writing classrooms does not teach students to revise. It probably does not teach them to think, either, a subject I will take up below.

Another result of Gould and Heyda's survey suggests a further detriment to teaching effectiveness, a negative attitude toward students. The teachers surveyed reported in their students a resistance to
learning, and in this perception is the suggestion that the teachers view the students negatively. Though merely hinted at in the survey, this sort of negative attitude is important to mention, first, because no pedagogy can override a teacher's attitude toward her students, and second, because other literature suggests a similar attitude toward basic writers. Podis and Podis, in their advice about evaluating drafts, suggest that a negative attitude interferes with one's ability to evaluate writing in process. These scholars assert that we should read students' drafts with the attitude of one conducting error analysis. That is, when we see weaknesses in writing, we should seek to "comprehend the mental process that underlies . . . difficulty in creating a discourse" (91); further, instead of seeing deficiencies, we should "encourage potential" (91). Such an emphasis on what exists (potential) instead of what does not (deficiency) is more than a semantic distinction. My personal experience with teachers testifies that this distinction reveals fundamental differences in their attitudes that have many ramifications for teaching. When such a negative attitude toward students exists, it will preclude the "warm, encouraging" basic writing classroom that Troyka calls for.
Basic Writers and Thinking

Christopher Gould and John Heyda discuss how the kind of instrumental pedagogy favored by basic writing teachers and proponents of the current-traditional paradigm neglects an "advanced literacy," which fosters critical thinking. The critical thinking skills of which our basic writers are capable is a subject that has produced considerable discussion in the literature on basic writing, although the literature on revision has not addressed this issue with as much vehemence. The question is an important one. It has implications for pedagogy and seems to be linked to our attitudes toward students, this latter being perhaps the reason why the arguments about this issue are sometimes passionate. The question about critical thinking is sometimes phrased "Have basic writers reached cognitive maturity?" When phrased thus, the answer indicates that our students are cognitively deficient; they have not achieved the adult level of cognitive development that begins, according to psychologists (Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky), in adolescence. Two essays are called upon to confirm this answer, Andrea Lunsford's "Cognitive Development and the Basic Writer" and Janet Hays's "The Development of Discursive Maturity in College Writers."
Lunsford used Piaget and Vygotsky to discuss basic writers at Ohio State, and she concluded that the writers "have not attained that level of cognitive development which would allow them to form abstractions or conceptions" (38). The students were able to formulate "spontaneous" concepts but not true concepts, a process that requires that they "remove themselves from . . . [the] concepts, . . . abstract from them, or . . . define them" (42). Both Vygotsky and Piaget distinguish between thinking with true concepts and thinking that appears to be conceptual, Vygotsky making the distinction Lunsford does. Being able to use the concept as a concept by distancing oneself from it, abstracting from it, defining it, or applying it to new particulars is the mark of true concept formation (Vygotsky, 79-80). To think with true concepts, it is necessary both to synthesize (to see similarities) and to analyze it: "to abstract, to single out elements, and to view the abstracted elements apart from the totality of the concrete experience in which they are embedded" (Vygotsky, 76). Concept formation is a creative, not a mechanical passive, [sic] process; . . . a concept emerges and takes shape in the course of a complex operation aimed at the solution of some problem; and . . . the mere presence of external conditions favoring a mechanical linking of word and object does not suffice to produce a concept (Vygotsky, 54).
Also interested in the development of the cognitive ability of college students, Hays analyzed writing samples according to William Perry's scheme of cognitive development. Her writers ranged from a second semester college freshmen to a recent graduate, a dualistic thinker to a true relativist who relates "one phenomenon to another in complex ways not possible for the sample's younger writers" (491). Hays concludes that the highest kind of complex thinking is a function of maturity. Even though she asserts that this maturity does not develop without the nurturance of instruction, there is, nonetheless, a note of determinism in her discussion—younger college writers will not write well simply because they are not mature enough. It is partly this inferred determinism in Hays and Lunsford that other scholars seem to react against.

Myra Kogen believes that conclusions like Hays's and Lunsford's are "assumptions of inability and inadequacy" (25), assumptions that she challenges by illustrating how writing weaknesses show an ignorance of the conventions concerning adequate support for one's ideas, the voice of reasonableness that is demanded of academic writing, the inadequacy of self-interest as a basis for argument, and so forth. Kogen directly challenges Lunsford and Hays. She concludes that
students (by which I think she means basic writers) "have the ability to reason and think analytically, but that they lack a sense of how to apply this ability, lack a sense of how the conventions of written academic discourse must be used in order for readers to take their arguments seriously" (36). She attacks the notion of deficiency, but does not directly address the matter of conceptual or complex, abstract thinking.

Anna Berg also addresses the matter of cognitive deficiency in basic writers and the results of her study tend to defend basic writers against charges of deficiency. She used direct measures of and instruction in cognitive tasks in a remedial curriculum at Passaic County Community College. She found that direct instruction in twelve cognitive processes (like inferential reasoning, classifying, and understanding complex relationships) improved cognitive ability as measured by the Thorndike-Hagen Cognitive Abilities Test. (The instruction tended to be on grammatical tasks.) She also found that the students' writing improved (based on pre- and post-tests, scored holistically). Berg concludes that instruction can improve the cognitive maturity of students and also that their writing can improve as a result of cognitive instruction. She does not, however, elucidate the
matter of whether basic writers can use conceptual thinking in their writing. She asserts that students may be at the "concrete operational" stage (the stage of pseudo concepts) in some "realms of activity, especially cognitive manipulations of unfamiliar subject matters, yet formally operational [the stage of true concepts] in others" (20).

The question of whether or not basic writers suffer cognitive deficiencies is argued, but inconclusively resolved in the literature on basic writers. Kogen and Berg challenge Lunsford's conclusion that basic writers are deficient; but among the various studies, the grounds of comparison are dissimilar: all use student writing, but we do not see enough of it in all the studies to know if they compare like samples, i.e. writing on similar topics and from students who are similar to begin with. Furthermore, Kogen's study does not determine cognitive ability; and Berg, who does examine cognitive development, measures that by a test, not by evidence in the students' writing. Hays interjects the confounding factor of maturity. Consequently, we do not yet have a clear picture of the cognitive abilities of basic writers.

Instead of asking if basic writers have reached cognitive maturity, we may question the thinking ability
of basic writers in different terms: "What kinds of cognitive abilities do our writers exhibit and under what conditions?" When we do, we begin to see the possibility for better insight. It is undeniable that basic writers are able to handle certain kinds of abstract writing tasks, ones in which they must integrate highly abstract concepts, often from material they read, into an argument or a discursive position statement or explanation. Lunsford used results from a simple version of such an assignment to draw her conclusions about the inability of basic writers to form true concepts. Several factors are interwoven in this kind of an assignment, however: thinking ability, reading ability, the degree of one's familiarity with the material from which he must abstract something, writing ability, and the level of abstractness in the reading material and in the writing expected. The level of abstractness is always relative; even a noun like car is an abstraction because it culls the essence of "car-ness" from concrete examples of cars. Consequently, determining just what has caused students' failure to handle an abstract assignment such as this is complicated. Whether or not the failure is evidence of cognitive deficiency is not clear. One way to address the question of cognitive ability, as demonstrated by
writing and not other measures, is to use assignments in which students are asked to abstract from material with which they are already familiar—personal experience. Such a shift from the sort of assignment discussed above reduces questions about unfamiliarity of the subject matter and reading ability. Further, the question about deficiency or maturity can be addressed in a study of revision: revising offers writers the possibility to demonstrate conceptual thinking that might be undemonstrable or purely potential in a single writing sample. Additionally, guidance from a teacher during the process of revision can determine the role of writing (not other) instruction in cognitive development.

The review of the literature about revision and basic writers leads us to several unanswered questions which this study will address:

1) In revision (as defined above), how do the surface and conceptual levels of text interact?

2) If we teach revision as invention, how do we read, evaluate, and comment on student drafts:

   How do we read poststructurally and archaeologically?

   How do we recognize critical thinking in its fragmentary forms?

   How do we respond as interested adults rather than judges or editors who "kidnap" texts?

   How do we create, with our comments, a
dialogue between ourselves and our students so that they will respond well to what we write or say to them?

3) If basic writers do not revise, can they be taught to do so?

4) If they can be taught revision as a means of invention, what kind of a classroom atmosphere, curriculum design, and teacher attitudes contribute to such instruction?

5) Can basic writers think in true concepts and show evidence of this thinking in revised writing?

6) What cognitive processes do we see in expository essays that draw upon personal experience?

These are questions this study will address. The remainder of this dissertation will proceed as follows. Chapter II examines problems in the research methods used to investigate revision, explains the case study method, outlines the study design and techniques of analysis, and provides working definitions of additional key terms. Chapter III discusses the class: course design, assignments, teacher's role, and the characteristics of the students. Chapter IV presents an in-depth case study of one writer and describes her revisions, her response to teacher and peer comments, and the thinking her writing exhibits. Chapter V presents more briefly three additional case studies and describes a single phenomenon of each writer's revisions. Chapter VI interprets the case studies,
shows how they relate to the research questions, and discusses the pedagogical implications of the results.
Chapter II
Methodological Problems, Case Histories, and Techniques of Analysis

In the preceding chapter, I discussed the complexity of revision and alluded to the problems that this complexity creates for revision studies. I will now discuss those problems in greater detail and describe the case history methodology and why I chose it for this study. Then I will explain the techniques of analysis I use to describe revision processes.

Methodological Problems in Revision Research

Valuable as recent research on revision is, taxonomic and quantitative studies like that of Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte's necessarily simplify the process to operations such as addition and deletion. Transformational grammar, the basis for such taxonomic studies, is designed to handle discourse at the sentence level or below, not beyond the sentence; and it deals far better with syntax than it does with semantics. Consequently, we might expect its limitations to impede revision studies that deal with global matters of
discourse. A conception of change limited to the surface descriptions—addition, deletion, permutation, substitution, distribution, and consolidation—simplifies the operations of revision. A machine can perform the operation of deletion, but a writer's act is different from a machine's because one deletion may require different cognitive strategies than another. For example, one may simply erase repetitive material and another may delete something that was once important but no longer is. These two kinds of deletion require different cognitive activities, the first, simple recognition of similarity and the second, a much more complex kind of focusing. Taxonomies and quantitative studies are limited in additional ways. First, they cannot describe semantic and other kinds of relationships in the text. Faigley and Witte's differentiation of revisions that change meaning from ones that do not attempts to describe the semantic aspects of revision, but this differentiation is only a gross one. It cannot describe or investigate the hierarchical structures in texts nor the interrelationship of concepts that create coherence and unity, both of which are aspects of the semantic level of texts insofar as they are cues from which readers construct meaning. Second, taxonomies and quantitative
studies cannot describe the heuristic function of revision, how one change leads to another or what processes operate in concept formation. Finally, such studies cannot investigate how writers respond to prompts for revision, like cues in the text and teacher and peer comments.

Taxonomies and quantitative studies are limited, and there is some evidence that any kind of study performed under test conditions skews the results about how basic writers revise. The reports in Chapter I of basic writers' inability to revise all came from studies performed under test conditions. In other settings, basic writers may perform differently. One study suggests that in the tutorial setting, basic writers do revise. Larry Mapp does not investigate revision directly; he discusses instead the value of tutoring with a focus on student writing rather than on modules that exercise basic skills. Along the way, he illustrates the considerable revisions of one basic writer. If basic writers perform differently in a tutoring lab from what research reports, we must find research methods that will elicit different performance from basic writers.

The conditions of any test also force revision to some extent: writers must perform when researchers want
them to, not necessarily when writers would choose to. Test conditions also often limit the amount of time allowed for revision, if not the time for each drafting episode, then the time between drafts. Such limits on time and the number of drafts, which is also controlled in most research designs, may constrain natural composing processes and interrupt the recursiveness of revision in midstream. (For example, writers may be forced to stop work on a piece in which recursive processes are still operating.)

Given these methodological problems, the case history technique is a good solution. It is ideal for examining the complexity of revision that taxonomic and quantitative studies cannot. And if case histories study students' performance in a class setting, they avoid the artificiality of test conditions. Consequently, I have chosen to use the case history method. I will now discuss the method in general, then its application to composition studies. Finally, I will explicate the particular case history design used in this research.

Case Study Research in General

The case studies used in this examination of revision are a kind of naturalistic research that will
first be described by reference to their much more common use outside English studies, particularly in anthropology and education. Clifford Geertz is an anthropologist whose work Ann Berthoff has introduced into composition circles; his discussions of ethnographic research enable us to compare the techniques he uses and the subjects he studies with those in this research. In a chapter from The Interpretation of Cultures (reprinted in Berthoff's Reclaiming the Imagination) Geertz writes about culture, the proper subject of anthropological study, which he defines as follows: "Believing . . . that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs" (228); it is "a stratified hierarchy of meaningful structures" (229), much like a text. The function of ethnography, then, is to study the "webs of significance" that the human animal has spun and to sort out the "structures of signification" that he has created (232). Geertz, like Kenneth Burke, sees human behavior as symbolic actions, a view that asks about them: what is it "that in their occurrence and through their agency, is getting said" and done (232). This view of symbolic action invites a functional analysis of language, a necessity for the investigation of the
heuristic function of revision.

In this study, student revision is like the culture that Geertz analyzes. A written text consists of several "webs of significance"; within its internal relationships—of word to word, of sentence to sentence, of paragraph to paragraph—it creates a network of meaning (or more accurately, cues from which meaning can be created); it is a web (or webs) created by a writer that may show her what is significant in the topic she is writing about; it is a web that can guide revision; and it is a web from which a reader constructs another network of meaning for herself. Additionally, the drafts and essays in this study were created within the webs of a basic writing classroom at Ohio State University in which I was the teacher. To study the webs of significance describes metaphorically the purpose of the current research.

In this undertaking, my role as the researcher is that of an interpreter who sorts through the webs of significance in the writer's process of revision—what changes did she make as she worked through several versions of an essay? What influenced her as she revised—class activities, peer or teacher comments, the text itself? What thinking-in-writing do we see in the webs that the writer composed? Answering these
questions is a task like the anthropologist's:

> What the ethnographer is . . . in fact faced with . . . is a multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another, which are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit, and which he must contrive somehow first to grasp and then to render . . . . Doing ethnography is like trying to read (in the sense of 'construct a reading of') a manuscript—foreign, faded, full of ellipses, incoherencies, suspicious emendations, and tendentious commentaries . . . [, an] enterprise . . . like that of the literary critic (Geertz, 232).

To perform case studies, one must read a complex web of interrelated material and then interpret it. Regarding interpretations, Geertz states the issue thus:

> Anthropological writings are themselves interpretations; . . . They are, thus, fictions; fictions, in the sense that they are 'something made,' 'something fashioned,'—the original meaning of fictio—not that they are false, unfactual, or merely 'as if' thought experiments (236).

Geertz is clearly aware that interpretations are not the same as facts; but he also knows that facts and perceptions are not as different from interpretations as we might think; neither fact nor perception is without what we call a subjective influence. Perceptions and all observed and collected "facts" are constructed, for example, by the perceiver's or collector's principles of selectivity and categorization, like the Eskimo words for snow. Likewise, the scientist's study design determines what "facts" he will find. Purely objective
facts and perceptions do not exist, nor does a

difference in kind between objective facts and

perceptions and subjective interpretations. (Indeed,

the dualism of subjective and objective is problematic

and, regardless of its long history in Western

civilization, misleading.) Interpretations are not

without elements of subjectivity, but neither is so-
called "scientific" research. To dismiss interpretive

research on the grounds of artifice and subjectivity

alone reveals too simplistic an understanding of the

nature of subjectivity and objectivity.

Interpretive research is neither non-factual

nor unmeasurable by rigorous standards—nor incapable of

producing generalizable results, as I shall soon

explain. Because the ethnographic analysis (of culture

for Geertz and of student revisions for me) "is (or

should be) guessing at meanings [or the significance of

revisions], assessing the guesses, and drawing

explanatory conclusions from the better guesses"

(Geertz, 240), the validity of interpretations in

ethnographic research is measured by the clarity and

persuasiveness of its "guesses," its "explanatory

conclusions," and its arguments.

A good interpretation of anything—a poem, a

person, a history, a ritual, an institution, a

society—takes us into the heart of that of

which it is the interpretation. When it does

not do that, but leads us instead somewhere
else—into an admiration of its own elegance, of its author's cleverness, or of the beauties of Euclidean order—it may have its intrinsic charms; but it is something else than what the task at hand . . . calls for (Geertz, 238).

We will see why valid interpretations are possible (and why case studies are valuable) if we realize that measures of their validity differ from those used in positivist research and if we consider first the technique of "thick description" and second "naturalistic" generalizations and how they differ from "scientific" ones.

Ethnography is embedded in what is called "thick description," the name for a rather microscopic recording of detail used in language studies (particularly in psycholinguistics, for example Roger Brown's work) as well as in anthropology. Because of its thick description, its "freedom to shape itself in terms of its internal logic is rather limited" (Geertz, 244). Interpretations are constrained by the material out of which they grow; the technique of thick description ties them closely to that which they interpret and so they cannot be, exclusively, the creations of those who make them.

Furthermore, as Geertz writes, "if ethnography is thick description and ethnographers those who are doing the describing, then the measurement for any given
example of it . . . is whether it sorts" and
categorizes human behavior and symbolic actions
according to their meaning, their signification, their
function in specific contexts (237) not whether it
presents "objective" fact or law. Geertz continues,

[t]he claim to attention [or the measure of
worth] of an ethnographic account does not
rest on its author's ability to capture
primitive facts in faraway places and carry
them home like a mask or a carving, but on the
degree to which he is able to clarify what
goes on in such places, to reduce the
puzzlement . . . which unfamiliar acts
emerging out of unknown backgrounds naturally
give rise (237).

That is, the worth of this account of revision is not in
the presentation of bare and universal facts or laws
about revision, but in the full explication of writers'
practices that categorizes the significance, the
functions of different revision activities. The
explication is, further, a rendering that makes the
mysterious known.

It is not against a body of uninterpreted
data, radically thinned description, that we
must measure the cogency of our explications,
but against the power of the scientific
imagination to bring us into touch with the
lives of strangers [or the working of basic
writers] (237).

Case studies bring us into touch with the phenomena
under investigation by presenting new information in the
fashion of one's experience. Robert Stake, an
educational researcher, says that
case studies are useful in the study of human affairs. . . . [They] will often be the preferred method of research because they may be epistemologically in harmony with the reader's experience and thus to that person a natural basis for generalization (5).

They engender an understanding of the particular, not a fleeting knowledge, which is "next to nothing", but a full and thorough knowledge of the particular, recognizing it also in new and foreign contexts. That knowledge is a form of generalization too, not scientific induction . . . , but arrived at by recognizing the similarities of objects and issues in and out of context. . . . To generalize this way is to be both intuitive and empirical. . . . [in the search that is common to] the scientist and the humanist scholar alike (6).

When we think of the generalizations produced by research, we typically (and perhaps exclusively) think of what Stake calls "scientific" ones. These abstract statements of law are the stuff of research that samples a portion of some population and generalizes on the basis of that portion to the whole. To form respectable scientific generalizations, these researchers must use a sample group that is typical and representative of the whole. However, another sort of generalization exists, the kind that grows out of case studies—naturalistic generalizations. These arise from one case, not a sample population, and do not generalize from a part to the whole. They generalize from one case to a similar one. In such a situation, "the demands for typicality
and representativeness yield to needs for assurance that the target case is properly described" (Stake, 7). As Geertz states, "What generality . . . [thick description] contrives to achieve grows out of the delicacy of its distinctions, not the sweep of its abstractions" (244).

Obvious uses of case studies are as tests of hypotheses, "particularly to examine a single exception that shows the hypothesis to be false," and they can also be used "as a method of exploration preliminary to theory development" (7). We can think of these studies of revision as ones that will influence hypotheses about the practices and abilities of basic writers or that will produce questions that future research, and in some cases experimental research, must answer. But Stake claims that these are not the best uses of case studies; the best use "appears . . . to be . . . adding to existing experience and humanistic understanding" (7). Such a purpose is like what George Campbell, a nineteenth century rhetorician, says that good rhetoric aims to do—gain conviction. Though Campbell and Stake differ in terminology, they share a sense of how discourse (that of rhetoric or of written research) affects people. For Campbell, effective rhetoric leads to action, and for Stake, case studies perform a similar
function. They lead to naturalistic generalizations which "seldom take the form of predictions [as would scientific generalizations] but lead regularly to expectation. They guide action, in fact they are inseparable from action" (6).

Case studies can guide action partly because they further one's tacit knowledge. In contrast to propositional knowledge which is "the knowledge of both reason and gossip . . . composed of all interpersonally sharable statements, most of which for most people are observations of objects and events," (Stake referring to Polya, 5), tacit knowledge "builds new understandings" (6). Tacit knowledge "may also dwell on objects and events, but it is knowledge gained from experience with them, experience with propositions about them, and rumination" (5). Building on tacit knowledge, leading to naturalistic generalizations, and guiding action, case studies are powerful instruments to use in the attempt to change teachers' habits of evaluation, one of the goals of this study.

Case Studies in Composition

In an essay entitled "Forming Research Communities among Naturalistic Researchers," Lucy Calkins urges us to pay more attention to our research methodologies in
composition studies—to select and describe them carefully. She explains that "this is a time of vulnerability as well as of potential for the new, variously titled holistic research methodologies" (127). The main step she takes to make us more sophisticated in our case-study techniques is to clarify the kinds of case studies already undertaken in composition research. Constructing a taxonomy of case studies, she specifies the "norms and goal" of each, the "models of excellence and criteria for success" (139). The three types she derives are descriptive, ethnographic, and teaching case studies. Since mine fall most nearly in the category of teaching case studies, I will describe it in more detail in order to explain some of the decisions about the structure of this study and how the results are reported.

Many teaching case studies are, according to Calkins, conducted by teacher-researchers, are atheoretical, and involve "field-testing" an idea:

a practitioner develops a new idea (a method for teaching vocabulary, a way of responding to student writing, etc.) applies it in a classroom (usually his or her own), and documents the results (142).

Studies such as this do not position themselves in a tradition nor in relation to relevant research and theory. Calkins considers this type of teaching case
study an impoverished one, particularly because it does not build on previous research and makes no effort to integrate theory and practice (143). Far preferable is another kind of teaching case study in which the researcher asks not only "'Does it work?'" in the classroom but also "'What are we [as a research community] working toward?'" (143), a much more far-reaching question that alters the goals, the content, and the structure of case studies that simply report classroom success, isolated from related history and theory. The prototypes for this kind of case study are Sigmund Freud's, Erik Erikson's, and Bruno Bettelheim's, the work of "practicing clinicians" who through working with patients and through related study . . . developed theories that informed their practices. They also acted as researchers, observing their work and the results of it and letting these observations guide them as they studied. This constant interaction between practice, reflection, and study led them to flesh out and refine their theories. Then, in order to teach these theories to others, they wrote case-study reports (143).

This study is only a modest version of the kind just described; it makes no claim to develop a comprehensive theory of revision or concept formation or basic writers, although its results pertain to all three subjects. But it is the patient, detailed observations of a practitioner-researcher, integrated with previous
theory and research. Among many studies like this, there can be an even better integration of theory and practice.

Techniques of Analysis

A decision for any kind of study is what data to use. Case studies in composition often use interviews with writers, protocols of their composing processes, and other such self-reporting techniques. This study, however, uses different data. While it includes context-setting information from the class, it uses manuscripts as the primary data source; it examines texts the students wrote and comments made upon them. While writers' reports reveal valuable information about revision, manuscript evidence more appropriately serves the purpose of this study because the written words will show exactly how a writer used language to shape her thoughts whereas interviews or protocols would show instead how she perceived her revisions. Such reports would be limited to those processes the writer was capable of articulating. A writer's actual language will show more of her behavior than she might be able to explain and will show as directly as possible the interaction of language and thinking. Further, the use of manuscripts more directly relates to teachers'
attempts to evaluate and respond to draft writing. Since one of the purposes of this study is to improve evaluation, manuscript evidence is clearly superior in this instance.

To examine concept formation, I proceeded with an inductive analysis of the student texts. In this respect I was much more like the ethnographer doing ethnographic case histories than a practitioner doing a teaching study because I was not looking for indicators of the success or failure of a teaching strategy but rather letting the data form the categories of analysis. As I examined changes among drafts, I noticed recurring words or phrases that gave unity and coherence to an essay, particularly as it was presented in its final form. (That is, a word or phrase might not have seemed crucial in an early draft but by the final one had become a key term.) I designate these terms concepts. Then I examined how they changed during revision and how they functioned: how the writer used them as structural elements in the text and as heuristic devices.

Linda Flower and John Hayes ("Images, Plans and Prose") consider concepts "abstract networks. . . . [that] cluster knowledge and . . . turn a complex, interconnected body of information into an abstract
representation" (137), so concepts organize information. In my investigation, I found that concepts occurred as principles of arrangement or patterns of organization (they guided paragraph order and the selection of detail). I called these concepts conceptual principles. If a principle like the contrast between appearance and reality guided the revision of a paragraph, I assume the concept of the contrast to have existed. That is, when the textual evidence indicates that the writer applies the abstract principle deliberately to concrete particulars, I consider her to be in control of a concept. A concept can be represented in writing by a network of material arranged according to an abstract, conceptual principle.

To examine revision processes, I analyzed changes in the levels of generality— or specificity (in this, I follow and expand upon Francis Christensen's notions). A change in levels of generality is a good measure of revision, particularly in the compositions of basic writers because a major weakness in their texts is a thin texture in the levels of generality (Cynthia Selfe and Sue Rodi); they tend to write either at the very concrete end of the scale or at the very general end and shift through only a few levels. Because a problem of considerable magnitude for basic writers is finding an
appropriate level of generality for the amount of discourse they will generate and then shifting appropriately through several levels of specificity to develop a topic adequately, my investigation of revision focused upon the levels of specific detail and generalizations in the text. Because basic writers begin with thinly textured drafts, more richly textured ones are evidence of revision, texts structured by a hierarchy moving from specific detail through several levels of generalization.

While I used levels of specificity to investigate the revision my students performed, I also used it to investigate their response to a curriculum, a curriculum that emphasized generating specific detail and generalizing about it. Because of the difficulty basic writers have in using levels of generality appropriately, I considered that my students needed instruction both in generating specific detail (so that their writing would not remain too general) and in expressing the significance of that detail or generalizing about it. Many basic writers can generalize but when they do, the generalizations are often extremely broad and make no connection to particulars. (My instructional techniques that emphasized specificity came partly from Sandra Schor and
Judith Fishman's Random House Guide to Basic Writing, the text used in the classes.

The instructional advice to "be specific" is open to criticism, primarily because the notion is oversimplified. As Richard Ohmann points out, instructions to be specific often intend for writers to use concrete, sensory language. Such a conception of specificity is far too limited, as Susan Peck MacDonald shows. Specificity in the development of ideas differs in kind, level, and function; furthermore, sensory language is inappropriate for many kinds of writing. MacDonald goes on to say that not only are teachers ill-informed about using specific detail; their students are also mystified: "since 'specificity' itself is a complicated abstraction, . . . [basic writers] do not always understand why or how they should be 'specific'" (196). MacDonald further explains that "low-level decisions--such as how and where to use specifics--are made in the context of larger communicative strategies" (195). Consequently, instruction that stresses an interplay between specifics and generalizations puts the advice to "be specific" in an appropriate context. Further, it teaches basic writers to texture their compositions more densely with levels of generalization, and it provides the opportunity for concept formation.
since it encourages writers to create abstract networks.

Examination of the levels of specificity yielded information about concept formation, not simply about the degree of revision. Another aspect of form also yielded information about both revision and concept formation—the relationship of narration and exposition, a relationship made possible by the kind of essay I assigned. The personal experience essays I asked students to write were unlike what some consider characteristic of that genre. They were not simple narrations or descriptions. Instead, I expected the essays to present and analyze personal experience; that is, I expected an expository framework for the essays, a superstructure of generalizations that held them together and interpreted the narrative or descriptive elements, those elements, of course, recounting personal experience. The process of deriving analytical generalizations from the concrete details of a story is a process of abstracting, a process of forming concepts. By analyzing textual shifts between these two modes of narration and exposition, I could see the process of concept formation and discover when it was a process that moved bottom-up, from the particulars of a story to a generalization (concept formation) and when it moved top-down, from the abstract to the concrete (applying a
true concept to new particulars). When I looked at the generalizations, I found that there were two kinds: summary and analytic ones. Summary ones add up some particulars into a whole; for example, "My date was verbose" adds up all the times he talked. Analytic generalizations reach beyond summary ones: "My date's verbosity stems from his fear of dialogue rather than a giant ego" and offer explanations. Analytic generalizations are the ones of most interest here.

For purposes of the class, I considered exposition to be better than narration because analysis occurs in the expository elements of the essays, the generalizations, where we can see the highest level of abstraction. I do not, however, consider narratives to be constructed more simply than exposition; rather they are more concrete. When I discuss the stories or narrative elements, I differentiate between a narrative that merely spills out events from one that is "composed." A simple narrative will be ordered chronologically, guided only by the principle of how events occurred in time or how they were retrieved from memory. A composed narrative will be arranged purposefully, by some invented principle of organization. If a narrative is composed so that it fits into the expository framework of the essay, it will
support some point of the exposition. Petrosky explains that

using examples and illustrations as the basis for explanations, generalizations, and critical examinations... gives... [students] a chance to make meaning for themselves through a process of discovery rooted in inferential reasoning (25)[,]

a process of abstracting. Although Petrosky is discussing writing based upon reading, the process would seem to be the same for writers who read their own stories and construct generalizations about them. In this process, we see the making of meaning and the formulation of concepts.

This discussion of the techniques of analysis has covered, among other things, the relationship of concept formation and form (levels of generality and narration-exposition). One of the research questions posed in Chapter 1 was "What cognitive processes do we see in expository essays that draw upon personal experience?"

The preceding discussion of form leads to a refinement of that question:

how do concepts function as principles of organization,
how do levels of specificity function heuristically, and
how do the modes of narration and exposition interact during revision and concept formation?

The investigations of revision and concept formation, as described above, display the dynamic
processes of both. A concept is not examined as a static entity that either exists or does not; its development is traced. It may occur in the concrete particulars of a story or in the word, phrase, or sentence that abstracts from those particulars. It may not be explicitly named in the text at all but function as a principle of organization. Its occurrence in all forms (concrete, abstract, and extra-textual) will be noted as will the interaction among forms and the changes from draft to draft. In addition, when a story and a generalization interact, the interaction will be noted and examined. Further, additions to the hierarchical structure will be noted as will changes in its configuration. The techniques of analysis make this a study of dynamic interactions.

The setting in which those interactions occurred is the subject of the next chapter, "The Class."
Chapter III
The Class

This chapter will present two basic writing classes that I taught at Ohio State in the Winter Quarter, 1981—the curriculum, the students, the writing assignments, how they were evaluated, and other such information. From the first days of Ohio State University's Writing Workshop in 1977-78, teachers in the basic writing program for which I taught had always followed a standard syllabus and course requirements designed by those administering the program; consequently, I cannot assume complete credit for structuring the classes when I taught them. Nonetheless, the syllabus (see Appendix A) and other elements of the course design exhibit several characteristics that I believe figure significantly in creating a classroom in which writers learn to revise; hence they deserve discussion. Furthermore, any teacher interprets and implements standard procedures in her own way, so that my discussion of the syllabus and course requirements will explain how I used them.
Background

In the years between its inception in 1977-78 and 1981, the Workshop syllabus had changed; since I had not taught there for some time, I worked with a brand-new syllabus. The new one retained from the old a strong emphasis on invention, separated error-consciousness from the early stages of writing, and provided for workshop activities: individual class work on up-coming assignments ("writing days"); peer-editing; and other group critiquing of student writing-in-progress. Except for "writing days," my early teaching in the Workshop had incorporated these aspects of class management and philosophy. But the new syllabus, though its evolution had been gradual, departed radically from the old one on two counts.

Students, whom I knew could often compose only a page-length text on the first day of class, were no longer given paragraph-length assignments throughout the term; they were expected to write groups of paragraphs, essays, that is, because (among other reasons) it had been found that basic writers who wrote only paragraphs in the Workshop had difficulty developing essay-length pieces with suitable paragraph-to-paragraph coherence when they moved into the regular freshman composition class. Furthermore, the new syllabus formalized revision by structuring students' work on certain
assignments so that several versions of an essay were due over a period of weeks: revision was not only allowed; it was demanded.

At the outset of the term, with the new syllabus and textbooks (see Appendix B), I took several deep breaths to quiet the noisy doubts in my mind: how was I, who knew the struggle of Workshop writers to produce a single paragraph, to teach them to create the longer, more demanding essays; and how was I to overcome the student resistance I anticipated to "writing this paper over again"? I plunged into the new course, not knowing how much it would teach me.

In this dissertation, I try to show what I learned about students writing and revising, though I have come to understand the lessons only in retrospect. While I taught these particular writing courses, I was only partly aware of what was happening. I knew that one of my expectations was proving wrong: students did not in passive refusal or ignorance revise papers only nominally. They, for the most part, worked willingly on several versions of the same essay. The syllabus, my instruction, and attitudes toward revision and the students had removed the punitive aspect from revision and taught the students to see value in reworking their drafts.
The Students

When I took the plunge into my new classes, the students I met were typical Workshop students, typical that is, in their general characteristics. Most of them were eighteen or nineteen (see Appendix C for demographic information) and from Ohio, therefore close to home. All of them had scored fifteen or below on their English ACT (or 370 or below on the SAT Verbal), as a result of which score they wrote a pre-quarter placement essay. These essays were scored holistically by two readers who agreed on placement in English 100.03 (now called English 060) rather than in a higher or lower level writing course. During the first week of class, all of the students wrote a diagnostic paragraph to determine the accuracy of their placement, so their writing skills had been sufficiently tested before our course began to insure that they were typical Workshop students who needed one quarter of remediation before they entered Ohio State's college-level writing course. Examples of their writing in Chapters IV and V show that they are not classified as basic writers on the basis of error, but by a lack of focus, control, and development. The examples, written after we were well into the term, are longer than the pieces the students wrote at the beginning of the quarter.
The students were a racially and sexually mixed group; out of the pool of twenty-eight (seventeen in one class and eleven in the other), fourteen were women and fourteen, men; twenty-one were white and seven, black. (See Appendix C for class breakdowns.) As individual human beings, however, these students were less typical. One, for example, was the victim of seizures; another was diabetic; a third suffered from memory loss because of an earlier injury and had had reading problems in elementary school. Another reported a hearing impairment, and still another had been diagnosed as dyslexic when he was a youngster, but thought he had "outgrown" his learning disability like an old shirt. Two of the female black students were considered promising enough as potential engineers to be part of a support program designed to insure the success of minority students in the School of Engineering. Two men were older, returning students who were married. The range of these facts about individuals may give as real a picture of the class make-up as do the generalized statistics. These characteristics about human beings surely affected the classroom dynamics and the writing performance of my students, though the impact of such details as these are not the concern of this study. (See John Rouse, "Scenes from the Writing Workshop," for a vivid example of how students'
personality traits and stations in life influence the business of a writing classroom.)

The Writing Assignments

These students and I met three days a week, one hour a day for ten weeks and once more in the eleventh week for a two-hour final exam. During that time they submitted the following writing (see Appendix D for the assignments):

- a daily journal,
- a diagnostic paragraph,
- an expository paragraph,
- a midterm exam (an in-class paragraph),
- two essays, and
- a final exam (an in-class essay).

In addition to these, the syllabus required several revisions or preliminary drafts of these assignments:

- a revision of the diagnostic paragraph,
- a proposal for each of the two essays (i.e. a mini-essay or skeleton of the planned essay),
- two rough drafts of the first essay, and
- one rough draft of the second essay.

For the essays, students were told to choose topics from their own experience and to develop pieces that were expository rather than purely narrative or descriptive. In our group discussions, I explained several times and in several ways what I meant by an expository essay; in terms for the class (which are not necessarily ones I would use to define "expository" for other audiences), the definition was an essay in which a thesis
necessarily generalized about or showed the significance of the personal experience the students wrote about. I used student essays as models, and I reinforced the definition through my comments on the students' drafts by asking them, for example, to show why they had included particular items of detail or what the relationship was between parts of a paragraph.

I did not assign topics for the essays but told students to choose their own topics and encouraged the use of journals as sourcebooks. Whether students should be allowed to choose topics freely or be led through a series of carefully sequenced assignments designed to necessitate the writers' use of cognitive, analytic, syntactic, and other skills they might not otherwise create the occasion for is a subject about which our discipline is not in agreement, just as we are not clear about the place of personal experience writing (Mike Rose; Lunsford, "Cognitive Studies" and "Assignments for Basic Writers"; Anthony Petrosky; Harry Brent; Anne Herrington; and Linda Flower, "Revising Writer-Based Prose").

For opposing views on choosing topics, I will consider two articles, David Bartholomae's, "Writing Assignments: Where Writing Begins," in which he makes a persuasive case for carefully integrated assignments and Donald Graves' equally persuasive article, "Break the
Welfare Cycle: Let Writers Choose Their Topics." In my classes, students did choose topics freely, as Graves recommends; but in these assignments, I did not, I believe, allow the writing to suffer from being, as Bartholomae puts it, "'student-sponsored,' . . . freeing . . . [the writers] from the fetters of an oppressive culture" that might, for example, oppress by demanding the conventions expected of academic writing (307). Bartholomae insists upon teacher-sponsorship of assignments so that students can learn how to go about the "'working out of the matter'" (307), a phrase he borrows from Tolstoy. To "work out the matter" of a discourse-in-progress, one must follow a procedure for "choosing, selecting, preserving, [and] remembering," writing acts that Bartholomae insists are not "'natural'" but "imposed" by "a system" constituted by the writer and the text he has in mind, a system that "allow[s] for certain choices" (307). A teacher's responsibility is to sponsor the learning of such acts, and though Bartholomae insists that the vehicle for doing so is a set of prescribed assignments, it seems to me possible that other vehicles are a teacher's response to writing-in-progress and the guidance she offers on revision. Such response and guidance can also direct students to learn non-natural procedures for choosing, selecting, preserving, and remembering.
Graves, in fact, sees great danger in teacher-sponsorship of writing; it puts writers on "welfare . . . [,] dependent on the teacher for everything, starting with the topic" (98). The real risk is that students do not develop a sense of text-ownership and control: those who are not allowed to choose their own topics "see writing as an artificial act disconnected from their own lives. Writers need to know what they can command and defend, to put their voices on the line" (98). Bartholomae might argue that writing is an artificial act; but even so, the point remains that to write well and to use writing as a tool for thinking, students must feel that they own their texts. One way I fostered that ownership was to have students choose their own topics.

Grades and Grading Sequence

Students were prepared from the outset (by elements of the course design and evaluation practices) to expect that early in the term they could write with little risk of failure. (See Appendix E for information on grades.) The earliest assignments did not figure into the final grade except as "credit"; that is, the diagnostic paragraph and its revision, the first two writing assignments, received no letter grade. Students had the opportunity to become acquainted with the conditions and
teacher-expectations of the class before their egos would suffer the possible blow of a grade. Further, assignments were weighted in the percentage they counted toward the final grade, with the percentages increasing as the quarter progressed (a Workshop-wide practice). Later work influenced the course grade more significantly than did early work, so that students could feel they had a chance to learn some writing skills before their grade was in much danger of being low. In addition, students first wrote four short pieces (three paragraphs and the revision of one), assignments that they could perceive as less difficult, before they tackled the longer, more demanding essays. And in their journal writing, students were nearly free of risk, as long as they wrote the required number of pages. (The journals were graded with checks and pluses.) Consequently, students had the opportunity to take risks as writers in these two classes.

To some extent the practice of assigning short pieces of writing and then working up to longer ones reveals a "building block" theory of writing to which I do not subscribe. It suggests that writers must learn to master sub-skills before they tackle the real thing, writing. It also suggests that we can determine with accuracy exactly what those sub-skills are and that once they are put together into a whole, a person is in total
possession of the ability to write perfectly at all

times. Just as the assumption that a whole discourse is
merely an addition of parts is untrue, so the assumption
about building blocks does not seem to hold true about
writing skill. Nonetheless, having students begin a
writing class with short pieces is defensible
pedagogically because many students believe shorter to
be easier and therefore, because they see before
them a manageable rather than impossible task, may be
more willing to tackle a writing assignment with the
expectation of success.

Teacher's Role

Many other teachers followed the same syllabus,
course requirements, and set of assignments; even so,
some were not able to engender serious revision in their
students' writing. Consequently, I think that although
these elements of course design are necessary conditions
for effective revision, they are not sufficient ones.
Reducing a writer's sense of risk figured importantly in
the design of these courses, as did the practice of
withholding a letter grade (and therefore a writer's
sense of task-completion) from writing-in-progress until
a final draft was submitted; but the teacher's attitude,
manner, and expectations, which are revealed to students
in both conscious and unconscious ways, determine in
part whether or not students will revise well.

A course design that postpones the consideration of error until later drafts has no impact if a teacher's attitude conveys the message that correctness is the sine qua non of good writing. A teacher who believes that basic writers do not belong in college or who believes that vacuous first drafts accurately reflect students' potential thinking abilities probably will not believe that students can write well. Without the sincere belief in students' potential, teachers will have difficulty persuading writers to change that which makes them "basic."

If a teacher has little confidence in her students' abilities, the students will, quite likely, have little confidence in themselves. When students perceive that an authority figure has confidence in them and expects them to be able to perform well, they very often expect the same of themselves. That is when they can begin to own the texts they create and when, also, an intrinsic motivation takes over—to reshape a composition, to figure out one's goals, purposes, and intentions for it, and to try to make the piece better.

Once students begin to understand that writing well enables them to learn, to articulate and shape what they know and internalize it, they are well on the way to being motivated not by external factors such as grades or marks but by their own developing competence (Lunsford, "A Choice of Roles," 39).
At this point, if not before, the teacher must work with great patience to help the students improve their writing—but at the same time to let them fail. The teacher must guide their stumbling progress without being alarmed by their missteps. She must teach students how to make good choices, not choose herself.

Evaluation of Writing

As the quarter progressed there developed an interplay between the students' writing and my response as a reader and evaluator of their emerging essays. My method of responding to their writing and the points at which I did so shaped that interplay.

I did not, in the early drafts, note or correct style, diction, syntax, or other surface-level matters. Rather I responded to the discourse-level features, for example, what the writer found interesting about his or her topic, whether or not there seemed to be a main idea with adequate and clearly related supporting detail, and whether or not relationships among parts of the growing essay were articulated or hidden. I read archaeologically and tried to recover from imperfect texts the potential meaning students were trying to express. Reading archaeologically confers upon student texts the same respect we usually reserve for those of published (and accomplished) authors (Phelps, "What
Literature Teachers Know). "Teachers," Lunsford explains,

who genuinely respect their students generally get respect in return, and as students gain respect for themselves and each other they begin to set increasingly higher standards of achievement for themselves ("A Choice of Roles," 42).

I read archaeologically and respected my students. Such evaluation reinforced the students' opportunity to take risks; writers were free to make mistakes in the conception, development, and organization of a topic, matters more of thinking than of the surface of discourse, before the surface of their discourse was judged.

Douglas Butturff and Nancy Sommers outline a cycle which teachers should follow in their commentaries on student writing to allow . . . students to experience rewriting as a recursive process. To do this, we must first offer them directions that will enable them to see possible subsets of ideas and examples in their essays. These commentaries should contain explicit directions on how each inchoate theme might be developed. Students should be encouraged to develop the one subset—and there are many—that they feel most accurately represents what they want to say. Commentaries on second drafts should aim at assisting students to reorder ideas, relate themes, and develop examples in a way that will result in a center of gravity emerging. It is only after a center of gravity has emerged that teachers should turn their attention to introductions, conclusions, and stylistic matters (104).

My commentary followed a similar cycle.
In addition, my focus on parts of the discourse-level matters (e.g., the depiction of a section's potential or an explanation of how two chunks of discourse contradicted one another), gave students the "deliberate guidance" they needed to "learn to analyze separate parts of a whole" (Troyka, "Legacies and Literacy," 259). I focused students' attentions on the parts of their discourse, described what was on the page (in contrast to what the students hoped was there), and in this respect helped them recognize where revision was needed. In the terms of Flower et al. (1986), I detected the problems, helped the students diagnose them, and suggested solutions. Breaking down the whole process of revision into sub-processes made it manageable. Flower offers a cognitive explanation for why such a strategy is useful pedagogically. When a task is "unfamiliar or complex, it makes sense to help beginning writers break up the problem" to avoid "cognitive overload" ("Revising Writer-Based Prose," 67).

I read and commented upon all drafts that were submitted by their due dates. If students submitted papers late, they received no credit for them and lost the opportunity to receive my considered responses; they could, however, on a workshop day, ask for my appraisal in class. At those times, my response was purposely
brief; I read such "late" papers quickly and told the students that my assessment then was not as carefully done as it would have been had I read the paper out of class. These practices reinforced the notion that an expert reader could be of considerable help to a writer who was revising. I also read, in or out of class, any additional or partial drafts beyond those required by the syllabus. Since I read many versions of many papers and since several students revised more than the syllabus required, I believe that they had come to depend upon my response to their writing as an important aid to revision. We had established an interplay, a dialogue about their writing. It is possible to differentiate this dependence from over-dependence because one student clearly depended on me too much. She, however, had arrived in class with extreme insecurities. She was the seizure victim who had been, necessarily, quite dependent upon her parents; for example, at nineteen, she did not yet drive a car and was terrified of learning. She feared independence more than other, healthier people would.

The students' dependence upon my comments meant that they valued an "expert" reader who could see more in their texts than they could themselves. It meant also that they had come to trust me not to use my expertise to keep them in the role of subordinates nor
damn their ideas with faint praise or snide remarks, to justify a letter grade, to prove that a teacher can always find more errors than the student, to confuse the writer with cryptic correction symbols, contradictory advice, or mysterious circles and lines.

This list of the wrong reasons for which teachers' comments are often written is from Erika Lindemann's article, "Teaching as a Rhetorical Art" (11). In this article, Lindemann also says that

marginal comments and end-notes must do more than label strengths and weaknesses. They represent an on-going written dialogue with the student about his or her writing, a private tutorial which explains not just what to do but how (11).

I contend that this written dialogue, this interplay, this pushing of student writers to make connections that were implicit but ill-expressed helped these writers discover intrinsic motivations for revising. I invited them to see and taught them to explore the richness of their world views.

A Workshop Class

Another important classroom condition for the nurturing of this interplay was the "workshop" nature of the class, which I began to exploit by following the syllabus recommendations for in-class writing (e.g. free-writing on the topic for an up-coming assignment) and peer-editing (e.g. having students exchange proposals
and try to outline the main idea and subtopics through which the writer would develop his or her topic). As the class evolved, however, it became even more of a workshop than these common classroom practices create. I found when I returned proposals or early drafts of an essay that students had individual questions to ask me about my written comments. As I answered them, the class turned into a series of individual conferences. While I conferred with one student, the others read and tried to interpret what I had written on their papers and began to revise according to the suggestions I had made or according to their own sense of what the paper needed. These conferences were not ones I had originally planned but grew out of what the students seemed to need. Often their questions were simply a restatement in their own words of my written suggestions to them, and the response they needed from me was a confirmation or denial that their interpretation was correct. Such a need could usually be met quickly, with an exchange of only a few sentences. In fact, most of these in-class conferences were brief, so that it was quite easy to speak to all seventeen students (or eleven, depending upon the class) at least once and often more than once during a forty-eight minute period. Sometimes several people needed only to write, not to confer, so that longer conferences were possible for
those who needed them. Students also conferred with one another, and though I was not as successful at teaching them to be uniformly good peer-editors (as some teachers and researchers are), I was sometimes able to create workable and productive pairs, particularly if I chose students whom I knew could work well together, either because they were friends, or because one was an expert on a particular point, or because both were on the verge of a break-through, for example, in understanding how to create sufficient specific detail. The written dialogue between teacher and student was thus joined by spoken dialogue between the two as well as by dialogues, both spoken and written, between students.

These class conference periods were unstructured, and what often happened is that students tried out strategies we had agreed to in a conference, and then later in the period called me over to check their progress. Here, my intervention in students' writing processes was direct, or as direct as it can be.

Many teachers and researchers have recognized and explained the value of conferences in improving student writing (e.g. Donald Murray, Muriel Harris). We know that individual conferences can foster in writers that important sense of text-ownership, without which students are unlikely to develop their own writing voices or the ability to use writing as an
epistemological tool. Conferences such as I used, in an unstructured class where students wrote and asked questions of readers, allowed for two channels of communication about the writing-in-progress (oral and written); it allowed for multiple audiences; it created an "enforced" writing situation; and it allowed for direct and immediate teacher intervention in the writing process.

Hillocks' Categories

What other apprati were part of these two courses I taught? Some are those that George Hillocks finds to be the most effective in improving writing quality. Hillocks' work surveys and evaluates over 500 experimental studies on teaching methods through the years 1963-1982, methods that the researchers claim influence writing quality. Analyzing by statistical means the results of all these studies, he creates an overview of effective and ineffective classroom pedagogies. Hillocks classifies these studies according to six pedagogies; in order of ineffective to effective, they are grammar, models, free writing, sentence combining, scales, and inquiry. (He did not include studies of revision.) I used the instruction he found considerably more effective than the other five. What he calls "inquiry" "focuses the attention of students on
strategies for dealing with sets of data, strategies that will be used in writing." It is "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," two techniques Hillocks uses as standards for measurement (161). For example, the teaching methods Hillocks categorized as inquiry "involve[d] students in finding and stating specific details that convey[ed] personal experience vividly, [or] in examining sets of data to develop and support explanatory generalizations" (161). In my comments on student papers, in conferences, and in group work, I involved students continually in the search for specifics and for generalizations, though perhaps these searches occurred less in structured group settings than Hillocks's. I did not lead my students through dry-run exercises either to invent detail for a generalization I created or to invent a generalization for detail I supplied. When we used inquiry techniques, it was with the purpose of improving the content or coherence of a given piece of student writing-in-progress. The search always was for significant detail or the right generalization to fit into an emerging essay.

Next most effective, according to Hillocks, are two techniques I also used, sentence combining and what he calls "scales" of evaluation, by which he means "scales,
By applying specific criteria and questions, students can improve their writing. Hillocks notes that students appear to internalize criteria systematically, even when they do not have them in front of them. One criterion, for instance, required that the student's essay "match" his or her thesis. This understanding is exemplified by a student's comment, which revealed how he kept his thesis visible throughout writing.

Other criteria and sets of questions were used, such as:

- Can you see the possibility of separate paragraphs from the proposal?
- Can you see how the theme proposed here will emerge?
- Is each paragraph specific? Will it allow for specific development?
We sometimes used sentence-combining exercises from the textbook (see Appendix B) and from *In-Prints*, an in-house publication of student work; and we also applied the techniques of combining and de-combining to sentences from the class' writing.

In Hillocks' evaluation or "meta-analysis," he delineates four teaching modes, what we might think of as styles of classroom management; and because he measures wide differences in how each of these modes influences writing quality, it is suitable to conclude this discussion of my classes with Hillocks' findings. In brief (see Appendix F for full definitions), the types can be described as follows:

- **presentational** - lecture-discussion classroom; use of models
- **natural process** - à la National Writing Project
- **environmental** - teacher and student have more equal responsibility for class; structured group activities; principles taught through means other than presentation
- **individual** - tutorials or other individual instruction.

Hillocks further differentiates the modes as follows:

In contrast to the presentational mode . . . [the environmental] places priority on high levels of student involvement. In contrast to the natural process mode, . . . [it] places priority on structured problem-solving activities, with clear objectives, planned to enable students to deal with similar problems in composing (160).

Hillocks' analysis of the effectiveness of these
various modes gives one pause for thought: the presentational, "which is probably the most common mode of composition instruction in secondary schools and colleges, emphasizes the role of the teacher as presenter of knowledge about writing" (145) and is clearly the least effective teaching mode ("only about half as effective as the average experimental treatment" surveyed, 159). The natural process mode, which we may see as the pendulum swing in reaction to the presentational mode, is better, but not much—"about 25 percent less effective than the average experimental treatment, but about 50 percent more effective than the presentational mode"; and the effectiveness of the individual method is "essentially the same" as the natural (160). The clear winner in Hillocks' assessment is the environmental mode of teaching ("on pretest-to-posttest measures [of writing quality], . . . over four times more effective than the traditional presentational mode and three times more effective than that [sic] natural process mode" 160). Hillocks concludes that

the dimensions of effective instruction are quite different from what is commonly practiced in schools and colleges on the one hand . . . and what has been recommended by some adherents of the National Writing Project on the other (159).

Though Hillocks may seem to have the final word on effective instruction, we must not embrace his
conclusions without qualification. His condemnation of the process approach is, as Arthur Applebee points out, a semantic sleight of hand that can produce a serious misinterpretation of what his data mean. The 'environmental' mode that Hillocks champions is itself a version of process-oriented instruction and draws on the panoply of techniques he seems to be attacking (105).

Applebee goes on to explain that the environmental mode is, in fact, not distinct from process instruction but rather a "structured process" approach, in "contrast to the 'natural process' mode" (105). As he explains, "'environmental' instruction is in fact a series of process-oriented activities structured to avoid at least some of the problems of implement[ing]" process instruction, for example adaptation of planning and revising to the particular writing task at hand (105). We might revise Hillocks', then, to say that the best process instruction is environmental.

Now that we are acquainted with the class and the students as a whole, we will get to know four of them as individuals through their writing. In the case studies that follow in Chapters IV and V, I will refer to writers by pseudonyms and will present their texts uncorrected.
Chapter IV
Profile of Roberta
An In-depth Study of Revision

The preceding chapter discussed the classroom setting in which I taught basic writers to revise. The discussion of the class addressed some of the research questions articulated in Chapter I: in what sort of class will basic writers revise, and how do we evaluate writing-in-process. We considered course design, assignments, teacher attitude, and characteristics of the students. We also considered, in general, the kinds of comments I made on student writing and how I staged those comments. I will continue, throughout this chapter, to address the following questions from Chapter I: what cognitive processes basic writers use in revision, how basic writers formulate and apply concepts, how concepts and levels of specificity function heuristically, and how narration and exposition interact during revision and concept formation. Initially, I will consider the evaluation of draft writing more specifically than in the previous chapter. I will identify, where possible, the prompts to revision that Roberta, the subject of this case history,
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responded to. Sometimes she responded to comments from her readers (either students or me); these prompts and revisions I will examine first. Often, however, Roberta responded to prompts from the text. Consequently, throughout the chapter, I will examine several different kinds of prompts:

- teacher and peer comments;
- concepts articulated in the text;
- patterns of text (levels of specificity, conceptual organization, symmetry, comparisons, and contrasts);
- the intended meaning (insofar as it can be inferred from the concepts, patterns, mode, and purpose of the final essay); and
- discourse features that contained, embryonically, the patterns and concepts of the final essay.

Roberta's revisions were usually not a response to a single prompt; they came as a response to several prompts, intermingled with one another. For example, when she responded to textual cues, her perception of those cues was influenced by readers' comments (if any were pertinent), her intended meaning, and other prompts that are equally difficult to document, like Roberta's memory of events). The Linda Flower et al. (1986) model of revision explains this intermingling of prompts: when writers represent to themselves a text for revision, their "reading" is a "rich mix of written texts [their own and written commentary about them], and unwritten gists, plans, [and] goals" (28). Consequently, my discussion of how to evaluate drafts necessarily
includes the investigation of prompts besides the commentary Roberta received about her writing. She responded to many prompts; and if teachers are to comment skillfully on drafts, they too must perform a kind of reading which allows them to perceive the textual prompts a writer might use.

Discussion of Roberta's responses to the above listed prompts will result in a lengthy, detailed "reading" of her revisions; this "reading" is an example of what we find if we read archaeologically. We find webs of interaction among writer, readers, and text. We find networks of text, fluctuating throughout revision as the writer articulates her intended meaning more and more fully. We find scattered material pulled together by the power of a concept, a concept acting like a magnet drawing to it shards of metal spread haphazardly across a tabletop and creating networks of content and form. We find abstractions growing out of the concrete, and the concrete shaped according to abstract principles. We find webs built upon webs and a textual surface that belies the complexity underneath.

The discussion that follows is necessarily complex. Before we proceed to the detailed tracing of four concepts, I will discuss each draft of the essay separately. I will first introduce and characterize the
writer and then summarize the essay. After these brief introductions, I will discuss the notable features of each draft in more detail: the relative amounts of detail and generalization (i.e. of narrative and expository elements), the particular insights and concepts the draft contributes, and the ways in which teacher or student commentary prompted revision. The draft-by-draft discussion will proceed through the following four versions of the essay:

- the journal (I), written as routine entry, not originally intended as a first draft of the essay;
- the proposal (II), which proposed the main point and sub-topics through which an essay would be developed; the proposal abstracted the journal and necessarily omitted specific detail;
- the rough draft (III), a full draft in which the narratives from the journal were again told in full detail and generalizations were added; and
- the final essay (IV), the most expository version.

After the draft-by-draft discussion, I will trace the emergence and application of four concepts. This discussion will continue to examine the textual prompts to revision. Coming after an acquaintance with each version of the essay, this more detailed discussion should be easier to follow.

All discussions will refer to sentences by Arabic numerals and to paragraphs by upper case P.

First we meet Roberta.
The Writer

In the Winter Quarter of 1981, Roberta entered Ohio State University as a freshman commuter student. She was eighteen, had an English ACT score below sixteen, and enrolled on the basis of the ACT score and a written placement test in the one-quarter basic writing course required of her. (See Chapter III for further discussion of the placement process.) In the following quarter, she enrolled in freshman composition and earned a grade of B. In the Spring Quarter of 1985, she graduated from Ohio State with a Bachelor of Science degree in education and a cumulative grade point average of 3.09. Roberta was a successful student at Ohio State. In her basic writing course, she was pleasant and likable. She was a relaxed contributor to our class discussions; and although she missed one or two deadlines and an occasional class session, she attended regularly. The grades on her papers reflect an average beginning, followed however by a rather sudden improvement: C, B-, C+, A-. Roberta was capable of performing well in the course, yet she was more recalcitrant than most to use specific detail in her writing. She had a tendency to philosophize, to develop highly abstract explanations of life. She used too many abstract generalizations like
"ordain your destiny" and tried to support abstractions with other abstractions, as the following example shows.

As Abraham Lincoln once said, 'It has been my observation that people are just as happy as they make up their minds to be.' I believe in these words, and I feel that self confidence is gained through goal setting. Through goal setting you realize that you are the only person who can set goals for yourself. Not even your best friend can set your goals. Since you set your goals, you know you can ordain your destiny. This in turn gives you confidence in controlling your life. Since you develope the goal from the first step through the final steps of accomplishment, you know how much energy you [sic] into achieving this goal. Knowing your ability to go the extra mile helps you set higher goals. You are the one person in charge of your life, and you call the shots.

The above passage begins an essay but does not focus it except in a general way on goal setting. Nearly every sentence shifts the point of view about goal-setting: first gaining self-confidence, then relying upon one's self instead of friends, followed by the relationship of goal-setting and "ordaining one's destiny," the steps through which one sets and achieves goals, the amount of energy one should put into achieving goals, or how goal-setting is just one example of being "in charge of your life." The sentence-to-sentence coherence is not strong among these abstractions, especially where Roberta assumes that everyone "goes the extra mile." (That assumption does not follow from the previous sentence.) Further, the essay could just as easily be about making up one's mind
to be happy instead of about goals. The series of abstractions leads me, the teacher-reader, to wonder whether the essay will really explicate the interrelationship of all these abstractions or whether instead Roberta really wants to write about one or two of them. For the basic writer, this introduction is full of pitfalls. It and the essay it introduced illustrate Roberta's limited control of abstractions and her inability to use specific detail well.

Toward the end of the quarter, Roberta wrote the essay under study here, one in which she includes much specific detail from her own life (not hypothetical detail like in the essay about goals); she manipulates the detail with some skill; she invents generalizations that grow directly out of the detail; and she controls her philosophizing by using fewer poorly-focused abstractions and integrating the abstractions she does use with the supporting material. Consequently, when Roberta completed the essay under study, she had made dramatic progress in her ability to develop an idea coherently with supporting detail.

The Essay: Summary

Roberta's untitled essay is one in which she defines her ideal companion on a date by comparing and
contrasting two quite different experiences, a date with a fellow who should have been exciting and who took her to a fancy restaurant and another date with a fellow who took her to an amusement park on a steamy August day where they were met with a sudden rain. The promise of the first date was unfulfilled, but the unexpected rainstorm during the second date was fun instead of disastrous. The reason one date was fun and the other not, Roberta asserts in her thesis, is that the person she is with, not the place they go, can make or break the occasion. Most of the essay is given over to two examples, the story of each date. (The final essay and all preliminary versions of it are in Appendix G, but I will include each draft below when I discuss it.)

This brief summary of the essay is a skeleton of its design: its interrelated content and form. In the final essay, this design is more elaborate, but its outline is present in the journal. These parts of the design are present from the first and remain the same: the two contrasting examples, the order in which they are presented, and the assertion that Roberta's companion accounts for her enjoyment on a date, not its location. In the journal, this assertion is the thesis, but by the final essay, the thesis has been reformulated
and the main purpose of the essay is to define an ideal date. Many of the specific details in the two examples are also present and remain in the final essay, but they are reorganized. The design of this essay developed organically out of what was present from the beginning. Consequently, it is an ideal essay for the study of how a writer's intended meaning develops in response to textual and other prompts. In addition, the essay is ideal for the study of how generalizations grow out of specific detail because the journal is predominantly narrative. Since the final essay includes a much richer texture of generalizations, we have the opportunity to see how they develop. Further, the essay is ideal for the study of concept formation and application since the concepts of the final essay do not all emerge in the same draft and, as a result, allow us to view different stages in their development and use.

The Journal

Roberta's journal entry is a very good one, one I read as part of a collection of entries mid-quarter. It is a good journal because it shows the sustained development of a single topic and also shows a writer engaged with her topic. For Roberta, the entry was especially good because it was full of specific detail:
1) It doesn't really matter where I go out for entertainment. 2) I believe that it is who you're with that counts.
3) I once dated a very boring guy.
4) His idea of fun was to talk endlessly about politics. 5) He took me out to a very nice restaurant. 6) One that I wouldn't go to everyday. 7) The meal consisted of rice pilaf as an apitizer, shrimp as a main course & chocolate mousse as dessert. 8) The food was terrific. 9) The atmosphere was elegant, soft music, dimmed lights and glowing candles.
10) It put me in a mood that what I wanted to hear was how beautifully my hair was styled, or how the color of my dress changed the color of my eyes to a deep blue. 11) All he wanted to talk about was how Carter's campaign failed, and what he should have done. 12) It would have been an interesting term paper for my Political Science class, however, what I wanted to hear was far from that. 13) Any attempt to change the subject failed since he had a one track mind. 14) Dancing wasn't the political discussion, because he could talk and dance, both at the same time. 15) So much for a Sat. night. 16) An apposite to the above example is An example of a fun time 17) I planned to go to Kings Island one Sat. afternoon with another guy. 18) When we started Sat. morn, the sun was shining, there was a cooling breeze to cool the August heat and it was a perfect summer day. 19) It wasn't too long before after we arrived, that a rain began to fall. 20) Soon half of the rides were closed down and the shelter's were packed with people fearing to get wet in the rain. 21) Seeing that we would be like a couple of sardines in a tin can, we decided to risk walk around the park, and see the sights deserted sights of Kings Island. 22) We talked, and laughed at the sight of each other's wet hair. 23) We both looked like we took a jump in the lake.

In the journal, we see the preponderance of narrative detail that I mentioned above. The long second
paragraph narrates the two contrasting dates (in twenty sentences) and contains no real analysis of why one date failed and the other did not. As a journal, the composition is good, but as an essay, it would have several weaknesses. The narratives, particularly the first one, read like lists of events; they are not shaped for a particular purpose other than to recount two examples. In addition, the non-narrative elements are confined to its two-sentence thesis ("It doesn't really matter where I go out for entertainment. I believe that it is who you're with that counts") and the transition between the two dates, but even these are only minimally expository. The thesis generalizes about the two dates but does not really analyze them nor explain what it asserts. The narrative exemplification is the only "explanation" of why the person matters more than the place. The last element of exposition is the sentence of transition between the two examples: "An apposite to the above example is An example of a fun time" (16); but it is a statement of contrast without an analysis of why the contrast exists and is a poor transition, merely paying lip-service to the demands of exposition.

The point of juncture between the two dates, however, prompts several of Roberta's revisions and is
more important than the surface of the journal reveals. The conclusion of the first date is an off-hand remark ("So much for a Sat. night") and the transition between two stories is superficial. But, this juncture prompts Roberta to name two concepts in the proposal and begin there to analyze the failure of the first date. The concepts and the beginning analysis of the first date lay the groundwork for Roberta's analysis of the second date's success. Because two contrasting stories meet at this juncture, it offers a distinct prompt for revision. Impelled to analyze the two dates, Roberta used the contrast between them heuristically.

When I read Roberta's journal entry, it was part of a collection, as mentioned above. My practice was not to comment on every single journal entry, but on ones I found interesting as a reader, or ones that showed the writer in an emotionally difficult situation, or ones that illustrated some characteristic of good writing addressed in class. Since I commented on this entry, I drew Roberta's attention to it. To show Roberta that the specificity in this journal was preferable to the abstract philosophizing of the essay about goals, I wrote at the top of the page "These two episodes could make an interesting theme." This showed Roberta a concrete example of the essay topics I expected. My
top-of-the-page comment continued: "You've already got the thesis," and I circled the first two sentences ("It doesn't really matter where I go out for entertainment. I believe that it is who you're with that counts") and drew an arrow to them. I identified Roberta's thesis with the top-of-the-page comment and, later, some of her details with marginal ones: "Nice details" I wrote about Roberta's wanting to hear "how beautifully my hair was styled or how the color of my dress changed the color of my eyes to a deep blue" (10). "Nice comment" I wrote beside Roberta's comparison of her date's conversation to a political science term paper (12). My marginal comments, "nice details" and "nice comment" are not fancy, but they singled out parts from the whole and gave Roberta assistance in perceiving parts of her discourse separately instead of seeing the piece holistically.

The comments on the thesis and the details exemplify Butturff and Sommers's first cycle of commentary: such commentary should identify "possible subsets of ideas and examples" (104) and single them out for later attention. Further, my comments praised Roberta, and the marginal ones indicated my true response as a reader: I had found interesting the parts about Roberta's conversational preference and her date's
political commentary. My final comment emphasized my expectations for the essays and reinforced the class emphasis on specificity: I wrote at the end of the entry "You're starting to give nice details here, Roberta." With this comment, I addressed her weakness (inadequate control of specificity) in a positive way, by praising her success with detail in this writing; and I invited her, indirectly with the praise, to continue her success. It is not particularly surprising that Roberta chose this journal entry for an essay.

The Proposal

Roberta's task for proposal was to propose an essay, its main point and the sub-topics through which it would be developed. Since she had written a journal entry on her topic, the task was different from many of the students'; she did not start from scratch, but instead summarized or "abstracted" the previous document. Although I did not know it at the time, this abstracting was heuristic, as I will discuss in Chapter VI.

Roberta's proposal is dull because she took out most of the details of the stories and, with them, her vitality and the sense a reader gains that she is engaged with the topic. Its repetitious sentences and
1) Through experience I've learned that it doesn't matter where I go out for entertainment, it's who I'm with that counts. 2) Once I dated a very intelligent guy. 3) He took me to a very nice restaurant, where we had a very nice dinner. 4) The topic he chose to talk about all night bored me to tears. 5) I tried to change the subject by starting a new one, but we always ended up on the same boring subject. 6) I even suggested dancing in hopes of a better topic for our conversation. 7) That evening wasn't fun for me because my date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening. 8) On the other hand I had an enjoyable date at Kings Island during an unexpected rain. 9) We both were soaked through to the bone, and my hair was a mess. 10) My date was a casual and talkative person. 11) The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation. 12) I had a very nice time, even though the rain tried to ruin it.

In discussion of the proposal, I will focus on the point of juncture between the two dates because at this point the proposal makes its greatest contributions. At this juncture, Roberta analyzes the failure of the first date and does not just sum it up off-handedly: "That evening wasn't fun for me because my date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening" (7). The sentence is awkward, but its virtue is that it generalizes from the details of the narrative (in the journal). The boring fellow had talked like a political science term paper when Roberta wanted to hear more
romantic words, and so she concludes that her "date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening" (7). Not only does Roberta create an expository generalization at this juncture, she also writes a much less superficial sentence of transition between the two stories: "On the other hand I had an enjoyable date at Kings Island during an unexpected rain" (8). This sentence contributes more to the unfolding essay than the mere transition. Although not analytic, the sentence articulates two very important concepts, enjoyable date and the unexpected. As a concept, enjoyable date controls the most pervasive network of related material in the whole essay. And as a concept, the unexpected later explains one of the main points of the essay; further, as a conceptual principle, it organizes the narration of the second date.

After the juncture between the two dates, the contrast between them continues to be heuristic. Roberta generalizes about why the second date (at King's Island) was successful, and her analysis builds on the failure of the first date: the boring fellow talked only about his favorite topic, not at all about what Roberta wanted to hear, so she concludes that "The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating
the whole conversation" (11). The contrast between the conversations on the two dates prompted Roberta to write this particular analysis of the second date. This sentence analyzes and generalizes, but besides generalizing, it is of further importance because in it Roberta originates another concept, communicative ability, my abbreviated name for the network of details about the conversations on both dates, the generalization that dialogic conversation is preferable to monologic, and one other generalization that Roberta writes later (see the final essay, P 1, 4). The contrast between the two dates is an important prompt for Roberta's revisions; it leads Roberta to her first generalizations about the narratives she had written in the journal and to three articulate concepts. The genre of the proposal also was heuristic: by asking Roberta to abstract an already written document, one that was almost exclusively narrative, it invited her to generalize.

As we look at prompts she used to write the next draft, we will consider both my comments and those of one of Roberta's peers, Sally. Again, I praised Roberta, my end comment being "This will be a good topic, Roberta." I boosted her self-confidence while steering her writing in the direction I thought advisable. Several of my other comments are mingled
with Sally's, so we will look at hers now. She wrote

1. I don't think the real topic is elaborated on. After I read the paper I had to go back to see what the paper was on again. I think she should have explained the topic more before she gave her examples.

2. The subtopic(s) are kind of hidden, but she does give some specific examples in her paper.

3. Yes, the subtopics are well-connected to the main topic by her examples.

Sally was not a very serious student nor a good thinker, but her response in item 1 is probably a true reader's response, and it gave Roberta useful information: Sally felt the essay needed some context; she wanted to perceive some purpose behind the two examples. When Roberta wrote the next draft, she responded directly to this information: she "explained her topic more before she gave her examples" by writing an introductory paragraph for the essay instead of beginning it with the thesis, as she had in the first two drafts.

Now, the web of reader, text, and commentary grows more intricate and difficult to unravel: I commented on Sally's observations and wrote "Good critique" (I wanted to praise Sally's effort). But I thought she was wrong about the relationship of the sub-topics and the main idea because I wanted Roberta to create very tight links between the thesis and the body of her essay, not the loose ones in the proposal. I continued: "Sally's
observations reflect the fact that the sub-topics aren't tied to the thesis the way they should be." The generalizations (7, 11) attempt to explain why Roberta had fun on one date and not on another, but the thesis focuses on a slightly different aspect of the two dates, the contrast between the person and the place. In fact, the generalizations are more closely related to the concept **enjoyable date** than to the contrast in the thesis: sentence 7 ("That evening wasn't fun for me because my date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening") clearly tries to explain why the date was not enjoyable; sentence 11 ("The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation") explains, by inference, why the other date was fun. As we will see, the concept **enjoyable date** later replaces the contrast between the person and the place when Roberta changes the thesis and makes defining an enjoyable date the overarching purpose of the essay. Here in the proposal, she takes several steps toward arriving at that purpose and thesis; the contrast between the two dates, a powerful prompt, ultimately leads Roberta to rewrite her thesis.

In the proposal, the steps toward the new thesis are not smooth ones: Roberta's articulation and use of
the concept *enjoyable date* is not well-synchronized with other developments in the essay because the two related generalizations are not yet linked. For coherence, Roberta needs to position the concept as the superordinate point in a hierarchy to link the two generalizations in the proposal, but she has created those two generalizations before she created the hierarchy. She got the cart before the horse. Composing, as we see, does not always happen in an even sequence; it does not supply the writer with each piece of the textual puzzle at the exact time she needs it: it supplied Roberta with generalizations before she had the hierarchy in which to fit them.

Further, composing does not furnish a writer with the hierarchical arrangement she needs for well-written discourse; she must fashion the hierarchy herself. Roberta was prompted to create the hierarchy by her readers' comments. In my end comment on the proposal, I wrote "You'll want to work now . . . to keep the paper unified, everything in support of your thesis." I also asked Roberta to question the relationship between the thesis and the body of the essay by bracketing the first sentence ("Through experience I've learned that it doesn't matter where I go out for entertainment, it's who I'm with that counts") and writing "Thesis?," a question that asked Roberta to confirm the main idea she
wanted to develop in the essay. Although Sally and I gave Roberta contradictory information about connecting the sub-topics to the main idea, Roberta did not seem baffled or paralyzed by the contradiction. She may simply have given my comments more weight, since I was the teacher. In any case, Roberta worked on the relationship between the sub-topics and the main idea in the next draft and in doing so, fashioned a hierarchy with more tiers.

So far, the discussion of comments Roberta received on the proposal has focused on the generalizations. But other remarks I made drew attention to the details. My end comment included the rather general advice, "You'll want to work now to develop your paragraphs and details." More importantly, I singled out the first example and advised Roberta to "Take care to set this up as a promising evening." Particularly in the proposal, that example is boring: "Once I dated a very intelligent guy. He took me to a very nice restaurant, where we had a very nice dinner," and I wanted to help Roberta make the example more interesting. To do that, she needed to focus it. My comment, then, directed her to "develop [an] example... in a way that... [would] result in a center of gravity emerging" (Butturff and Sommers, 104), a kind of comment appropriate to second drafts.
The center of gravity that I located was the promise of an evening. Roberta's changes in the next draft show that she agreed with me about the promise of an evening; in fact, prompted by my term, she perceived a more elaborate use for it than I had. Not only was the evening promising, but also the promise was unfulfilled: the center of gravity was this contrast and she used the contrast to reorganize the paragraph. My comment on the first example was a prompt she could respond to because it matched Roberta's intentions for the essay.

The Rough Draft

I have already mentioned how Roberta used her readers' comments on the proposal as prompts for revision of the rough draft. As we look more closely at the rough draft, we will see that in it, she worked on the thesis and the arrangement of details in the story of the first date. She also generated a several-sentence introduction for the essay, partly as a response to Sally's comment and partly as a response to the concepts and generalizations she had developed at the point of juncture between the two dates. To see the extent of her changes and her exact responses to the prompts, we will consider the first two paragraphs in the rough draft. The draft follows.
1) It doesn't matter where I go for entertainment; I believe it's who I'm with that determines how good of a time I have when I'm out with a guy, I like to have a fun time.
2) I am not particular about where we go on a date because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date, what I feel is important is my date's personality.
3) If he doesn't have a pleasant and interesting personality with just a dash of adventure, than even he liveliest party wouldn't be much fun while I was with him.
4) On the other hand, if my date has a combination of the three qualities, a boring party would even be fun while I was with him.

5) When I was invited to dinner by guy known to be intelligent, it was a promising Saturday night.
6) All dressed up we headed to one of the most expensive restaurants in town.
7) The atmosphere was elegant with dimmed lights, glowing candles, and soft music, setting a relaxed mood.
8) The fantastic dinner consisted of rice pilaf as an appetizer, shrimp & steak for the main course, and chocolate mousse for dessert.
9) With all those wonderful _________ I was almost bored to tears.
10) His idea of fun was to talk endlessly about politics, specifically why Jimmy Carter's campaign failed.
11) It would have made an interesting term paper for a political science course, however, that subject wasn't where my interests lied.
12) I would have loved to dance, or hear how beautiful my hair looked, but no, I was stuck with Jimmy's campaign manager for the next election year.
13) That promising Saturday wasn't the best because my date failed to relate to my idea of a fun time.
14) My next date started out on a very nice Saturday afternoon at Kings Island amusement park.
15) The ride to Cincinnati was great because the sun was shining and there wasn't a cloud in the sky.
16) It wasn't too long after we walked through the main gate that the rain began to come down in buckets, surprise!
17) Soon half of the rides were closed, and the shelters were packed with people fearing the rain.
18) Seeing that we would be a couple of sardines in a tin can, we decided to walk around the park and observe the deserted sights of Kings Island.
19) We
laughed at the sight of each other's wet stringy hair, dripping clothes and of all the people jammed inside the rain shelters.

By virtue of the five-sentence long introduction, the essay now is no longer predominately narrative. Roberta has created an expository frame around the stories with generalizations in the introduction; further, the frame extends to the end of the first paragraph where a generalization concludes the narrative of the first date ("That promising Saturday wasn't the best because my date failed to relate to my idea of a fun time," 13) and links the introduction and the example with the repeated term "fun time." Roberta has further elaborated the hierarchy and placed the concept enjoyable date in a very high position in it, in sentence 2 ("I am not particular about where we go on a date because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date . . ."). To do this, she took the concept out of the body of the essay and moved it into the introduction. The direction of this movement is an upward one, upward in the expository framework of the essay. Two other changes happen as a result of this movement. One is that the concept leaves the second paragraph entirely, and the other is that Roberta writes a second thesis.

When Roberta moves the concept upward into the introduction, she deletes it from its position in the
body of the essay, at the point of juncture between the two dates, although she need not have. (We find out in the final essay why she did.) At that point in the draft, when she generalizes about the first date, she uses the term "fun time," one that is relatively synonymous with "enjoyable date," but less specific. In addition, when the concept moves upward into the introduction, it leaves the story of the second date with what is still a pretty weak conclusion. ("That promising Saturday wasn't the best because my date failed to relate to my idea of a fun time," 13). As I mentioned above, however, the term "fun time" links the second paragraph and the thesis, so it is useful; but it makes no contribution to the analysis of the first date, even though it originated at the point where Roberta generalizes about that date and seems like an appropriate prompt for a better generalization. As it turns out, however, the concept enjoyable date is not the one Roberta used to draw a better conclusion about the first date's failure; she used a different concept altogether in the final essay. Consequently, her removing enjoyable date from the generalization about the first date suggests that she was guided by the intention to compose a different conclusion for it, even
though she may not have known her intention and
certainly had not yet realized it.

The second result of Roberta's moving the concept
enjoyable date upward is that she writes what will
become the new thesis for her essay. This new thesis,
however, remains in tandem with the old one in this
draft, and the relationship is an interesting one. The
new thesis is, in fact, a restatement of the old at a
more specific level, as we see below:

Old thesis:
"It doesn't matter where I go for
entertainment; I believe it's who I'm with
that determines how good of a time I have when
I'm out with a guy, I like to have a fun
time."

More specific thesis:
"I am not particular about where we go on a
date because that's not the important factor
of an enjoyable date, what I feel is important
is my date's personality."

The gist of the two sentences is similar, but the clause
from the old thesis "where I go for entertainment" is
rewritten as the more specific "where we go on a date,"
a date being only one of many kinds of entertainment.
Further, the old thesis states in general that it is the
whole person ("who I'm with") that accounts for
Roberta's enjoyment, but the new thesis specifies the
one important aspect of the person, his personality.
Insofar as the new thesis is a more specific restatement
of the old, the process by which Roberta formed it is a
top-down one, from the general to the specific, from the whole to the part. This process is the one textbooks typically recommend that students use for restricting a thesis. The top-down process is not, however, the only one Roberta uses to reformulate the thesis. She does so through a series of steps that involves several interactions between body of the text and the introduction and between levels of specificity. It is important to note the process, but it is also important to note that Roberta's revisions now are moving far beyond the instructions contained in her readers' comments. She is detecting the need for revision, diagnosing the problems herself, and creating good solutions.

Roberta's new thesis is additionally important because it articulates another very useful concept, personality. This concept is a cue I used in my comments on the rough draft, and Roberta and I both used the concept as a prompt to guide her revisions of the final essay. I will discuss this prompt when I explain below my comments on the rough draft. First, I will continue to describe changes Roberta made after the proposal.

We have seen that in the rough draft Roberta constructed an expository introduction with two crucial
concepts in it (enjoyable date and personality); in addition, she redesigned the story of the first date, now divided from the second date by paragraph markers. Prompted by my advice to set up the first example as a promising evening, Roberta rearranged the details in this narrative so that only pleasant ones occurred in the first half of the paragraph, "expensive restaurant," dimmed lights, glowing candles," and so on. She created a boundary between the two halves of the paragraph ("With all those wonderful_______ I was almost bored to tears," even though she could not fill in the blank in the sentence). And in the second half of the paragraph, Roberta included only details that illustrated the unpleasantness of the evening, "term paper for a political science paper," "I was stuck..." In addition to rearranging detail, she added and deleted some, so that she restructured the paragraph according to the principle she had constructed from my comment. In the rough draft, Roberta used her readers' comments effectively and revised the first and second paragraphs of the essay.

My comments on the rough draft were given orally, at an in-class conference. Since I marked on the draft as I talked, it bears traces of my advice. A minor remark advised Roberta to create a transition between
the introduction and the body of the essay. More significant comments advised her to be specific and to show the significance of several bits of information in the draft in the following places: I advised her to be specific after sentence 6 ("All dressed up we headed to one of the most expensive restaurants in town") and after sentence 7 ("The atmosphere was elegant with dimmed lights, glowing candles, and soft music, setting a relaxed mood"). Roberta did not know how she could give any more detail than she had, so I made some up for her by creating a picture of the fancy clothes she might have worn on her date. That example was enough for her to recognize possibilities for expansion in what she had already written.

When I asked Roberta to show the significance of what she had written, I meant for her to explain or generalize or to tie the material to some main point, either at the paragraph or theme level. Roberta translated this advice into the word "conclude," which she wrote after sentence 9 ("With all those wonderful ________ . . .") and above sentence 11 ("It would have made an interesting term paper for a political science course . . .") - she wrote a note to herself to conclude these two sentences, a suitable short-hand notation for my remarks.
The most important comment I made concerned the concept **personality**; Roberta's articulation of the concept in this draft prompted me to see the importance of it, and I tried to explain that importance to her. I explained what I saw as her attempt to show the relationship between her companion's personality and the fun she had on a date. It was a cause and effect relationship that I spelled out with a simple diagram: personality/fun, with an arrow reaching over "personality" and pointing to "fun." Although Roberta had made the relationship obvious in the introductory paragraph, she had not realized the implication of this relationship for the remainder of the essay. She had only articulated the concept but had not yet applied it to new particulars. However, she planned to: she made a note to herself about the "date's personality" at sentence 13, the weak generalization about the first date ("That promising Saturday wasn't the best because my date failed to relate to my idea of a fun time"); and she revised in response to that remark in a way that shows how she interwove concepts for the final essay. I will discuss that interweaving below, after I introduce all the necessary parts.

Before we move on to the final essay, I want to summarize the rough draft. As I had for the proposal, I
made comments on the rough draft that isolated segments of the text from the whole and detected problems for Roberta to solve. When she wrote instructions to herself after my oral comments (as she did here), she was imagining her own solutions to problems in the text. She had, in fact, shown this degree of independent problem-solving before. Even when I was very explicit and named a concept for her ("set this up as a promising evening"), she went beyond my instructions in her revisions. Roberta shows even more independence in the final essay.

The Final Essay

The final essay is an expository essay. From the narrative journal with a skimpy expository frame, the essay has become an essay with a new thesis and a several-sentence introduction that includes four important concepts. The concepts unite networks of related material in the body of the essay. In the introduction is a hierarchy of generalizations, and the hierarchy extends through the body of the essay. The two stories have been redesigned from the journal narratives and are more purposively structured. The first story has a new conclusion and uses a different concept to analyze the story, different from any it had
used before. The second story has been expanded, redesigned internally, and linked to the introductory paragraph. Finally, Roberta attends to the end of her essay: she writes, for the first time, a concluding paragraph that attempts to tie everything up.

1) I am not particular about where I go out on a date, because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date. 2) What I feel is important is my date's personality. 3) My date's personality should be daring to coordinate with my love of doing the unexpected. 4) Also he must communicate honestly with me because I enjoy getting to know my date through an open, two way conversation. 5) If my date has an interesting and pleasant personality with a dash of adventure, even a boring party would be fun while I was with him. 6) On the other hand, if his personality is dull and lifeless with a talent for being boring, than even the liveliest party would be a bummer while I was with him. 7) I base my requirements of personality on the experiences I've had while on two specific dates. 8) When I was invited to dinner by a very intellelgent guy, it promised to be a fun Saturday night. 9) All dressed up in my new red dress with the slit up the side, we headed out to the Fisherman's Wharf. 10) The atmosphere of this expensive restaurant was elegant with dimmed lights, glowing candles, and soft music that set a relaxed mood. 11) We were seated at a table for two in a cozy corner, and tried to read the menu by candle light. 12) We ordered a fantastic meal consisting of rice pilaf as an apitizer, shrimp and steak for the main course, and chocolate mousse to top it off right. 13) During desert I got tired of hearing my date talk endlessly about why Jimmy Carter's campaign failed. 14) I would have rather talked about him and his hobbies or what he does for fun on the weekends, but I was stuck listening to a talking term paper for a political science class. 15) My intellelgent date was trying so hard to impress
me with his knowledge, that he forgot to tell me what the real person inside of him is like.

16) My next date started out on a cool, summer morning driving to Kings Island amusement park. 17) As we rode to Cincinnati, the brightly shining sun increased the temperature rapidly into the nineties. 18) This sudden rise of heat wrinkled my freshly ironed cotton blouse, and gave an unwanted oily shine to my face. 19) When we arrived at the crowded park, we had to push our way through the thousands of people, when combined with the heat was most uncomfortable. 20) After a very tiring hour of trying to have fun, rain began to come down in buckets. 21) Our first reaction was to run inside a shelter, but seeing that we'd be processed into sardines by the mob of rain-fearing people, we decided to rough it, and walk barefoot in the rain. 22) A constant downpour saturated our clothing and hair, but the rain was so cooling from the hot summer rays, we didn't care how silly we looked. 23) We splashed through the cool puddles, and totally enjoyed the deserted park. 24) We laughed at the sight of each other's stringy hair, wet clothes, and the sardines jammed inside the shelters. 25) Throughout the whole day, my date was willing to be himself. 26) He didn't run for cover from the rain just because everyone else did, which shows his daring personality. 27) I got to know my date and the real person inside him through his actions and our conversations. 28) We talked, what seemed to be everything about each other, his feelings, what he enjoys and hates and how I feel. 29) So inspite of the rain I had a fantastic day with my date.

30) Through these two specific dates, I have learned that it's not where I go on a date that determines if I have fun; it's who I'm with that really matters. 31) I prefer to be with a guy who has a daring personality about his feelings. 32) If he doesn't have these qualities, then I wouldn't have fun anywhere he took me.

I will begin my discussion of changes in this draft with the thesis. Without any explicit or implicit
instructions to do so, Roberta excised her old thesis (the rough draft version was "It doesn't matter where I go for entertainment; I believe it's who I'm with that determines how good of a time I have when I'm out with a guy, I like to have a fun time"). The rough draft had two theses, this one and another, more specific one that included the concept enjoyable date. As she created the final essay, she decided that the new thesis was better, and it seems possible that the concept enjoyable date and the increased specificity in the new thesis prompted her deletion of the old thesis. Once she placed the concept high in the hierarchy of generalizations, she seemed to realize that her intentions were to define "the important factor of an enjoyable date." The old, more general, less-focused thesis was no longer necessary. Making a new thesis, she changed the dominant mode of the essay from comparison and contrast to definition.

The introduction proceeds, a newly arranged hierarchy of generalizations that moves from the most general, sentence 1, down through sentence 4: from "the important factor of an enjoyable date," through the date's "personality" to particular aspects of personality--love of the unexpected and honest, two-way communication. Roberta's continued work on the
introduction after the rough draft and her design of it proceeded without external prompts. She was guided at this point by her intentions, signals in the text, and whatever motivation she had to make the essay better—to succeed.

Roberta's revisions of paragraph three, the story of the second date, also show her independent problem-recognition and problem-solving. In the previous drafts, she had done almost nothing to the second narrative. In the final essay, however, she reorganizes the details of the story and sums up the success of the date. The order of the details is guided by the following conceptual principles: appearance versus reality, the individual versus the crowd, and several subordinate contrasts. These minor contrasts occur throughout the paragraph and in its early part increase the tension between appearances and reality, for example a cool morning grew quickly hot; a freshly-ironed blouse was soon wrinkled. In this part of the paragraph, what appears to be pleasant turns unpleasant; what appears to be one kind of afternoon—a routine kind of fun at an amusement park—becomes another when nature intrudes with a rainstorm. The conceptual principle switches when Roberta and her companion take advantage of the apparently undesirable rainstorm to cool themselves and
"enjoy . . . the deserted park" (23). Then, the paragraph contrasts the individual and the crowd. The two people stand out as individuals from the crowd, as Roberta shows us: "... my date was willing to be himself. He didn't run for cover . . . just because everyone else did" (25-26). These two contrasts, appearance versus reality and the individual versus the crowd, organize the second example with a much more intricate structure than it has in the journal or the rough draft. Additionally, this example ultimately carries out the main idea of the essay because Roberta's summations of it are tied very closely to those in the introductory paragraph: the spontaneity and individuality of Roberta's companion in the second story show his daring personality, a necessity of the ideal date, as Roberta asserts in the introduction. Roberta further links the second date and the introduction when she explains the success of the second date: "I got to know my date and the real person inside him through his actions and our conversations" (27). This explanation is linked to the concept of communicative ability in the introduction ("... he must communicate honestly with me because I enjoy getting to know my date through an open, two way conversation," 4). All of these changes are unprompted by my comments on the text and show
Roberta's ability to detect the opportunities for revision and invent thoughtful changes.

Roberta makes some smaller changes that were prompted by my comments. She wrote a sentence of transition between the first and second paragraphs ("I base my requirements of personality on the experiences I've had while on two specific dates," 7), but this sentence is a mechanical response to the prompt. In the second paragraph, however, she was more inventive. She added detail in the two spots we had discussed. In sentence 9 ("All dressed up in my new red dress with the slit up the side, we headed for Fisherman's Wharf"), she used my examples about her apparel and included one detail of her own, the name of the restaurant. She also made up all of the detail in sentence 11 ("We were seated at a table for two in a cozy corner, and tried to read the menu by candle light"). Her ability to invent appropriate detail beyond the examples I gave her shows that Roberta was quite capable of responding to the abstract advice to "be specific," once she understood it.

One of Roberta's most significant changes in the final essay is the new conclusion she wrote for the first example: "My intelligent date was trying so hard to impress me with his knowledge, that he forgot to tell
me what the real person inside of him is like" (15). Although her note jotted on the rough draft instructed her to conclude that the first date failed because of her companion's personality, she did not follow her instructions, at least not exactly. And the reason she did not, it seems, is because a change in the introductory paragraph prompted a different conclusion about the first date than the one she had planned. In the introduction, she had placed communicative ability, a concept that is a specific aspect of personality. Consequently, when Roberta used communicative ability to explain the failure of the first date, she responded inventively to her instructions and to the revised introduction. She let the text guide her and made several independent decisions in response to her jotted down note.

The cumulative effect of all Roberta's revisions has been to turn the journal, a predominately narrative piece, into an expository essay with supporting detail. The revisions have created sentences of analysis at several levels of generality in an expository framework that begins in the introductory paragraph and surrounds the whole essay. The revisions also have created purposively ordered, composed narratives. Roberta has used her readers' comments well and has responded to
prompts in the text. She has written an essay that uses specific detail from her own life, detail that she manipulates with some skill; and she has invented generalizations that grow directly out of that detail. Although she has not created a perfectly written essay, she has revised well.

In the discussions that follow, we will single out four of the concepts important in Roberta's essay in order to look more closely at the processes through which Roberta formulates and applies concepts. We will consider, especially, the textual prompts she responded to. The four concepts are enjoyable date, communicative ability, the unexpected, and the promise of an evening.

Enjoyable Date

Much of the previous, draft-by-draft discussion included the evolution of the concept enjoyable date. I include it here, however, because its history is that of how a thesis is revised. Since much composition instruction is devoted to the production of a good, restricted thesis, the process of how Roberta wrote hers is important to look at. It is not a process usually included in textbook advice about thesis-writing. Consequently, this section will summarize the previous discussions--where the concept was formulated, where it
moved afterward, and what parts of the text it influenced after it was articulated.

We have already seen that in the final essay, Roberta explains the crucial determinant of an enjoyable date: "I am not particular about where I go out on a date, because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date. ... [It is] my date's personality" (1-2). She furthers the definition with the discussion of her companion's personality, his love of the unexpected, and his communicative ability (3-4). Defined in general terms in the introductory paragraph, the "important factor of an enjoyable date" is illustrated through contrasting examples in the body of the essay. In this respect, the concept enjoyable date is the most pervasive of the whole essay. But how did it come to be so, and how was it developed?

We know that the concept was not articulated until the second draft of the essay, but does that mean that it was not present until then? No, not exactly. Although the concept is not named until the proposal, it is inherent in the journal. The whole second story exemplifies an enjoyable date, and the first story (of the unsuccessful date) exemplifies the opposite. The concept is there, in the details of those two stories, even though it is not given a name. We might say that
the journal, with all that material about fun on dates, includes "pre-conceptual" material, the concrete material that Roberta unites when she creates the abstraction to hold the concrete particulars together. According to Vygotsky, however, naming a concept is necessary for the concept to have been truly formulated: Roberta formulated the concept in the proposal.

Another test of the level of cognitive development is whether the concept can be applied to new situations and used as an abstraction. In the proposal, the concept is merely named ("On the other hand I had an enjoyable date at Kings Island . . ."). Because the concept is in a sentence that does not analyze anything but merely asserts, we cannot claim that Roberta uses the concept as an abstraction. Her doing so occurs in a separate step, when she moves the concept upward into the introductory paragraph of the rough draft and embeds it in a sentence of generalization ("I am not particular about where we go on a date because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date, what I feel is important is my date's personality"). The concept enjoyable date then becomes part of the generalization Roberta will define in her essay. She uses the concept abstractly, and, additionally, it unifies the whole essay.
We see, then, that Roberta's formulation of the new thesis involved several steps, none of which was rewriting the thesis sentence in isolation. First, she articulated a necessary concept in the body of the essay. Then she placed the concept in a sentence of generalization and moved it upward into the main expository framework. Only then, did she discard the old thesis for the new, a more specific restatement of the old.

Once articulated, the main result of this concept was to help Roberta reformulate the thesis and to alter the purpose of the essay. Because Roberta made relatively few additions based upon this concept, we do not see how she used a concept to generate elaborate networks out of new material, a process we will see, however, when I discuss communicative ability—where Roberta's application of it to new situations is particularly visible. Unlike the gradual evolution of the concept enjoyable date, communicative ability proceeds in starts and stops and is accompanied by the sudden appearance of an insightful generalization.

Communicative Ability

Roberta's essay is unified, in part, by the concept of communicative ability; it is one of the key notions
that links exposition and narration, that links paragraphs, that links main ideas and supporting detail. In its more abstract versions, the concept is realized through generalizations about communication; in its more concrete and pre-conceptual ones, it is through facts about real conversations. In the completed essay, the network of material the concept joins occurs in several places: in a fairly broad generalization in the introductory paragraph, in lower level generalizations that analyze the stories, and in the narrative details. Each of the following sentences from the final version contains information about communication or conversations and is related to the concept:

P. 1: [H]e must communicate honestly with me because I enjoy getting to know my date through an open, two way conversation (4) [high-level generalization].

P. 2: I got tired of hearing my date talk endlessly (13) [detail]. My intelligent date was trying so hard to impress me with his knowledge, that he forgot to tell me what the real person inside of him is like (15) [low-level generalization].

P. 3: I got to know my date and the real person inside him through . . . our conversations (27) [low-level generalization]. We talked, what seemed to be everything about each other, his feelings, what he enjoys and hates and how I feel (28) [detail].

The realization of this concept in the final essay is fairly elaborate (though not as pervasive as enjoyable
the concept occurs at several levels of specificity, threads through the whole, from beginning to end, and unifies the essay.

Before the concept is articulated in the journal, pre-conceptual material is included in the journal. There, it is concentrated exclusively in the first example and does not occur in either the introductory paragraph or the second example, as it later will be. In the journal, material related to the concept occurs in the details of several sentences (from 10-14):

What I wanted to hear was how beautifully my hair was styled, or how the color of my dress changed the color of my eyes to a deep blue. It would have been an interesting term paper for my Political Science class, however, what I wanted to hear was far from that. All he wanted to talk about was how Carter's campaign failed, and what he should have done. Any attempt to change the subject failed since he had a one track mind. Dancing wasn't the best solution to end the political discussion, because he could talk and dance, both at the same time.

In the journal, the material related to this concept occurs almost exclusively in details about one conversation. (In the story of the second date, Roberta remarks merely that she and her companion "talked.") Five of the thirteen sentences that tell the first story are focused on the conversation; however, none of the other details in that story focuses so extensively on any one topic. This amount of material is effective
heuristically because it provides something for Roberta to work with later. Further, we can see simply by the quantity of material that the concept of *communicative ability* is significant in Roberta's conception of the topic and was so even before she could name the concept and use it abstractly. However vague her intentions for this essay at the outset, they included the use of this concept.

Although Roberta did not use the concept anywhere in the journal except in the first example, she broadens its use in the proposal (II). She includes it in the second example, and she also uses it in an expository way—to analyze the results of her two dates. In the proposal, she reaches a very insightful conclusion about communication; in fact, she makes her first real analysis of conversations. Here she writes that "the difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation" (11). The text begins at his point to work toward a position to be more fully expressed later—that, for Roberta, good conversation is a dialogue in which she can speak, not a monologue in which she can play only the role of auditor. In isolation, Roberta's observation may seem ordinary—that a true dialogue is preferable to a monologue. But in
Roberta's writing, the insight represents a considerable achievement because the observation is firmly grounded in the material Roberta has already presented; that is, the generalization is so closely tied to the details in her composition that the insight is really her own, not a commonplace platitude that could fit any number and kind of particulars. If we look in the proposal (II) at further realizations of the concept of communicative ability, we will see the textual prompts for this insight. When we look ahead at the concept in the rough draft, we will see how easy it is for such student achievement to go unnoticed.

The amount of text in the proposal is so small that it might seem to contribute little to Roberta's revision efforts, but we have already seen that it does. Nonetheless, the proposal is so short and, according to the strictures of the assignment, contained so few details that it would seem unlikely that the details in the proposal constituted much of a prompt. With that in mind, consider the details about conversation, a surprising number for so short and skeletal a piece.

Story 1: "The topic he chose to talk about all night bored me to tears. I tried to change the subject by starting a new one, but we always ended up on the same boring subject. I even suggested dancing in hopes of a better topic for our conversation" (4-6).

Story 2: "My date was a casual and talkative person" (10).
Three of the six sentences that comprise the first story are devoted to the topic of conversation; then, in the second story, Roberta introduces new information about her second companion. She describes his conversational ability in what we might call "summary detail": detail that is not as specific as that about conversation in the first example, but detail nonetheless, not analytical generalization.

This amount of detail about conversation has an importance beyond adding some particulars to the text. It creates prompts that seem to have helped Roberta formulate the generalization about the second date. In both the journal and the proposal, a disproportionate number of details in the first example are about conversation, so we see that the boring conversation on this date exemplifies its failure. The dominance of conversation in the first example seems to have invited Roberta to look at conversation in the second date, and so she describes her second companion as "talkitive." But the difference between the two dates is so radical that Roberta was compelled to contrast them on this characteristic of their conversations, thus her insight "The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the conversation." A significant amount of
specificity and the principles of comparison and contrast prompted this insight.

The symmetry between the two dates and levels of specificity also seem to have prompted the insight. As Roberta had when she wrote two theses for the rough draft, she here writes two generalizations, one more specific than the other. In this instance, she writes a concluding sentence about each of her dates, the first conclusion more general than the second. About the first example, she says that "That evening wasn't fun for me because my date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening" (7). Roberta seems driven by the symmetry of her two examples to treat them similarly: when she concludes one, she concludes the other. The second conclusion, however, functions to some extent as a conclusion of the first example and because it does, we can easily see that it is to some extent a more specific restatement of the first conclusion. The second conclusion refers to both dates by giving explicit and implicit information about each one: it contrasts the two dates and explains why one was successful and, by inference, the other failed. To the extent that this sentence ("The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole
conversation") concludes the first example, it is a more specific restatement of the first conclusion ("That evening wasn't fun for me because my date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening"). This interrelatedness suggests that sentence 7 contributes heuristically to the development of sentence 11, a sentence of notable insight.

We see that the brief, apparently unremarkable proposal is very important in formulating the concept of communicative ability. Its importance would go undetected if one looked only at what we might call the quality of its writing: it is not a very exciting piece, and its blandness disguises its heuristic functions.

In the proposal, the concept of communicative ability develops considerably. If, however, the rough draft (III) were the final version of the essay, the concept of communicative ability would seem less important in the essay than it ultimately is because in this draft the amount of material related to it is small and is not used in a generalization. If Roberta had not worked through as many drafts as she did, and particularly if she had not revised a full rough draft of the essay (from III to IV), the achievement of insight in the proposal would not have been fully developed.
The rough draft obscures the importance of communicative ability in Roberta's conception of her topic. In that draft, we see only a few details about conversation on the first date, fewer than in the short journal.

His idea of fun was to talk endlessly about politics, specifically why Jimmy Carter's campaign failed. It would have made an interesting term paper for a political science course, however, that subject wasn't where my interest layed. I would have loved to dance, or hear how beautiful my hair looked...

These details are the only material related to the concept in the rough draft: we see no details about conversation in the second example nor do we see any general comments about communication. This situation might seem puzzling—why did the concept of communicative ability nearly disappear from a draft of the essay immediately after Roberta had written an insightful analysis of conversation; and then why did it reappear in the final essay, which it does? Two phenomena account for this situation—a shift in Roberta's focus as she wrote the rough draft and the recursiveness of composing.

In this draft (III), she concentrates on creating a real introductory paragraph and on restructuring the second example; she concentrates on these to the extent that she ignores, temporarily, the concept of
communicative ability. In this draft, she begins to define the "important factor of an enjoyable date" and introduces the concept of personality; in doing so, she develops in the introductory paragraph a greater expository framework for the essay and creates a hook upon which to hang communicative ability—the concept of personality. After this concept is articulated, communicative ability has a place to fit: it hangs from personality in the final essay: "My date's personality should be daring to coordinate with my love of doing the unexpected. Also he must communicate honestly with me because I enjoy getting to know my date through an open, two way conversation" (III, 3-4). One's communicative ability is an aspect of his personality, as Roberta can now explain. In other words, once Roberta articulated the concept personality, it functioned as a generalization to which the concept of communicative ability was subordinate, a relationship Roberta could use. When she returned again to the introductory paragraph as she wrote the final draft, some recursive processes were in evidence (emanating from the proposal, perhaps) that joined the concepts from the two previous drafts. The concept personality seems to have prompted Roberta to use the concept of communicative ability in the final essay.
In the rough draft, however, Roberta focused on revisions that did not deal directly with communicative ability. She expanded the introductory paragraph where the conceptual work involved personality, and she concentrated on reshaping the second paragraph. Thus we see that the rough draft does not continue the direct development of communicative ability, but it does make indirect contributions by creating a place for this concept to fit. When Roberta revised again, her writing process was recursive: she returned to her earlier insight and reintroduced it into the text (in a slightly modified form) in the place that had been made for it.

In our last discussions of communicative ability, we will look at how the concept moved to a position fairly high up in the hierarchy of generalizations, into one of the sentences of the introductory paragraph. When Roberta names the concept in the proposal, it is embedded in this sentence of generalization that is closely tied to the concrete material of the two stories: "The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation" (11). When Roberta moves the concept upward into the introduction, she embeds it in the following sentence: "Also he must communicate honestly with me because I enjoy getting to
know my date through an open, two way conversation" (IV, 4), a sentence that is more general than the first because it describes an ideal companion, not the conversation on a specific date.

The difference between these two sentences exhibits one means of forming generalizations, a "bottom-up" process that we have seen before, one which moves from concrete details through low-level generalizations to broader ones. Here, the low-level generalization in the proposal grows out of the details in the examples; it analyzes the examples. In the final essay, the analysis refers to an ideal date. Roberta extends the analysis beyond the two examples. This bottom-up process is one through which Roberta develops her thoughts by interpreting the significance of (relatively) concrete material she has already written about. (In this case, the development is a several stage process.) When a writer develops her thoughts in this "bottom-up" direction, she is unable to benefit from instruction that advises her at an early stage of composing to make her main point clear and specific; when such a process operates, the main point (topic sentence, thesis, whatever) is developed out of more specific material that occurs prior to the generalization; and a generalization broad enough to be
one of the primary ones in an essay may require several steps in its formation, each step creating a more encompassing generalization out of more specific material.

Now we must consider together the final conclusions of both examples. The following sentences conclude the stories and connect them to that part of the expository framework established by the concept of communicative ability.

P. 2: My intelligent date was trying so hard to impress me with his knowledge, that he forgot to tell me what the real person inside of him is like (15).

P. 3: I got to know my date and the real person inside him through his actions and our conversations. We talked, what seemed to be everything about each other, his feelings, what he enjoys and hates and how I feel (27-28).

Both of these conclusions emphasize the "real person," an offshoot of the ideal companion who "communicates honestly." The conclusion of the second example is noteworthy simply because the paragraph lacked a conclusion in the previous draft; here we see Roberta's effort to make in her final essay even more expository. The more notable conclusion, however, is the first one because it departs significantly from any of the prior conclusions of the first example and because it is the most insightful explanation of why Roberta's first date
failed. With it, she makes a brand new point—that her
date tried to "impress" her with his "knowledge."

Previous conclusions of the first example stressed
the lack of Roberta and her date's agreement about a
"fun time"; the conclusions did not include the concept
of conversation. By the final essay, however, the
concepts and their relationships to one another have
been sufficiently defined to reveal the relationship
between a good conversation and an enjoyable date, one
we can see in the introductory paragraph. After the two
concepts were related, Roberta wrote an entirely new
conclusion for the first example, one that is tied more
closely to the details of the example than the earlier
conclusions. The new conclusion fits the story
perfectly, and, it seems, could have been written only
after the other changes were in place. With this new
conclusion, we see several aspects of the text coalesce
as they create the conditions in which this new
generalization arose.

The concept of communicative ability, like that of
enjoyable date, eventually became part of the
overarching hierarchy of generalizations in the
introductory paragraph of Roberta's essay. But the
movement of each concept into that hierarchy proceeded
differently. Although the direction of movement was the
same, bottom-up from concrete material to a high-level generalization, the concept of communicative ability moved by fits and starts, not gradually like enjoyable date. The movement of communicative ability, first in, then out, and then back in the essay, shows that concepts follow their own logic, in a sense, as they develop. If writers are to use revision heuristically, they must be able to let concepts follow their own logic, a point that has implications for teachers.

Unexpected

Instead of tracing the step-by-step development of the concept of the unexpected, as I have with the two previous concepts, I want to consider it differently. Through this concept, I want to bring into focus the relationship of the surface and conceptual levels of text, a relationship we must be concerned about if we evaluate draft writing. The far-reaching influence of apparently small, surface-level changes is a theme that has run through the discussions of other concepts, but I want to concentrate on it here.

Like communicative ability and enjoyable date, the concept of the unexpected had its origin in the proposal ("On the other hand I had an enjoyable date at Kings
Island during an unexpected rain," II, 8). Like them, too, it moved up the hierarchy into the superordinate framework of the essay ("My date's personality should be daring to coordinate with my love of doing the unexpected," IV, 3). Like them, it united a wide network of material: many of the contrasts in the stories of both dates are based upon the contrast between the expected and the unexpected. After all, an evening that promises to be wonderfully romantic and is not exemplifies something that turns out contrary to expectations. An outdoor afternoon that turns out to be fun, even in a rainstorm, is also unexpected. In other words, many of the conceptual relationships in both stories are variations on the contrast between the expected and the unexpected: the promise of an evening—unfulfilled; an intelligent fellow who is boring instead of stimulating; a hot, August day amid crowds of people that turned out to be enjoyable after all.

Much of this network of material is controlled (and in fact shaped during revision) by the concept of the unexpected. But the concept itself was first named in such an inconspicuous way that it draws no attention to its global importance: it was first articulated as a word describing the rain, a term of importance only as a
scene-setting detail, a term that described one event of Roberta's afternoon at an amusement part. In other words, the surface of the text in which this term "unexpected" first occurred reveals very little, if anything, of the role this concept plays.

Let me make the argument from a slightly different angle. The amount and range of material related to the unexpected indicates how important this concept is to the essay. Much of this material exists even before the concept is articulated and exerts its shaping influence on the details of the two stories. Consider, for example, the details in the story of the unsuccessful date. We know in the journal that Roberta went to a "very nice restaurant"; that she ate "rice pilaf," "shrimp," and "chocolate mousse"; that she had a candelight dinner—and that her companion was a talking term paper. The elements of the contrast are there, even though the contrast is not made overtly (i.e. the details are not arranged to highlight this contrast).

As we can see by these details of the unsuccessful date, much of the concrete material that formed the network of the unexpected was present at the outset of Roberta's efforts to compose this essay. The concept, we might say, existed embryonically. Alternately, we might say that Roberta's intended meaning included some
relationship between the expected and the unexpected.

However we describe this phenomenon, the fact remains that the surface text in the proposal does not illustrate the great conceptual importance that the word "unexpected" holds in the final essay. The surface level of a text may not always reveal the conceptual activity of a writer. Because a single word (such as "unexpected") can hold so much importance conceptually, we must realize that editorial comments we make on the surface of the text (e.g. "find a livelier adjective") may have a significant effect on the conceptual level of a writer's activity. This is a point I will return to in the final chapter when I discuss the pedagogical implications of this study.

The Promise of an Evening

The last concept I will discuss is the promise of an evening. I have already devoted some attention to Roberta's use of this concept when she wrote the rough draft: the promise of an evening guided her reorganization of the story of the first date so that all the pleasant details occurred in the first part of the paragraph; all the unpleasant ones, in the second half. In the discussion of my comments that prompted the reorganization, I noted my advice to "set this up as
a promising evening." In other words, I named the concept for Roberta. I want here to discuss my role in the formation of this concept and to question whether the concept was mine or Roberta's because the question has pedagogical implications. I would like to consider again how Roberta reorganized that paragraph as a way of answering the question of who "owned" the concept, Roberta or me.

When Roberta revised the story of the first date for the rough draft (III), she followed my instructions as we can see in sentence 1: "When I was invited to dinner by a guy known to be intelligent, it was a promising Saturday night" (III, 5). So far, she has only appropriated my term, "promising", a tactic we often see students employ: they adopt someone else's term without being able to use it accurately or to manipulate it or the text related to it. The paragraph continues, however, with notable differences from its previous versions. Roberta writes that she was "All dressed up" and "headed to one of the most expensive restaurants in town" (III, 6); that "The atmosphere was elegant, with dimmed lights, glowing candles, and soft music" (III, 7); and that the "fantastic dinner consisted of rice pilaf . . . , shrimp & steak. . . , and chocolate mousse" (III, 8). She omits from the
first half of the paragraph these sentences that tell of the evening's failure: "I once dated a very boring guy. His idea of fun was to talk endlessly about politics" (1, 1-2). But she returns some of this omitted material to the paragraph—in the second half. (In shifting around all this detail, she changes the description of her companion radically: he had been "boring," but now that she introduces him in the first half of the paragraph, he is "intellegent."

Roberta's reorganization of this paragraph is substantial. As she set the scene of a promising Saturday evening (as she had been instructed to do), she moved information not pertinent to that description downward into the second half of the paragraph. She added a sentence of demarcation and highlighted the division between the two sections, the first of which sets a scene, the second of which undercuts it. She has differentiated the two halves and joined them by the contrast they make, each providing a context by which to interpret the other. This reorganization clarifies the purpose of the paragraph and makes its organization more functional, given the overall purpose of the essay. Roberta has further adjusted the structure of the paragraph so that it has become not only more clear in its purpose but also more elaborate in its contrasts.
Each of the sentences in the second half of the paragraph contains internal contrasts or is in contrast with another sentence. (It is possible that clarifying the main contrast in the paragraph prompted Roberta to clarify the other contrasts.)

Roberta may have borrowed the word promising from me, but she followed my instructions with creative changes of her own, ones I had not instructed her to make, at least not directly. Roberta's revisions that reorganize and refocus the paragraph show that she understood how to use the concept and knew why it was valuable. Hers were far more than token revisions performed at a teacher's insistence; she "owned" the concept.

Roberta clearly owned the concept; and my role was, it seems clear, to articulate for her a concept that was part of her intended meaning. I did not provide her with a term that held my conception of the topic rather than her own. She may not have known (in any way she could articulate) that she wanted to use the concept, but I conclude that it was part of her intended meaning because of how she used it to revise—indeed, independently, effectively, and extensively. A crucial pedagogical issue here is how teachers can identify concepts that belong to the writer and differentiate them from
concepts that they superimpose on the text. We must, of course, identify students' concepts and not superimpose our own if we wish our students to develop as independent writers and thinkers. How we do so is an issue I will address in Chapter VI.

In this profile of Roberta, we have seen that she worked with a narrative piece of discourse and made it expository and that she invented and applied concepts to new situations. We have seen that she responded to prompts from her readers, the text, and her intended meaning. We have seen her grow more and more independent of external prompts (i.e. readers' comments) and more reliant upon her own diagnosis and solution of problems. And we have seen that she developed concepts in different sequences. In the next chapter, we will meet three more writers and continue the examination of revision and concept formation in basic writers with students who are different from Roberta.
Chapter IV is an in-depth study of Roberta's revision, certain characteristics of which are pertinent to the discussion three other writers in this chapter because they establish the grounds of comparison. Let me review Chapter IV briefly. Roberta is a writer whose tendency during the early part of the quarter was to write unfocused abstractions. The essay studied in Chapter IV was a departure because she used much concrete detail in it and, for the most part, derived her good generalizations by working upward from detail. She began this essay with a piece that was almost purely narrative; she then constructed a hierarchy of generalizations that formed an expository framework, a skeleton to which the narrative flesh of the essay was attached. During revision, she responded to her teacher's comments, sometimes implementing exactly the solution she had been given. As often, she invented her own solutions to problems and, finally, detected textual problems herself and solved them. She responded to textual cues as well as the comments of her readers. This relative independence indicates that her revision...
was motivated by cues internal to the process of composing, not external ones like grades or a desire simply to please the teacher.

Sally, Tammy, and Chuck are three writers who differ from Roberta; each differs from her either in writing ability, maturity, knowledge of conventions about essay form, or in the sequence of their drafts. Sally is a writer at a far more elemental stage in her ability to use specific detail and to interweave several levels of specificity in a well-focused essay. She is far more dependent than Roberta on the teacher's comments to prompt revision. Tammy is a writer whose process of revising is, in its overall pattern, much different from Roberta's: Tammy writes drafts that look radically different from one another rather than organically related. And Chuck is simply more mature than any of the other three, a writer who shows us the process of focusing an essay in direct response to the teacher's comments. Nonetheless, all three of them exemplify one or more of the characteristics of revision that we saw in Chapter IV. Seen in different writers, these characteristics take on a greater importance than they would if they were idiosyncratic of Roberta alone.

In this chapter, we will meet each of these writers, one by one. As in Chapter IV, I will first
introduce the writer, characterize his or her writing, then introduce the essay. I will not trace the development of each essay in as much detail as I did Roberta's. Rather, I will isolate in each of these three case studies one or two notable characteristics and trace them through as many drafts as necessary to illustrate a point about revision.

Sally: Learning to Use Detail

In our classroom, Sally sat at the desk in front of Roberta, and the two of them often worked together when I asked students to edit one another's writing. (As I mentioned in Chapter IV, the student comments on Roberta's proposal are Sally's.) In writing problems, the two were similar, both writing in generalities. Like Roberta, Sally needed to learn to make her writing more specific; but her resistance to doing so was different from Roberta's. Sally was obstinate when given suggestions for improvement. She usually refused to believe that her ideas were undeveloped or that she could be more specific than she had. Her attitude indicated that rather than implement the advice she was given, she would prefer to demonstrate the impossibility of doing so. Roberta, not surprisingly, was the more serious student. Sally was less interested in school
and more interested in her boyfriend and her impending marriage. Soon after she finished my class, I saw her in a Woolworth's store where she worked full-time. She had quit school and was, no doubt, earning money for the wedding she hoped for.

From Sally's essay, we see a writer just beginning to learn how to use specific detail. Since her essay starts out as a group of generalizations, some of them very broad and platitudinous, she must add detail. Consequently, we see her work in a top-down direction to add levels of specificity to the hierarchy, such as it is. When Sally adds detail to her essay, one about teaching piano to children, she does not do so very effectively nor independently. She added detail for the most part in response to my advice, and when she did, the detail often did not exemplify exactly the generalization she makes about it, as we will see. She is a writer who does not yet read and understand the implications of what she has written. She is also unable to distinguish generalizations from detail. When instructed to add detail, she sometimes added more generalizations. However, in a course evaluation written at the end of the term, Sally used detail more effectively than she had at any other time and shows that she had learned how to move down through several
levels of specificity. (I will include an excerpt from the evaluation below.)

Sally was as casual as the stereotypical teenager in the generalizations she made. In the first draft of her essay on teaching piano to children, she begins writing in platitudes and does not rescue the majority of her generalizations from that category. For the most part, she does not create more insightful generalizations; the changes she makes in them tend to be rewordings rather than reconceptualizations (in this regard, she is like the "thesaurus" revisers that Nancy Sommers describes, [1980]). Nor does she manipulate detail with the same degree of purpose, control, and complexity of results that Roberta does. Even so, her essay demonstrates that a student who is apparently a superficial thinker can revise and, with the use of specific detail, reduce the superficiality of her prose. She used specific detail in a way that imbued platitudes with significance and gave more depth to her writing.

When forced to give examples of her assertions, Sally would finally try, but superficial assertions dominated her writing. In her essay proposal, we see the typical easy generalizations of Sally's writing. (The proposal by nature of the assignment was, of course, general; but Sally's was more so than necessary
and was also unfocused.) The proposal follows:

The topic I want to write on is teaching music to young children. I feel I want to teach music because I've grown extremely fond of the many aspects of music & I feel inside that that's what I want to do as a career. I feel that music is a very important part of everyone's lives & I want to teach children because that's when they are first exposed to many things, especially music & I want to bring music into many children's lives. I also believe instrumental music is an important part of society today with our orchestras, concert bands, singing groups & their bands, & the many other instrumental groups that there are. Children are exposed to music this way, but I want to teach them so that maybe one day that [they?] can be that part of society too.

(Three versions of Sally's essay are in Appendix H.)

With the skill of an expert writer, perhaps an essay based on this proposal could be well-developed, but not with the abilities of a basic writer. The proposal contains the potential for at least several short essays, one on the many aspects of music and why the writer likes them, one on why the writer wants a career teaching music, one on how music is an important part of everyone's lives, another on the special place of music in children's lives, and yet another on the role of instrumental music in our society. Sally's proposal contains generalizations about each of the topics. Our experience with basic writers tells us that without guidance, Sally would have included all of these generalizations in her essay, that she would not have been able to develop each one with clarity, that she
would not have connected them to one another, and that she would not have balanced them in the essay so that one would dominate and give the essay purpose and focus. The essay based on this proposal would merely say everything that Sally thought about teaching music.

Sally's thesis, which she noted at the bottom of her proposal, illustrates further the generality of her thoughts and the problems in her writing. She wrote "Thesis idea--I want to teach music to young children because music is an important part of life & its important that children are exposed to it well & in many areas." Several parts of this sentence are problematic. "An important part of life" is quite general--music important to everyone's life, not just children's; this phrase would require Sally to write about children and adults, a more inclusive group than she seems to want. And what kind of importance does music hold? Sally would have to define this importance, a difficult task for most freshmen, one requiring a depth of analysis. "Exposed to . . . [music] well and in many areas," is not a very clear phrase and would take the writer off the track of what she really wants to write about--why she wants to teach music--and onto one about enriching children's lives. This thesis, as we see, is full of phrases that are pitfalls for the basic writer, and so
is the proposal. Fortunately, Sally narrowed the focus of her essay from everything she thought about teaching music to the sense of accomplishment it gives. She did so with the help of her classmates.

After the proposal, I gave Sally a chance to hear her classmates' suggestions of ways she could focus her essay and be specific in it; I duplicated the proposal for the whole class to read and comment upon. During the discussion, Sally jotted down notes about her classmates' comments; the ideas she noted were these (mistakes uncorrected):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>important in child's life—why?</th>
<th>what do I see them accomplish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultures?</td>
<td>skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps imagination—picture things expressions exposure</td>
<td>power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how does it benefit children?</td>
<td>rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exposure in front of people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation</td>
<td>peticular examples of when I [was] teaching that were meaningful &amp; why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enriching in [thought incomplete]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

my feeling from teaching
I feel I gave them something.
Sally's list may represent everything the students told her or merely those things she had time to write down during a brainstorming session. Regardless of what process of selection produced the list, Sally's choice is clear, as the spacing and a further note indicate. She circled the phrase at the center of the page, "my feeling from teaching," and clustered the related phrases near it ("examples of when I [was] teaching that were meaningful to me & why").

When Sally wrote the rough draft of her essay (II), she began it with the question "Why do I want to teach instrumental music to children?" and then attempted to answer it with examples from her experience. With the help of her classmates, she had narrowed the focus of her essay. The essay was still too general, but Sally had made some progress. We will look at how she introduced and revised one example to see how she used specific detail.

In the rough draft (II), Sally included some supporting material, but her best example of the rewards she received from teaching music was not very detailed. She writes that one of her students told her "Someday, I want to teach piano, too," (II, 20), and she reports that the boy's remark "almost brought tears to my eyes" (II, 21). Presented as it is, with little detail
setting the scene and with Sally's trite comment, the remark may sound as much like that of a fawning student as it does testimony about the teacher's accomplishment. In this draft, Sally appears too much the young teacher, flattered by her student, about whom we know very little except that he wants to follow in her footsteps. In the next version of the essay, however, Sally greatly increases the amount of information she gives about her student, Kent, as we come to know him. My comments prompted her add this detail. In a marginal note, I wrote "[give] examples: playing notes in the right order? memorizing scales--what?," a query that asked her to explain the sentence "When results are bad at times & then soon look much, much better from more specific instruction, it gives me pleasure in knowing that I have the ability to teach someone from my own knowledge" (II, 10). My comment also provided Sally with a very concrete strategy for revision; it pointed out some of the kinds of examples she might use.

Sally responded directly to my comments in the next version of the essay (III). She wrote an extended example of one day's practice with Kent when he had a problem playing a certain scale; the concreteness of my comment was a useful prompt. To show that Kent is a student who improved because of her instruction, Sally
writes:

When for example, I was teaching scales to Kent, one of my students, he would have trouble remembering and playing one particular difficult scale because he couldn't remember the number of flats and because of that problem he couldn't play the A flat major scale. He worked on that scale for a week and when he came to his next lesson he showed me his problem of forgetting the number of flats in the scale and I showed him an easy way to visualize the position of the flats on the keyboard so that he could remember the scale (III, 11-13).

The example may not be perfectly written, but it is spelled out in enough detail so that we can picture Sally as a teacher solving a musical problem. Having shown herself and Kent in a working student-teacher relationship, Sally further builds up Kent's seriousness as a student by writing that "He is not like some children who are a ham and plays the piano to show off, but he always knows his music well, he asks questions and he is eager to have more work to do" (III, 24).

When she finishes writing about Kent, she generalizes about the significance of his remark: "One day at his lesson when he had done extremely well, he surprised me by saying, 'Someday, I want to teach piano too'. That almost brought tears to my eyes from the overwhelming feeling that I was able to teach so well that he wanted to pass on his ability also" (III, 25-26). Now she sounds less like the young woman seduced by flattery and more like the accomplished teacher; we see her in
action. The detailed information about Kent has increased her credibility as a reporter of her accomplishments and has established a context in which to interpret Kent's remark and to measure Sally's report of it. Consequently, this addition to the text might improve its effect on readers. Whether it does or not, this addition is decidedly instructive for teachers: an episode that had seemed trite ("that almost brought tears to my eyes") was an important event in Sally's life. Her phrasing had trivialized the episode; but when she retold it in detail, she shows us that the episode was not trivial for her. She could still have explained the significance of the episode much more analytically and organized the essay to show more effectively how she gained her sense of accomplishment. Even with those failures, however, she shows us that a writer's superficiality may not accurately represent the depth of her thought.

What Sally learned as a writer from this revision seems at first, however, less than we would hope for. She generated much specific detail, but the revision depended heavily on my advice to her. Furthermore, the detail did not exactly illustrate the main thrust of Sally's text. Let me explain. Sally described a student's musical problem and her solution to it, but,
ideally, she would have shown how this event gave her pleasure because of the focus of the sentence she illustrated: "When results are bad at times & then look much, much better from specific instruction, it gives me pleasure in knowing that I have the ability to teach someone from my own knowledge" (II, 9). She should have added slightly different detail or more than she did to show how helping Kent made her feel.

I should point out that my comments failed to direct Sally to focus her examples as she should have; I asked only that she give examples of playing notes in the right order, not how she felt about the examples. Prompting students like Sally to generate any significant amount of detail is a crucial first step, however; focusing the detail can wait until the student knows what detail is and how to generate it. Sally was unable to take that first step without very concrete instructions.

At another point in her essay, I also advised her to add detail, but my advice was less concrete. I underlined the part of a sentence she was to illustrate ("what can happen") and wrote "show me with specifics." (The sentence I wanted Sally to explain is "I have seen what can happen to a child who takes music lessons," II, 6.) Sally responded to my comment--with
generalizations. What can happen to a child who takes music lessons, she explains, is that "[t]hey usually like it & progress, sometimes their excitement is overwhelming & they feel good because they've learned something new" (III, 7). My advice was not a prompt Sally could use.

After she had generated the material about Kent, however, she seemed to have a better grasp of specific detail. In a course evaluation written at the end of the quarter, Sally uses another lengthy example to explain a point and includes an example within an example--several layers of specificity. She writes:

In this class I've also learned how to write papers. I've learned how to make good sentences into favorable paragraphs by being specific in my ideas and examples. I learned to know whether my idea was restricted enough and how to show it was restricted. One example is when I was writing my last essay on teaching music, I wanted to write on why I wanted to teach, but I couldn't have been specific and restricted enough if I hadn't wrote about my experiences as a piano teacher. Writing that paper I had to dig up my feelings about my teaching, the actual results from my students, and I even had to explain in a few parts how I was actually technically teaching them to play the piano.

Sally developed all of this material without any prompt from me. The material shows that she could generate specific detail, she could focus it, and she knew its importance. Sally's surprise shows what a new experience it was for her to use specific detail.
Exemplifying a writer just beginning to use specific detail, the case history of Sally is important for this study: it shows a writer less advanced than Roberta, and it allows us the opportunity to concentrate on the relationship between specific detail and generalizations in a student's essay and the teacher's job of evaluation. Roberta began her essay with two, fairly details and focused narratives; she did not face the problem of inventing massive amounts of detail nor of paring down a number of broad generalizations to focus the essay on a few. Sally faced exactly those problems and offers a different view of revision. The problem of working top-down from a collection of unfocused generalizations is a different process than working bottom-up from focused and detailed material. Sally's job of focusing her essay would have been much easier if she had generated a considerable amount of detail to prompt her generalizations, but she did not. She did, however, use detail in a few places in her essay and in doing so, constructed small segments that patterned a relationship between detail and generalization necessary for good exposition. She practiced this pattern and later used it more effectively.
Tammy: Fresh Starts

Tammy was a very quiet student in our class who seemed innocent and unfamiliar with the city world of Columbus and the mainstream youth culture. Whether the innocence was imposed by family rules (that prevented her from attending rock concerts, for example) or by her personality was never clear to me; but Tammy indicated in her writing that once in college she investigated some unfamiliar worlds like the High Street bars. Her investigations moved with caution, however, not the abandon we see in many freshmen. Judging from her progress through Ohio State, we may assume that the new worlds never seduced her into total disregard of her school work: after her quarter in basic writing, she took freshman composition and earned a grade of B-. In the summer of 1986, she graduated from Ohio State with a degree in education and a grade point average of 2.40.

Tammy's writing is much different from either Sally's or Roberta's. Unlike Sally, Tammy readily generates detail; unlike Roberta, Tammy writes drafts that seem quite unrelated to one another. Tammy is a writer who admitted in her first draft that she did not know what aspect of her topic she wanted to focus on. As she worked through the drafts, she tried out several approaches. She stuck with the same subject, her high
school musical **Guys and Dolls**, but she started each draft from a new angle. In each draft, however, she worked with a basic concept that relates one draft to the others.

Throughout the drafts, Tammy explores different ways in which her performance in the musical was valuable. The concept of *value*, however, is really a group of different ones that Tammy confuses. As she revises and receives comments that address this confusion, Tammy isolates some of the concepts related to the value of the play and explains how they are related to one another.

For the first draft of her essay, Tammy writes what was supposed to be a proposal (main idea and sub-topics) but was instead a free-writing in which she discovered her topic, at least she claimed to do so. The draft follows:

1) My topic is about the Musical I was in my Senior year and what I learned about myself from this special part in my life.
2) I loved every moment of this production, even the hours of rehearsal that was spent putting the show together. 3) This play is very special to me because I learned that if I have confidence in myself when I'm reaching out for something, like a lead roll, that I can do it, but only if I really want it and work for it will I receive. 4) I learned that I can perform in front of an audience by singing, dancing, and express a feeling of a character. 5) The singing was pretty easy, the range was, since I was a soprano in choir and I tried out for a lead roll, alto part. 6) So, most of the songs were in my range. 7) The dancing was the funnest part. 8) The practices were long and
difficult. 9) I knew that putting the show together would take a lot of time, but I just didn't realize the time spent would be the whole evening during the week and weekends. 10) First we practiced our lines, just speaking them with a little action by using some of the props and each day increased, until we were ready to perform on stage. 11) First we had to learn the terms to be able to work on stage. 12) Terms like up stage, which is furthest away from the audience and down stage, closest to the audience once we knew this we just put the acts together that we learned while working in the choir room. 13) Gradually everything started coming together. 14) and the more we rehearsed the more we knew our lines by memory.

15) The time came for the show to be put on, time really flew by it seemed like we just started practicing and then we were getting costumes ready and making posters to inform citizens about the production.

16) The show we started and played for 4 nights. 17) We wanted to keep the play going for at least another weekend, but we couldn't

18) So much time spent, for just a few days played.

(The three versions of Tammy's essay are reproduced in Appendix I.)

Before I discuss exactly the kinds of value Tammy was concerned with in this draft and others, let me explain my comments in response to this piece. They were in part prompted by a marginal note Tammy wrote to me in which she said "[I] couldn't decide on what I really wanted to write so I kept writing"; that is, she knew that she wanted to write about the school musical but not which aspect of it. She trusted that she could find a focus if she kept on writing, and she trusted that it was acceptable for her to adjust the proposal
assignment to fit her own needs. Since she did not know her approach to the topic, she could not propose the main points and sub-topics for an essay, so she needed to write something besides a proposal. In this respect, Tammy was more knowledgeable about her writing and writing processes than Sally, who also wrote an unfocused proposal but did not know it. Tammy's note shows further that she was willing to initiate a dialogue with me about her writing.

Her note prompted my response: "Fine, Tammy. Take a look now at the topics I've marked and see if any interests you." I bracketed five separate spots and commented on them. The first part of the proposal is governed roughly by the notion of "what I learned about myself from this special part in my life" (I, 1), one general kind of value resulting from the musical. I described this part of the draft as "one topic, general." I marked two more sentences that are related to this topic. The first I considered a "more specific statement of the . . . topic" (". . . I learned that if I have confidence in myself when I'm reaching out for something, like a lead roll, that I can do it, but only if I really want it and work for it. . . . " I, 3). I also considered the next sentence a "second specific statement of the topic" ("I learned that I can perform
in front of an audience by singing, dancing, and expres[sing] a feeling of character" I, 4). My intention with these marks was to identify for Tammy certain relatively specific things she had learned from her performance in the musical so that she could write a more restricted thesis than "I learned [much] about myself from this special part in my life" (I, 1).

The second part of Tammy's draft is governed by a different notion. It moves from what Tammy learned to comments about the singing and dancing ("The singing was pretty easy. . . . The dancing was the funnest part," I, 5-6), comments which grow out of the preceding material ("I learned that I can perform in front of an audience by singing . . . [and] dancing. . . ." I, 4). The draft then moves into a detailed discussion of the rehearsals and away from what she had learned ("The practices were long and difficult. . . . I knew that putting the show together would take a lot of time. . . . First we practiced our lines. . . . [W]e had to learn the terms to be able to work on stage. . . . like up stage and down stage. . . . [E]verything started coming together. . . . [and] we knew our lines by memory," I, 8-14).

At sentences 8 and 9 ("The practices were long and difficult. I knew that putting the show together would
take a lot of time, but I just didn't realize the time spent would be the whole evening during the week and weekends"), I commented again: "another topic?" Since I was unsure about how Tammy wanted to use the details about practice, I marked the last sentence ("So much time spent, for just a few days played," I, 18) as a possible "focus for the topic about the amount of time spent" getting ready for the production. In retrospect, I can see that the point Tammy wanted to make about the practices was different: the long hours were worthwhile because she could see how "[g]radually everything . . . [came] together." She wanted to write about another kind of value--the pay-off of hard work.

Tammy wrote another note on the draft: "This is what I want to write about." She had found her topic--or thought she had--and it was that "[g]radually everything started coming together," but the time for performance came quickly: "time really flew by it seemed like we just started practicing and then we were getting costumes ready and making posters" (I, 11, 15). (Her note was written in the margin beside these sentences.)

It is possible to see how the second draft grew out of the first because the body of the second follows the order of the third paragraph in the previous one--first
practice in the choir room, then on the stage, then the performance; but the second draft is much different from the first and starts fresh, with an approach that almost ignores what she had learned from the musical. Tammy adds much new detail, a large segment of which is about her role (Adelaide, "a dance hall girl") and the problems she had learning to portray the "boisterous" character (II, 7-17). She orders material chronologically, like a narrative, and works again with notions of value; but a clear focus eludes her. Her thesis is "There was a lot of time spent on this production, which made it more than worth while to see" (II, 3). In this sentence she connects the amount of time spent on the musical to the notion of value, perhaps two kind of value: the play was worthwhile to an audience and to her, an unstated assertion but one I suspect she meant because of what she later writes. Overtly, the value of the play as Tammy expresses it is for the audience; but the appeal of a play does not necessarily depend on the amount of time spent in rehearsal. Consequently, Tammy does not express the notion of value that logically justifies her time commitment to the musical. Later in the essay, she discusses the audience; but she is concerned there with its size and the box office return, not the appeal of
the play. Again, a clear focus eludes her. Further, Tammy introduces another, confounding notion of value—the cost of the production. Illogically related, these notions of value seem still to have provided for Tammy the conceptual unity for the essay and explain why all its parts exist.

My comments on Tammy's draft directed her attention to its lack of focus:

Your paper has some very good detail in it, especially at the beginning about rehearsals, but overall, the focus of the essay is too general. The part about attendance doesn't fit too well with the part about rehearsals. A big part of the problem is your thesis. It's pretty general, and it's got two contradictory points of view in it: 1) The musical was worthwhile to you who put so much work into it. 2) It was worthwhile for the audience.

Because Tammy's next draft is so much different from this one, it is difficult to see exactly how she used this prompt, but the content and focus of it suggest that the prompt drew her attention to the rehearsals and the value she reaped from the musical.

In the final essay, she focused on the value the play held for her: she had gained self-confidence from tackling a challenging role ("a lead roll which I was afraid I wouldn't be able to handle," III, 2). Consequently, she devotes a major portion of the essay to details about how she learned to play the role, how she rehearsed (II, P2, P4). Other people supported her
efforts and increased her self-confidence, she also tells us—her cousin, her mother, her choir director. For example in the second paragraph, she writes that her cousin generated "extra attention for her at school" that "made . . . [her] feel like a real star" (III, 11), and we see her self-confidence grow. Through the concept of confidence, Tammy is finally able to explain the significance of her time commitment in a logical way: without the help from others, she would not "have made it through the long hours of preparation (III, 4). She has eliminated the confusing notions of value and settled on one, the self-confidence she found.

Tammy seems to use material from each of the two preceding drafts as the foundation for this one: they help explain how she handled the difficult role. In draft II, she gave considerable narrative detail about how she practiced the role of Adelaide ("I had to play a . . . character [the opposite of] my personality . . . . a dance hall girl who had waited 'fourteen years' to get married to a gambler . . . . This . . . role was hard for me to act out, since I wasn't used to being as boisterous as . . . Adelaide. . . . The hardest part . . . was . . . to cry. . . . " and so forth, II, 6-16). Although this material is not identical to what she uses ultimately, it is pre-conceptual material and
probably focused her attention on this aspect of the musical. In addition, Tammy used material from the first draft, where she had generalized about the role: "I learned that if I have confidence in myself when I'm reaching out for something, like a lead roll, that I can do it" (I, 3). The challenging role of Adelaide was clearly a dominant part of Tammy's conception of her topic because she wrote about it in each draft and finally devoted her whole essay to it. The notions of value and Tammy's role in the musical link all three versions of her essay, even though the texts are very much different from one another.

Tammy is limited in her revision to starting afresh, a process that Linda Flower et al. call "rewriting" (1986). Using this process, writers "replicate . . . [their] original attempt to produce text, shaping intention once again into different syntactic and semantic representation[s]" (43). This sort of revision is guided by what Flower et al. call "a set of propositions or a gist" (43), so the radically different texts that result from it are revised texts, not compositions on a new topic. With Tammy, the guiding forces are the concept of value (finally clarified as the self-confidence she gained from the musical) and the challenge the role of Adelaide
presented.

Such a process of revision is probably not adequate for all of a writer's needs. Since we see no evidence that Tammy could use other processes, we conclude that her ability to revise may be the most limited of all the writers in this study. She does, however, use the starting-afresh process better than many students would because she has the facility necessary to make it work. She has the fluency to generate text that Flower et al. consider a prerequisite for the effective use of "rewriting."

Chuck: A Refocused Essay

Chuck was a non-traditional student, twenty-five years old, married, and a transfer student from one of the local community colleges. He seemed intelligent and more mature in his writing and thinking than the others, and he was the best writer in either of the classes from which these students were selected. He was also a good worker and a good contributor in class, but his success in the university is difficult to assess. Immediately after his basic writing course, he took freshman composition and earned a grade of B+. He has continued his studies, first in the engineering school and most recently in a non-degree granting program. (Some time
after our class, he told me he had changed his major because of difficulties he had had with required courses. He is currently enrolled (Winter 1987), and after 213 credit hours, his grade point average is 2.13. His performance in college is mixed. He continues to enroll, but he fails to graduate after accumulating sufficient credit hours to do so. I suspected Chuck of having a learning disability, but I could not persuade him to be tested. If he is learning disabled and if he had availed himself of the support provided to such students, he might have made his way through the university more successfully.

Chuck worked very hard in our class. He wrote long papers, put much thought into his writing, and strove to follow my advice. He is the writer I mentioned in Chapter III who wrote his thesis on a separate card to refer to as he revised. The essay we will examine shows how effective his referral card was. We will see his successful attempt to relate each paragraph to the thesis of his essay. He brought wayward paragraphs under the control of a single main point, and in that his accomplishment is great. Chuck created a coherent essay as a result of his concentration on the thesis and its relation to the body of the essay; but in the effort to achieve coherence, he stripped the essay of its humor.
and appealing voice. He removed detail and made the essay less interesting than it was in the first and second drafts. His failure in this regard is attributable in part to my failure to guide him well. I misread his second draft; and he and I together mistakenly identified his thesis, as I will explain below.

Chuck, a photographer with a darkroom in his home, knew much about photography from experience and courses in the subject, so he had more than enough material to use in his essay about the benefits of taking a course in photography. The appeal of the essay, however, comes from his sense of humor and voice as much as from his technical knowledge. Chuck's first draft was dominated by an invented story about beginning photographers who discover, much to their dismay, the high cost of their hobby and their mistakes:

1) For the beginning 35 MM photographer, developing and printing your own "black and white" photographs will help you past being an amateur and put you well on your way to being a professional photographer. 2) A beginner's course in black and white photography will save time and money. 3) A lot of people, when they first obtain a 35MM camera, start clicking away and in a short time will have used up their first roll of film. 4) No big deal, just take the film down to the store and have it developed and printed. 5) That's when they get their first surprise. 6) The novice finds that their "35MM Gizwitchit" is going to cost them an arm and a leg. 7) Developing and printing one roll of color film, 24 exposures, at today's prices can be done for about a little over eight dollars. 8) The film will cost about two-fifty. 9) Already
there's around ten bucks wrapped up in the first try. 10) When the film gets back, it's time for the second surprise. 11) Some of the pictures didn't turn out. 12) Why? 13) You don't know! 14) Because no one told you what could go wrong. 15) Hopefully the store you took your film to has a "goof proof policy" and will buy back up to half of your 24 prints. 16) Then, you should either think about giving it up or taking a course in black and white photography. 17) A beginning course in black and white photography not only offers an instructor who will give useful information on camera operation and how to take pictures, (which saves money) but the equipment necessary to develop and print film. 18) It is through developing and printing that the amateur learns what is going on when he or she takes the picture. 19) There are many people interested in photography. 20) Those people who really enjoy it will take at least one course. 21) Just being exposed to people discussing their work in photography will help to develop your own skill.

(The proposal and three other versions of Chuck's essay are reproduced in Appendix J.)

This draft was written in response to an assignment for an essay proposal; Chuch was to give the main point and sub-topics he planned for his composition. Consequently, I read Chuck's proposal as I read the others: I looked for the thesis at the beginning (where the assignment specified it should be) and tried to determine how the essay would develop out of the remaining material. I identified sentence 1 as the thesis ("For the beginning 35 mm photographer, developing and printing your own 'black and white' photographs will help you past being an amateur and put you well on your way to being a professional..."
photographer," I, 1). But I noted another sentence that competed with the thesis: "a beginner's course in black and white photography will save time and money" (I, 2); and I asked Chuck to check the "connection between these two [competing] sentences" to decide if they were related or if one was really unimportant. Although I accurately identified the competition between these two sentences, I did not accurately identify the thesis, as we will see with Chuck's next draft.

My final comments recognized the story about the first mistakes as a good introduction, identified several concepts Chuck seemed to be working with—the cost and frustration of a novice and the status of amateur versus professional, and discussed how Chuck would develop the essay. These comments written at the end of the draft indicate my overall assessment of it:

You've got a good start. Now where do you think you'll expand the paragraph into a theme? The first big flub is described in detail, itself probably sufficient for an introductory paragraph . . . but there's a problem. The thesis doesn't say anything about cost and frustration; [it] only [mentions] amateur versus professional. Therefore adjust the thesis and/or the support. Then, what I think the remainder of the theme will be about is that first course—the details of what one learns. That's where there's room for expansion.

Chuck wrote a very full second draft: he added a little polish to the story of a beginner's problems (the beginner has a name now, "Mr. Novice"), and he wrote
three very long and detailed paragraphs (II, P2-4) about a course in photography. When he handed in this draft, Chuck complained that it was too long. (His complaint seemed to be about the amount of time it had taken to write the paper as much as a concern that it was overly long.) His vague sense that there was too much in the paper may have come from his inclusion of a considerable amount of technical material about photography that was extraneous. Toward the end of two paragraphs (II, P2, P4), Chuck wrote several sentences that developed material only tangentially related to the topic (II, 21-24; 41-45).

When I read the draft, I detected its incoherence, but I did not accurately pinpoint the source of the problem; and the reason I did not is that I misidentified the thesis. Let me explain what happened to the thesis in this draft and then return to the coherence problems. The sentence Chuck and I identified as the thesis in draft two is this one: "For the beginning photographer, a course in 35 MM black and white photography will save precious time and money" (II, 1); that is, Chuck focused the introduction of his essay on the concepts of saving time and money and eliminated the competing concept of amateur versus professional. Consequently, when I read the essay, I
expected each paragraph about the course in photography to demonstrate a savings of time or money. The paragraphs did not—because the real thesis of the essay seems to be a sentence embedded in the body of the essay, at the beginning of the second paragraph: "A beginning course in black and white photography offers the amateur photographer the necessary equipment and information that will help make each exposure count" (II, 17). This sentence controls each of the paragraphs in the body of the essay and functions like a thesis, the overarching generalization that each paragraph explains.

If sentence 17 is the thesis ("a beginning course in black and white photography offers the amateur photographer the necessary equipment and information that will help make each exposure count"), the incoherence of the essay is limited to paragraph unity and is not the global incoherence that results if sentence 1 is the thesis ("For the beginning photographer a course in 35MM black and white photography will save precious time and money"). If sentence 17 is the thesis, then the incoherence could be remedied by adjusting a few sentences in the two paragraphs I mentioned above (II, P2, P4), the sentences at the end that wander. But Chuck and I set out on a
different course of revision.

As I said above, I detected the incoherence; but I misidentified the source. I directed Chuck to refocus the essay so that it would support the thesis about saving time and money, as the following comment indicates: "Connect all this to the thesis. How does this save time and money? Spell it out," a comment on paragraph 3. My general comment addresses the problems Chuck and I thought he had:

OK, Chuck, I can see the struggle you had. Part of the problem is that you're dealing with a technical subject, BUT to solve the problem, try to forget half of what you know about photography. At least, don't put it all in. You've set your paper up to show how a class saves time and money, not as a how-to for the darkroom. See the difference?

I advised Chuck to change the whole paper; and he did, an accomplishment of no small significance. (See the final essay where he focuses material about the course on the savings of time and money and writes some very good generalizations like "Although no course can guarantee creativity, a basic 35 mm black and white photography course will provide the technical knowledge and experience that will free the amateur photographer of the common mistakes and allow him to work on proficiency or creativity," IV, 17.) In refocusing the essay, he implicitly agreed with me about his thesis; so we were partners in failure: I misread, and he failed
to challenge me. And his essay was not as good as it could have been; he wrote a respectable five-paragraph theme (IV), but he took the life out of his essay.

The greater responsibility, however, is mine because I was the teacher. My mistake shows the importance of reading archaeologically. I misidentified the thesis in Chuck's proposal in part because I imposed my notion of form on it: I expected the thesis to be in a certain place, and I found it there. However, the text did little to alter my expectations, as it might have. Because so little material in the proposal was devoted to the photography course, I could not determine what Chuck wanted to focus on there. When, in the next draft, the text offered new information about the thesis, I failed to see it. I had already decided what the thesis was, and I focused on Chuck's sense of the essay less than I should have. Perhaps my mistake will be instructive.

In this chapter, we have studied three writers who revised in different ways. Sally, who wrote superficial generalizations and usually tried not to revise, finally learned how to add specific detail and was pleased with her accomplishment. Tammy, a writer who could easily
generate detail, composed a fresh draft for each version of her essay. Each draft, however, provided concepts or pre-conceptual material that she used in the main generalizations of the final essay. Chuck, in many ways a more able writer than the others, refocused his essay on the basis of mistaken advice. The case studies of all three, however, show that basic writers can be taught to revise.

Now I will conclude this study.
Chapter VI
Results, Contributions, and Implications

In Chapters I and II, I posed several questions that research about revision and basic writers has not answered. Throughout Chapters III, IV, and V (dealing with the class and the case studies), I have addressed these questions about teaching basic writers and the processes and cognitive activities of revision. In this chapter, I will continue to address them, particularly in discussing the patterns of revisions of the four writers. This chapter will also widen the context of discussion from the particular student writers to implications of this study for revision, basic writing, and the evaluation of draft writing, specifically how we read and respond to student texts. In this chapter, I will again consider the same topics discussed in Chapters I and II, in a slightly different order:

- definition of revision,
- evaluation of draft writing,
- definition of basic writers,
- revision of basic writers,
- basic writers and thinking,
- pedagogy, and
- methodological contributions of this study.

The evaluation of revision is so pervasive a subject that I will address it in the several sections where
discussions lead either to a better understanding of the nature of revision, the difficulties in evaluating drafts, or the means of doing so. Under each heading, I will include, where pertinent, the results of this study and the contributions it makes.

Defining Revision

In Chapter I, I created a working definition of revision; let me reiterate that definition here.

Revision

is a dimension of composing, not a stage, involves the conceptual level of texts, not just the surface, is guided by more extensive concerns than correctness, addresses global matters, is a means of invention and can result in discovery, and is guided by writers' intentions in ways that are paradoxical.

This definition focuses especially on the heuristic function of revision, the processes of revision (including its recursiveness), the relationship between editing and revising, and the role of a writer's intentions in guiding revision. The case studies have illustrated how revision functioned heuristically.

Changes in the texts prompted subsequent revision, as did patterns of text structure, particularly symmetry, contrast, levels of specificity, conceptual networks of related material, and the interaction between narrative
and expository elements. This definition also focuses on changes to paragraphs and beyond: the development of ideas, the coherence from sentence to sentence, paragraph to paragraph, and beginning to end.

Two problems result from this definition, first how to portray and categorize complex changes and second how to differentiate revision from editing. The first problem created a particular difficulty for this study because one change at the global level may reverberate throughout a whole paragraph or across paragraphs. Consequently, any categorization had to include a way to show the interaction of categories; that is, the categories had to be dynamic rather than static. For example, when a concept is articulated, it can cause several interrelated changes, even across drafts (e.g., unexpected and communicative ability in Roberta's essay). To portray such interrelated changes, I focused on certain patterns in the texts and the changes within each set of patterns and among them. These patterns are concepts and conceptual networks, levels of specificity, and the interaction between narrative and expository elements. My focus on these patterns dovetails with the instructional emphasis described in Chapter III, but the patterns serve much wider purposes than investigating the effects of pedagogy or structuring the
four case studies of revision. Throughout this chapter, I will discuss the wider functions of these patterns, particularly as they figure in cognitive development, writing ability, and the evaluation of draft writing.

The second problem is differentiating editing from revision, a problem that has taken on new dimensions as the study progressed. At first, it was a problem of defining the acts that would be considered revision, but it has broadened and become a crucial issue for the evaluation of revision. How does a teacher read and interpret the surface level of texts? To discuss this issue, I will first consider the relationship between the surface and conceptual levels of text as this study reveals it; then I will discuss how weaknesses in student writing make it more difficult to perceive conceptual accomplishments; and finally I will discuss how teachers can surmount difficulties and interpret the thinking behind the surface.

To constitute revision, as I have defined it, a writer's changes must do more than edit its surface features. The writer must do more than correct mechanical errors, adjust diction, or rewrite individual sentences for the sake of focus or flow. When he revises, his efforts must involve the conceptual level. He may either invent new concepts, refine existing ones,
or adjust segments of the text according to principles these concepts establish. We have seen, however, that the formation of concepts can involve single words or phrases, particularly when the concept is first articulated. Consequently, the actions of revising and editing will occasionally look alike, even though the two are not the same. In other words, the surface of a text will not always indicate whether revision has taken place; at least, it will not by itself yield this information.

When we explore the relationship between the surface and conceptual levels with examples from the cases, especially Roberta's, we see that the relationship is a complex one. The first example shows an intimate connection between the two; word choice becomes an aspect of the conceptual development of an essay. When Roberta first used the word unexpected, it appeared as a mere descriptive word in the proposal ("I had an enjoyable date at Kings Island during an unexpected rain," II, 8). The word described the rain, one of the events of the day, in the way any adjective may add color, liveliness, or vividness. By the time Roberta wrote the last version of her essay, however, unexpectedness was clearly much more than a characteristic of the rain; it was a conceptual
principle by which she organized the details of a whole paragraph (IV, P 3). It formed the basis of a main contrast and many subordinate ones within the paragraph and gave the paragraph a purposeful organization. It helped her design a tight structure that was more "composed" than the previous recounting of the story and one that also supported the main point of the essay much more effectively (and subtly). The concept was important outside that single paragraph also. One of the main generalizations of the essay was formed around it ("My date's personality should be daring to coordinate with my love of doing the unexpected," IV, 3). Roberta's choice of the word unexpected seems clearly to have been guided by the conceptual aspects of her essay, no matter how incomplete those concepts were. Here, the surface text seems to reveal the conceptual logic underneath.

The opposite, however, is just as true; the surface of the text may be so fluid during conceptual manipulation that changes in the surface bear little relation to the conceptual activity underneath. The primary example of this occurs in Tammy's work. The three versions of her essay differed radically from one another on the surface while there was a conceptual consistency throughout. The surface, however, did not
change gradually, in a logical, sequential fashion; it changed unpredictably. Roberta's essay shows, further, that when concepts move, they can create a surface that seems illogical from one draft to the next. The word boring moved considerably, and when it moved it did not simply change location but changed the word it modified. Before Roberta settled on the final use of this concept (boredom), the word boring (or synonyms) described her companion, the subject of his conversation, a party, and herself. Moreover, when Roberta decided that her companion was not "boring" but the topic of his conversation was, she decided to describe her companion as "intelligent," a radical alteration from a negative modifier to a positive one. The surface text seems quite fluid and changes in ways that do not seem to show a logical conceptual development.

The relationship between the surface and conceptual levels is, as we see, an unpredictable one. Sometimes the surface reveals the conceptual activity going on; and sometimes it does not, at least not directly. Conceptual revision may make connections in the surface of the text more reasonable, but it may also make the surface relations seem illogical. Any good definition of revision ought not to simplify the relationship between the surface and the conceptual, either by
assuming that the two are entirely independent or that they are the same. Nor can any good definition assume that the single distinction between changes that affect the surface of a text and those that affect the conceptual is sufficient to differentiate revision from editing.

Complexities in this relationship make it more difficult for teachers to interpret the surface representations of change, but weaknesses in the texts themselves also make the task difficult. For example, awkward, incorrect, or garbled syntax is a common problem of basic writers. When the syntax goes awry, it blurs the focus of a sentence or the movement of a paragraph. It can make more difficult the teacher's task of reading beneath the surface to perceive the writer's intentions and hidden conceptual development.

Examples of problems in syntax abound in the case studies. Sally's sentences run out of control and consist of clauses strung together with little relationship to one another, as in the proposal:

I've grown extremely fond of the many aspects of music & I feel inside that thats what I want to do as a career. I feel that music is a very important part of everyone's lives & I want to teach children because thats when they are first exposed to many things, especially music & I want to bring music into many childrens lives (II, 2-3).

Sometimes she packs so many clauses together into one
sentence, with vague pronoun referents and inaccurate conjoining words, that she disguises the main thrust of the whole sentence as, for example, in this sentence of generalization: "That almost brought tears to my eyes from the overwhelming feeling that I was able to teach so well that he wanted to pass on his ability also" (III, 26). Faulty syntax is attributable to many different sentence errors, of course, and we need only illustrate a few to suggest basic writers' syntactic weaknesses.

Another example is necessary, however, to illustrate that in addition to obscuring sentence sense, faulty syntax can be related to conceptual development. An example from Roberta's essay suggests that such syntax may result from conceptual interference as much as from the writer's incomplete mastery of sentence form. In a paragraph organized by many layered contrasts, Roberta wrote this: "... but the rain was so cooling from the hot summer rays, we didn't care how silly we looked" (IV, 22), a syntactically incorrect string because of a disjuncture between the participle ("cooling") and the prepositional phrase ("from the hot summer rays"). This sentence occurs in a well-designed paragraph that Roberta's revisions had structured more intricately. They had streamlined the main contrast
between the expected and unexpected and arranged the
details in many subordinate contrasts. In the context
of the whole paragraph, the syntactic problem looks
different because the sentence contains both elements
(heat and coolness) of one of the subordinate contrasts.
The contrast is between the steaminess of an August day
and the coolness of the rain.

Roberta's work with the concept of heat versus
coolness correlates with the incorrect syntax, and the
correlation may not be incidental. Instead it may
pinpoint an instance in which the writer's rhetorical
intentions (to make a contrast) overrode syntactic
considerations: her desire to repeat a concept (the
contrast) was stronger than her desire to create a
sentence that worked correctly. Roberta's revisions
highlighted the contrasts within the paragraph, between
the expected and the unexpected, between the individual
and the crowd, between a freshly-ironed blouse and a
wrinkled one, and so forth. Within this sentence,
Roberta made another contrast, one made earlier,
however, so that her repetition of both elements of it
was unnecessary. She contrasted the heat and coolness
in this sentence; but if she had omitted one half of the
contrast (the heat), the sentence would have been much
better syntactically: "the rain was so cooling [that]
we didn't care how silly we looked." Since she had mentioned the heat elsewhere in the paragraph, it was not necessary in this sentence; but Roberta repeated it anyway.

Although we cannot be certain of her reason for doing so, we can postulate an explanation as plausible as that involving Roberta's lack of syntactic fluency. The conceptual level of the text interfered with the surface. Since Roberta's conceptual work highlighted contrasts in the paragraph, the one in this sentence may be an instance of Roberta's overgeneralizing a principle, a common characteristic of learning. She may simply have lacked confidence that the contrast between the heat and coolness was sufficiently explicit without the repetition of both elements.

This explanation suggests that strides in conceptual work may be related to faulty syntax and, further, that no amount of drill will correct the syntax since the source of the problem is not bad habits or ignorance but conceptual development and overgeneralization. It also suggests that a teacher who wants a student to eliminate incorrect syntax cannot do so without reference to the conceptual level of the text. That is, even a teacher whose greatest goal is to
have students produce conventionally correct products may be unsuccessful if he or she attends only to the surface.

The only possible solution to the dilemma of how to interpret surface changes is that the teacher must use additional information besides the surface. What patterns, potential and manifest, are there in the text; what might the writer intend to say or mean; what have previous drafts said; what material does the writer discuss in the most interesting or forceful way; what material does the writer repeat; what material does she leave out from one draft to the next; and, most important, what reasons might the writer have for any of her rhetorical decisions, reasons that can be discerned from the textual puzzle or from discussion with her?

When I defined revision in Chapter I, I also considered the role of writers' intentions in revision. They guide writers by providing an image, usually hazy and incomplete, of what the writers intend their discourse to mean. Remembering how nebulous the intentions of accomplished writers are, teachers will expect students to have vague intentions—and yet be guided by them, as we see from the cases. For example, Tammy began her essay without knowing exactly what aspects of the school musical she wanted to write about.
Nevertheless, it is clear that she intended to write about certain concepts from the outset: the concept of value, specifically, what she learned by tackling a challenging role in her high school musical. These concepts were not fully developed at the beginning, nor was Tammy aware of their central role in her conception of the topic. But her intention to write about them persisted from the first draft to the last. Vague intentions guided her to write about partly-formed concepts, which she developed through revision.

Both vague intentions and partly-formed concepts guide writers, concepts being particularly powerful to prompt revision. They draw related material to them, as we saw in Roberta's essay: personality drew communicative ability to it; promise drew together supporting details in a paragraph and separated contrasting ones from it; and unexpected functioned similarly. Concepts, in fact, are powerful enough to force a writer to subvert her stated intentions; for example, Tammy wrote that she wanted to report the story of her musical, from try-outs to performance; but the concepts required a different essay, the essay she wrote about her increased self-knowledge. (Whether Tammy's stated intentions were her real ones is problematic; in any case, her intentions and the core of concepts in her
Knowing how intentions and concepts function during revision, teachers should be undismayed when students begin composing without knowing exactly what they will write. Their intentions and concepts will guide them—if teachers also offer good guidance. To do so, teachers should use as many sources as possible to interpret the surface of texts and to determine what writers intend to mean. They should also design instruction that acknowledges the paradoxical role of intentions and that leads students toward reliance on the whole range of prompts to revision, including their own image of an intended meaning. The meanings students intend to create may not meet academic conventions, readers' needs, and such. Thus, writers must learn to recognize their intentions before they can evaluate whether the meaning they intend (e.g. to evoke the quality of a remembered experience) is suitable for the purposes of their texts (e.g. to persuade) and the needs of their readers (e.g. clarity of argument). Knowing how intentions and concepts function during revision and how the surface and conceptual levels are related should prompt instructors to read archaeologically, write good commentary, and teach writers how to recognize their intentions and embryonic ideas.
My definition of revision involves certain characteristics that many researchers might consider necessary in a good definition, for example, recursivity; but not all researchers agree about all the characteristics of revision. For example, I earlier explained that Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte include recursivity, but they also consider all changes to be revision, even those involving only the surface of texts. They would not agree that revision attends only to global matters. In this respect, my definition differs from theirs. Such differences result in part from constraints imposed by the designs and goals of particular studies: Faigley and Witte quantified revision and were not much interested in the effects of change, only the amount. In contrast, I have used revision as a means of looking at thinking and have been most interested in the results of changes—upon the text structure and the subsequent revisions. Given the complexity of a full definition of revision (e.g. the 1986 Flower et al. model), any attempts to study it will almost necessarily carve out part of the whole for examination and will stipulate a definition appropriate to the goals of the study undertaken. Consequently, we must expect something less than unanimous agreement about our definitions.
Early studies in revision, particularly Nancy Sommers's, lamented the wide divergence of notions about what constitutes revision, when the activities take place, and what level of texts are addressed. Still, our discipline has not settled on a single definition of revision. These early cries, however, were not ignored. If they did not produce unanimity, they spurred many researchers (this one included) to view revision as invention instead of copy-editing. Since some diversity of definition is unavoidable because of different types of research, perhaps the diversity is of slightly less concern than it was a decade ago. Certainly now, the frontier is the classroom, even the classroom where writing is ostensibly taught as process. Teachers still do not teach revision as invention because many of them do not know how to; in particular, they do not know how to evaluate draft writing.

Evaluation:

Reading and Responding to Draft Writing

In Chapter I, I discussed problems in evaluating draft writing, especially ones that come from New Critical assumptions about texts and reading rather than from poststructuralist ones. This study has shown that such a product-centered approach will prevent teachers
from teaching revision and may not even work very well in product-centered instruction. As the above discussions have shown, these two levels interact so that a teacher's attention to the surface without regard to the conceptual may not effect the change he wants, even if the goal is correct syntax.

In order to teach revision, we first need two different kinds of capabilities. We need categories that match the kinds of textual changes we wish our writers to produce, and we need a repertoire of instructive commentary to describe those categories and explain them to students. Our profession certainly has systems of commentary; usually they are reproduced inside the covers of handbooks. But these systems describe only the surface of texts. To describe the changes we want in revision, we need categories for the conceptual level, categories like those used in this study:

- concepts and conceptual principles,
- levels of specificity, and
- narrative and expository elements.

While each of these categories functions as an element of text structure, each also functions heuristically; that is, these categories are ones through which we may describe both texts and thinking. Consequently, they categorize the conceptual level of texts. These
categories are additionally useful for the evaluation of revision because they do not describe unchanging entities (like "comma-splice") but dynamic patterns that change in the process of revision and interact with one another.

These categories describe the revisions in the case studies, but an important question (although one this study cannot answer definitively) is whether or not the categories would be useful for other writers and other revisions. There are reasons to believe they would. As I have applied these categories to the texts of basic writers, I have used them to describe important cognitive processes, ones Andrea Lunsford calls "the set of cognitive strategies . . . that . . . [is] crucial to both reading and writing" ("Cognitive Studies," 158). These strategies are "generalizing, abstracting, inferring, and synthesizing (by which . . . [she] mean[s] seeing patterns of 'connections')" ("Cognitive Studies," 158). With some adaptation, the categories in this study could describe the generalizing, abstracting, inferring, and synthesizing that occurs in other writing.

The most limited category is the third, covering narrative and expository elements, because not all writing is done in these genres. Narrative writing,
however, is probably more nearly universal than may be apparent. Harry Brent, Mike Rose, Arthur Applebee, and Linda Flower (1981) all testify from different perspectives about the primacy of narrative, Brent explaining that for all but the most "narrow and technical" writing he does, he "tend[s] to write the first draft . . . partially as a personal narrative" (51). Narrative elements may occur in early drafts more than we think, regardless of the genre of the final product. Even when they do not, this category could be easily adapted to describe the interaction between pre-conceptual material and the concepts and generalizations arising out of it, an interaction I used the category to describe. Other research must pursue the question of how widely-applicable these categories are. Nonetheless, the point remains that to evaluate draft writing, we need categories of description that reach the conceptual level of texts, as these categories do.

Next, we need a repertoire of instructive commentary. This repertoire includes principles we should follow when we comment on student papers, not specific comments we can write. Certain of the principles govern our attitudes toward students and their texts, and others govern our practices. We must have confidence that our students can improve their
writing and can demonstrate better thinking-in-writing than their texts usually demonstrate. We must believe that the hidden things, the partly-formed concepts and significant events in a writer's life (both inner and outer events) carry seeds for the development of real intellectual activity in writing. We should not discourage writers who do not have clear goals at the beginning, who do not know what they want to write about. They probably "know" more than they can say. We must praise their successes ("nice details," "these two episodes could make an interesting theme") more than condemn their failures. We must be patient with their learning and the mistakes that accompany it (Roberta's syntax, "the rain was so cooling from the hot summer rays"; Sally's specific detail that did not exactly exemplify the generalization about it). Further, we must respect student texts as we do the writing of published authors ("I can see the struggle you had. Part of the problem is that you're dealing with a technical subject"). We must not kidnap student writing and impose upon it our structures, ideas, and intentions without regard for what the student attempted.

In our written or oral comments, we must be guided by the cycles of commentary that Douglas Butturff and
Nancy Sommers describe for different drafts. In early drafts, when writers have not found a "center of gravity" (104) for their compositions, teachers should identify the possible center and urge students to choose the one they are most interested in building an essay around ("Take a look now, Tammy, at the topics I've marked [on the proposal] and see if any interests you"). For later drafts, teachers should show in concrete ways how each sub-set of ideas could be developed:

Part of the problem is that you're dealing with a technical subject, but to solve the problem, try to forget half of what you know about photography. At least don't put it all in. You've set your paper up to show how a class saves time and money, not as a how-to for the darkroom. See the difference?

Throughout these two cycles of commentary, teachers will need to identify the parts of students' composition --the specific detail, the generalizations (the good and the not so good), the main ideas, the contradictory assertions, the concepts and conceptual principles:

Take care to set this up as a promising evening.

This explanation doesn't fit well here. Omit it? Consider its relation to cost.

You've already got the thesis.

Nice details.

[This sentence provides the] focus for the topic about the amount of time you spent [on the musical.]
This identification will help basic writers like Roberta, Sally, Tammy, and Chuck to perceive the parts of their texts separately from the whole. If the parts identified involve the conceptual level and not just the surface, then the writers will have information to use for global revision. If the only parts they perceive are words or sentences, however, they will more likely edit than if they perceive parts of more global importance.

In the final cycle, teachers' comments should address the textbook concerns of "introductions, conclusions, and stylistic matters" (104). Then is the time for surface-level matters. It has become a maxim among those who teach writing as process that attention to surface level changes should be delayed until late in the writing process. Addressing mechanics, syntax, word choice, and other such surface features of a text at that time is not a new notion, but this study offers a new reason why the delay is desirable. Most commonly, we are advised to postpone editing so that we do not increase a writer's anxiety about error to a point that inhibits invention. Nearly as often, the postponement is advised because correcting surface error too early is a waste of time since many of the problem words, sentences, or paragraphs may be omitted through revision. Both of these are good reasons, but this
study shows another. The surface and the conceptual levels of the text are related in such unpredictable ways that we cannot know when editing, performed too early, might interfere unproductively with conceptual development. If, for example, our comments advised a student to edit out a bit of incorrect syntax (like "the rain was so cooling from the hot summer rays"), the result might eliminate important conceptual material that the student was using.

Besides the ability to categorize the conceptual aspects of writing and a repertoire of instructive commentary, our ability to evaluate draft writing also rests upon how we read texts. We must read archaeologically because much conceptual activity is hidden underneath the surface. For example, concepts follow their own logic as they develop, and the surface of a text does not always follow the same logic. In addition, relationships among concepts emerge piecemeal. If teachers (and students as well) are to construct relationships among concepts, they must read archaeologically. To do so, they must read below the surface of a text or around it within a circumference that includes a writer's intention and a reader's knowledge and experience. This circumference is wider than New Criticism allows and recognizes that a reader's
construction of meaning, using the text as mere signals, reaches far beyond the text and that teachers' status as experienced readers gives them tools of meaning-construction (intertextuality, conventions, expectations) that students often do not possess. We must use all the tools we have; and as we read archaeologically, we must ask ourselves questions like the following:

what patterns, potential and manifest, are there in the text,

what might the writer intend to say or mean,

what have previous drafts said,

what material does the writer discuss in the most interesting or forceful way,

what material does he leave out from one draft to the next, and most important,

what reasons might the writer have for any rhetorical decisions he has made, reasons discernable from the textual puzzle or from discussions with him.

Our answers to these questions should use categories at the conceptual level. The answers will provide material for commentary on student drafts: comments that describe parts of the essay, ask writers to identify their intentions, make independent rhetorical choices, and record our responses as we read.

Janet Emig states in The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders that average and below average writers
cannot "translate an abstract directive such as 'Be concise' into a set of behaviors involving the selection of lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical options. . . . at least, [not] without constant and specific guidance by their teachers" (99). This study presents some counter-evidence because these basic writers could translate the advice to be specific into text after our classwork had laid the foundation by defining general and specific through concrete examples in their own reading and writing. My comments on their papers then identified places that were general and sometimes suggested the kind of specific detail that might be appropriate:

Since your whole paper is about teaching experiences, you could strengthen your introduction. Now it's a general discussion of what you want to do in the future. Give it a more restricted focus—a summary of the details of your essay.

Give examples—playing notes in the right order, memorizing scales.

Some specifics here—as a build-up—could help readers share your feelings.

[A series of marginal comments beside bracketed material:] One topic, general. More specific statement of the first topic. Second specific statement of the topic. Another topic?

The comments also gave students concrete descriptions of their own incoherence, for example, "Check the connection between these two sentences"; "The thesis doesn't say anything about cost and frustration, [it
mentions] only amateur versus professional. So adjust the thesis and/or the support." This instruction was intensive; but it was not constant and even when it was relatively specific, it still produced responses from the writers that I did not specify, or in many cases even imagine. One of the keys to producing suitable responses from our writers may be that we tie our general comments like "be specific" or "show connections here" to particular parts of the text, either by bracketing the material we refer to or by reiterating it in the writer's language, as I have shown above.

Definition of Basic Writers

Chapter I included several descriptions of basic writers as well as the warning that generalizations about such writers are often inaccurate descriptions of the whole population. I will reiterate some of these descriptions here, and then I will compare the students in this study to those descriptions.

Mina Shaughnessy described basic writers whose prose is error-ridden, who can generate little textual material, whose ethnic backgrounds vary considerably, and whose preparation for academia offered by their cultural, educational, and class backgrounds is
inadequate. Lynn Troyka extended this definition to include the following characteristics: basic writers are "highly gregarious and social" ("Legacies and Literacy," 256), are "more comfortable in an oral rather than a written mode" (258), are holistic or global thinkers (258-259), and are "ambivalent about learning" (260). Drawing on these and other generalizations about basic writers, George Jensen asserted that we have "reified" the basic writer as "a gregarious writer who talks but does not think, who has difficulty developing concepts, is overly concerned about correctness, likes to please the teacher, and prefers the basic five-paragraph theme" (54).

While my study does not provide information about all of the generalizations above, it supplies information about some. The four students in this study are all native speakers of English with little ethnic diversity. Although my information is incomplete, it indicates that all are from middle-class families. (Chuck's family is upper middle-class.) These four writers did not produce texts that were error-free but neither is their writing best characterized by the amount of error it contains. In their texts, the greater problems are focusing, developing topics with detail, generalizing, drawing inferences, and suitably
integrating generalizations and detail. These writers were relatively fluent, if we judge from the amount of text they could generate: about one hand-written page at the beginning of the quarter and two to four hand-written pages at the end. While the students were inadequately prepared for college writing, they were not completely uninstructed in composition. All had taken writing courses before they arrived in my class and exhibit in varying degrees a sense of essay form.

My study did not investigate signs of orality, but the students' positive response to conferences—to oral not written dialogue about their writing—suggests that they benefited from this channel of communication even if their texts would not classify them as "oral" writers. Their response to conferences suggests that they, like Troyka's students, needed a "warm, encouraging" classroom ("Legacies and Literacy," 261) to counteract the coolness of the academic culture. If they could talk to the teacher (and each other), they felt the classroom a less impersonal place, and their academic efforts were supported by a web of more personal connections.

While the descriptions of the writers in this study are not definitive of all basic writers, they create a picture that challenges the generalizations made about
all, particularly about cognitive development and revising habits, as I will discuss below. Further, these writers have been carefully enough portrayed, through their writing and other information about them, to offer the grounds of comparison for further studies about the revising and thinking of basic writers.

How Basic Writers Revise

In Chapter I, I reported the conclusions of Susan Wall and Anthony Petrosky—that basic writers spend less time on their papers, have fewer strategies for invention, and revise less than more accomplished writers. The case studies presented here show, however, four basic writers who made considerable revisions and spent quite a bit of time writing, insofar as the number and length of their drafts is a measure of the time spent. Tammy wrote four drafts; Chuck wrote six; and Roberta and Sally wrote seven; all wrote more than the required three. While Sally's revisions show less thought than Chuck's or Roberta's (and therefore possibly less time composing), it would have taken her several hours just to fill that number of pages. The time spent on writing is an unreliable predictor of the results, but the time necessary to produce the number of drafts these writers submitted probably indicates a
change in their writing behavior, one step toward improving the results.

Wall and Petrosky further indicate that basic writers care most about revising "as a chance to try out a new approach when the first one does not work out" (118), a strategy of revision born out of desperation or frustration. Since I did not allow my students to change topics once they had begun to write, I prevented their giving up and starting over. They had to stick with a topic and try to work out the problems they had created. In a superficial way, this required persistence encouraged the students to sustain work on the same topic and the concepts integral to it, to return to what they had already written, and to try to build upon it. The requirement forced them to work through some of the frustration their composing might have presented and prevented the students from giving up in desperation. With the possible exception of Tammy, they did not see revision "as a chance to try out a new approach when the first one ... [did] not work out."

Chapter I also discussed the conclusion of Richard Beach and Sara Eaton that poorer writers cannot perceive or construct a "larger frame or context" (162) for their writing: they could not describe the function of different sections of their drafts. Sally, the least
able writer in this study, may not have been able to describe the function of her essay or any one of its paragraphs (as the Beach and Eaton study demanded), but she had achieved enough distance from her writing to be able to analyze the one tool she had learned to use. After a quarter's worth of instruction, she wrote a course evaluation in which she described the role of specificity in writing:

I've . . . learned how to . . . be . . . specific in my ideas and examples. . . . One example is when I was writing my last essay on teaching music, I wanted to write on why I wanted to teach, but I couldn't have been specific and restricted enough if I hadn't wrote about my experiences as a piano teacher. Writing that paper I had to dig up my feelings about my teaching, the actual results from my students, and I even had to explain in a few parts how I was actually technically teaching them to play the piano.

Sally's comment, an example as well as an explanation of what she had learned, suggests that if basic writers are taught to differentiate parts of a text from the whole, (for example, detail from generalization), they can attain enough distance from their texts to analyze them. This distance is necessary in order to construct larger frames or contexts for their writing.

When we discussed in Chapter I the ways in which poorer writers may derail in the revision process, we saw that they may fail to detect problems in the text. Such detection is hampered by a perception of the text
that does not separate parts from the whole. Consequently, basic writers need instruction in recognizing parts of the text that are larger than words and sentences. They need to perceive networks of related material (conceptual networks, patterns in the details, levels of specificity, generalizations, and the like). They need to be taught how to create for themselves more accurate and complete representations of the whole. The writers in this study received from me concrete descriptions of several parts of their texts; and after they did, they revised globally. My comments on their writing, revealing the needs of a careful reader, changed the students' perception of text and enabled them to revise.

In terms of the 1986 Flower et al. model of revision, my comments performed for the students some of the reading tasks necessary for revision. That model includes three kinds of reading: to comprehend (to create a mental representation of the text), to evaluate (to test for problems), and to define problems (to diagnose). While the writers in this study may have performed the first kind of reading (to comprehend), my comments affected it. By shifting their perception to particular parts of the whole and the interrelationships of these parts, I influenced how they perceived their
texts and created mental representations of them. My comments also evaluated and diagnosed problems, but the evidence shows that these writers began to perform this tripartite reading for themselves. They became more able to detect problems. Roberta especially, but even Sally, too, revised in response to textual prompts and not only to my comments. This independent response required reading to comprehend, evaluate, and diagnose. Furthermore, it is built upon a perception of parts of a text.

Besides conclusions about how much the writers revised and how they perceived, read, and evaluated their texts, this study provides information about the sequence and direction of their revisions—draft-to-draft, globally within a whole draft, and sentence-to-sentence. The following discussion will first point out the sequence of revision from the beginning to end of the essays, within and across drafts. Then it will focus on the number of steps involved in forming high-level generalizations and, afterward, the top-down and bottom-up processes by which generalizations are formed. Next, it will note the coexistence of platitudes with original generalizations as students revise, and finally it will describe two different rhythms by which concepts are developed in writing.
Characteristic of Roberta's revision was a tendency for her to work first on the beginning of the essay, and then in the next draft to work on the end, but she never concentrated equally on both halves in any one draft. What this means is that except for the proposal, which necessarily concerned the whole piece because it abstracted a previous, complete one, Roberta revised only part of each draft. In one, she worked on the first couple of paragraphs. In the next, she worked primarily on the third and fourth. Furthermore, the attention she gave to the latter half of the essay was not as productive as what she gave the first. The conclusion, for example, was formulaic and unrevised. Chuck showed a similar concentration on the first portion of his essay, his paragraphs losing focus at the end. This concentration of effort on the beginning of one's work is not surprising; at some time during composing or any other task, people get tired and may not work as well in later stages as they did earlier. A concentration on the beginning may also indicate certain cognitive limits, the difficulty of holding a whole text in memory while working on its parts. However, the more patterns a writer can readily perceive, the greater his ability to categorize information and hold bigger chunks of it in memory,
hence, the greater likelihood of his revising globally. Once again we see the importance of teachers using their comments on student writing to separate parts from the whole and identify conceptual patterns.

We gain a further appreciation of how cognitive limits affect a student's revising if we consider how many steps are involved in composing one sentence. Consider, for example, Roberta's particularly insightful sentence in the proposal ("The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation," II, 11). Writing it required several steps: Roberta drew a conclusion about each of the dates; she contrasted, analyzed them, and summarized the results in a single sentence. For Roberta to understand how this insight related to a concept two drafts later is an even more demanding cognitive task, but one she accomplished—probably by seeing patterns in her texts. If teachers want students to perform tasks of this cognitive complexity over and over again as they revise, we must try to understand the thinking behind their composing acts.

The next discussion shows how generalizations may grow out of material in either a top-down or a bottom-up direction. Writers in this study used both top-down and
bottom-up processes to write good generalizations. Typically, however, instruction has not recognized both nor has it used such processes to teach writers how to compose good generalizations, particularly topic sentences and theses.

We see the bottom-up growth of several concepts that climbed finally into the superordinate generalizations of Roberta's introductory paragraph. The concepts of the unexpected, communicative ability, and enjoyable date all appeared first in the body of the essay. Usually, their appearance was preceded by narrative detail related to the concepts (pre-conceptual material) and accompanied by a low-level generalization. Narrative detail and low-level generalizations contributed material for the formation of the high-level generalizations. The best example is, again, the sentence in Roberta's proposal ("The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation," II, 11.) The generalization was built upon the two contrasting examples (although the particular insight about communication was not). This sentence analyzed both examples and functioned as a conclusion of them. Then a higher-level generalization was built upon it. This bottom-up process of forming
generalizations is one of several steps. It is one, however, that teachers often try to compress artificially by instructing students to revise a thesis before they have drafted an essay.

The opposite pattern, a top-down one, also occurs; it is one in which a generalization is made more specific (as student theses often need to become). The two theses in Roberta's rough draft exemplify this pattern. One sentence (the "old" thesis) is more general ("It doesn't matter where I go for entertainment; I believe it's who I'm with that determines how good of a time I have when I'm out with a guy, I like to have a fun time," III, 1); the second is a restatement of the first at a more specific level ("I am not particular about where we go on a date because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date, what I feel is important is my date's personality," III, 2). The second sentence is more specific at several points, notably these: "where I go for entertainment" instead of "where we go on a date," and "who I'm with" instead of "my date's personality." Ultimately, the more specific sentence became the thesis of the essay. Roberta chose it and discarded the old one without any direct advice from me to do so. When she used a top-down process, that is, when she made her thesis more
specific, it was a result of her own decision without any prompt from me. She had learned to break the text down into parts and evaluate the parts separately, and she recognized that the more specific sentence was preferable. Without a strategy for recognizing general sentences and specific ones, Roberta probably would not have been able to perform this commonly-advised task of choosing a more restricted thesis.

While concepts are being developed and generalizations are growing in either a bottom-up or top-down direction, real insights will coexist with platitudinous generalizations. For example, in the final version of Roberta's essay, the introductory paragraph contains solid generalizations about communicative ability and personality, ones that grew out of material in the text and are closely tied to it. Alongside of them in the introduction, however, are the commonplace pronouncements that if her companion had "an interesting and pleasant personality . . . , even a boring party would be fun while I was with him" (IV, 5), and "if his personality is dull and lifeless . . . , than even the liveliest party would be a bummer" (IV, 6). Because we saw Roberta favor the more specific of her theses, deleting the more general one from her final essay without any specific instruction to do so, we can
expect that these other overgeneral sentences might also disappear on their own, in some later revision.

In fact, the coexistence of platitudes and solid generalizations may indicate a stage in writing development when a writer practices the structures of expository prose. That practice can lay the groundwork for later achievement. Janice Hays, interpreting William Perry's scheme of cognitive development, explains that those students who "most dutifully" practice "the structures of complex reasoning" (e.g. writing solid generalizations based upon supporting material) will "most easily" acquire these structures later because their "practice lays the foundation for the genuine structural transformation that later takes place" in their thinking (486). Roberta practiced those structures of thinking and writing in her essay. Although some of her sentences looked like dutiful representations of real generalizations, her texts show a writer approximating the structures of expository prose. Roberta's demonstrated ability to generate insights and to work up and down the ladder of specificity suggest, however, the possibility of continued improvement in her ability to compose solid generalizations. Consequently, teachers can be less alarmed about platitudinous overgeneralizations than
they would be if they used poor generalizations only to judge the quality of textual products.

Conceptual development in Roberta's writing process moves in two different rhythms. One is the gradual, incremental, highly visible development that we see with the concept of enjoyable date. The development of that concept moves in logical progression. Pre-conceptual material exists in the first draft; the concept is articulated in the second—in the body of the essay; then in the next draft, it moves into a high-level generalization in the introductory paragraph. In each draft, Roberta used the concept, and the changes related to it seemed to build on previous ones, step by step. It occurred first in a simple summary sentence, next in a low-level generalization, and then in a high-level one, and the supporting details related to it remained in each draft in roughly the same proportion. This is a linear progression, and the rhythm of development is even. If it were the only rhythm of conceptual development, it would support a building-block pedagogy of the writing process, one in which students are instructed first to generate detail, then to summarize it, then to analyze it. Composing, however, is not always so tidy.

The development of the concept of communicative ability was much different. It was a process of starts
and stops, halting motion, and unsteady progress. This concept is articulated in the second draft of the essay, without much pre-conceptual material existing in the previous draft. The foundation of the concept is not completely visible. Furthermore, this first generalization about the concept is several steps removed from any of the previous details about conversations, the only visible material out of which it could have been formed. Subsequently, the concept disappears, but two drafts later, it appears much more extensively: suddenly it is everywhere, tying the whole essay together. The low-level generalization from the proposal has been moved into the superordinate framework of the essay; and the concept has become part of both examples, much more pervasively in the second example than ever before. Many of the steps leading up to this wide-ranging use of the concept were not visible, so the rhythm of development seems uneven. This uneven pace illustrates that composing is not linear; it does not progress in steady increments inevitably toward a goal. Revision is recursive, as we know. This example shows the textual effects of recursivity, however, and argues for instruction and evaluation that accommodate non-linearity. If concepts develop in an uneven rhythm with
many steps in the development hidden, instructors must tolerate ambiguous and incomplete drafts and evaluate drafts as the fluid documents they are.

We should perhaps try to capitalize upon the uneven rhythm of concept development because it seems to have a heuristic function. The unevenness highlights different aspects of a text at different times during composing. For example, communicative ability was highlighted in the proposal but in the next draft a different concept was highlighted (personality), and communicative ability moved into the background. While communicative ability was in the background, Roberta developed personality, a related concept, and thereby created material for a more complex conceptual network, communicative ability subsequently joining the concept of personality. To capitalize upon this heuristic, we must not lock students into rigid textual patterns too early in composing because a rigid structure prevents writers from weaving in new material that composing generates. Conceptual networks and other patterns in the text must be able to expand, shift, and develop organically.

Basic Writers and Thinking

Unlike Jensen's reified basic writer who "talks but does not think . . . [and] who has difficulty developing
concepts" (54), the four writers in this study demonstrate an ability to think and develop concepts, Roberta and Chuck the most able in this respect, Sally the least. They demonstrated this ability in their writing, not by a test as did the students in Anna Berg's study. And they met Lev Vygotsky's measure of true (not pseudo-) concepts: they developed concepts and applied them to new situations. Revision was the vehicle for the development and application of concepts: single-draft writing might not have demonstrated this conceptual ability nor might it have occurred without teacher-intervention in revision. Nonetheless, before we can decide on the cognitive deficiency of basic writers, we must first tap their cognitive potential, as this study has.

What conclusions are possible about the cognitive maturity of basic writers? Basic writers are able to develop concepts out of the material of their own lives, and they are able to use the interplay between narrative and expository elements in an essay to do so. We may ask whether this conceptual ability demonstrates that basic writers have reached cognitive maturity, but this question will propel us into pointless argument because cognitive maturity is probably not a stage that one reaches, once and for all. As Vygotsky and Jean Piaget
have shown, thinking strategies from different stages co-exist at the same time. Lunsford has shown further that cognitive development "is not linear but recursive and context-dependent" ("Cognitive Studies," 154). That is, writers may be able to form concepts in one context but not another. Lunsford continues:

Building on this concept [of context dependency and recursivity], [Joseph] Williams proposes that instead of progressing through global stages of development, "we simply go through the same stages . . . over and over again . . . every time we confront a new universe of discourse" . . . (154).

Consequently, conclusions about cognitive development in writing cannot make universal claims about maturity; they must instead be restricted to very clear descriptions of cognitive ability vis-à-vis a particular context, as I have made clear the writing tasks (and other elements of context) that formed the basis for my conclusions about concept formation. As I wrote in Chapter I, our question should not be "Have basic writers reached cognitive maturity?" but rather "What kinds of cognitive abilities do our writers exhibit and under what conditions?" If concept development is context-dependent, we need to establish the contexts in which basic writers are able to develop concepts, determine the contexts we want them to adopt (i.e. specify at the very minimum the writing tasks and our
expectations), and design a curriculum that "'marches slightly ahead' of the student['s]" level of development, "thus allowing that student's reach only slightly to exceed his or her grasp" (Lunsford, "Cognitive Studies," 157). Our point should not be to classify our students according to universal developmental schemes (which are limited, at best). Our point must be to teach writers the cognitive strategies necessary to produce the kind of thinking-in-writing necessary for college work. As I wrote above, our question should be "What kinds of cognitive abilities do our writers exhibit and under what conditions?" The answer this study provides is that basic writers developed concepts in personal experience essays in a classroom setting in which they were guided through revision by their teacher. The next question for these writers should be "What cognitive ability can they demonstrate in a different context?" If we asked for writing that used material more removed from their personal experience or assigned tasks that asked them to generalize about a broader range of experience than their own, would they now be able to develop concepts? Are these tasks similar enough to ones they accomplished and different enough to be slightly beyond their reach? These are questions we must now ask and try to answer.
Pedagogy

Research discussed in Chapter I shows that one reason basic writers do not revise is that their classes do not teach them how, either because revision is not a part of the curriculum (Susan Wall and Anthony Petrosky) or because the classes use an instructional model that impedes revision by emphasizing product over process, by emphasizing editing, by favoring linearity rather than recursivity, by failing to conceive of writing as discovery, by ignoring the writer's role in constructing meaning, and by simplifying the interaction of thought and language (Christopher Gould and John Heyda). The students in this study did revise, and Chapter III describes the curriculum of their classes, one that included revision and nurtured it. Certain results of the case studies further address pedagogical concerns, and I will discuss those now.

Fundamental throughout this study has been an insistence at every step that the teacher, course design, commentary on student papers, and research techniques emphasize the potential instead of the deficiencies in basic writers and their texts, but nowhere is this emphasis more apparent than in the discussion of pedagogy. It begins with a teacher's
attitude toward students. Teachers of basic writers must create "warm, encouraging" classrooms (Troyka, 1982) and be interested in their students' intellectual lives and their personal lives, insofar as the personal pertains to the students' academic success. Teachers must praise their students' efforts, watch students' missteps without undue alarm, and be patient. They must be confident that their students know more than they can write, and teachers must confer upon their students' texts the same respect they give professional authors. The respect for the students' lives and texts should be accompanied by restraint, the teacher refraining from the imposition of his or her intentions and concepts.

The results of this study suggest that in their classes, teachers should encourage dialogue between themselves and their students as a way of reducing the estrangement basic writers feel in academia and as a reinforcement of written commentary on student papers. Further, teachers should intervene directly in the writing process; that is, they should be available to give immediate feedback when students are in the process of making rhetorical choices. In-class conferences were the vehicle for this communication in this study.

In a course where revision is integral, a number of drafts is a necessary part. The writers in this study
composed three versions of each essay, three required drafts, that is; in fact, all of the students composed at least five. The course design that gave credit for rough drafts, the opportunity for useful, not demoralizing advice from the teacher about how to revise, in-class time for writing, and that fostered risk-taking and a sense of text ownership in the students created in them the desire to revise their papers more than the syllabus asked them to. They had found internal motivations to revise, not just external ones.

Although requiring several drafts does not insure revision, certain habits of the basic writers in this study indicate that several drafts are preferable to one draft and a final paper. We have seen the number of steps involved in the conceptual activity these writers undertook. While more accomplished writers might compress several steps, basic writers may take these steps one at a time and may need several drafts to complete conceptual revision. The non-linearity of composing further suggests that basic writers may achieve more complete conceptual development if they work through several drafts, since concepts may skip a draft (as did communicative ability in Roberta's essay). Students who write a single rough draft before the
polished paper are more likely to submit papers in which they have not explored very deeply the concepts they are working with. Nor will they have written enough, in many cases, for their teachers to have a clear sense of the main concepts they are working with. A single draft may deprive the student of important steps in conceptual development and hinder teachers in their attempts to guide revision.

Other characteristics of the revision in this study also have pedagogical implications. For years, textbooks have considered contrast (as in comparison-contrast) and other modes (like definition, cause and effect, and process) to be patterns of organization. Occasionally, these books have given lip service to the heuristic function of such modes by acknowledging that they are patterns of thought, but the textbooks (and teachers who use them) usually do not go far enough in teaching students how to use the modes heuristically. They still tend to teach the modes as prescriptions for textual order.

This dual role is not understood as well as it should be because the inventive use of modes such as contrast is not well-documented or explained, a void this study has filled. One of the problems with the typical use of comparison-contrast as a heuristic tool
is its application to only the beginning of the writing process; but invention occurs throughout composing, as we have seen. Roberta continued to use contrast heuristically until her last draft. The essay began with rather gross contrasts, its main idea expressing the contrast between person and place and its body illustrating two contrasting dates. These gross contrasts were embellished in stages as the essay progressed by the rearrangement and selection of new detail and by naming the elements of comparison and generalizing about them. Throughout the process of embellishing the contrasts, Roberta invented new contrasts and relied upon existing material to guide her creation of more. For example, the word unexpected, expressed in the second draft, became an organizational principle for an entire paragraph in the fourth. In this process, Roberta used contrast heuristically, but not just at the beginning when she was "finding her topic." This study shows that if we are really serious about teaching comparison-contrast as a mode of thinking, we must find ways to integrate it into the whole composing process, not just the beginning.

Levels of specificity are also characteristics of both text structure and heuristic. Teaching students to shift among levels in their writing is a powerful
strategy, one that is probably instrumental in their learning how to compose solid generalizations and revise conceptually. Hays insists on "the immense value of requiring students to practice heuristic procedures that force them to view phenomena hierarchically" as a means of achieving what she calls "discursive maturity" (494). Hays continues: "For freshmen, this might mean requiring students to give reasons for their assertions and examples to illustrate those reasons, and then to develop these examples, in Christensen's terms, to a third or fourth level of generality" (494). Teaching students to manipulate levels of specificity, even in the simple form of adding specific detail that Sally was capable of, invests their own texts—and the thoughts those texts represent—with hierarchies. It teaches writers to perceive and express those hierarchies.

The value in teaching students where and how to add specific detail couples nicely with the use of personal experience essays in basic writing classes, a type of essay that is criticized for its lack of similarity to most college writing assignments. This type of essay is not widely required in college courses outside departments of English, and furthermore, so the argument goes, it asks the writers to do only that which they already know how to do—tell a story; it does not
challenge them to think critically and write abstractly.

While other kinds of writing, besides the personal experience essay are certainly valuable, we should not discard this sort of essay on the grounds that it does not challenge our students and that it does not require critical skills. Telling stories may come naturally to our writers: Tammy did so when she was stuck, Roberta began her essay with stories, and Chuck wrote a story as he began an essay different from the one examined here. Even though our writers wrote stories naturally, they did not write them well; they did not compose them so much as spill them out, the stories taking their shapes either from the order in which events happened or were remembered. Composing stories, designing them as Roberta did the two narratives that support her thesis, challenges our students. An even greater challenge is to compose stories so that they illustrate some abstract significance and contribute to an expository point in an essay. We have seen that there is a back and forth interplay between revisions of the narrative elements in an essay and revisions of the expository ones. Each contributes to the development of the other. While personal experience essays may not require the amount of abstraction that other essays may, they nonetheless push basic writing students to extend the limits of their
abilities. To that extent, these essays are effective tools for teaching the processes of abstraction and generalization that will be used for more abstract tasks. Personal experience essays are also a valuable tool because students writing them are more likely to develop a sense of text ownership if they write about material from their own lives than if they write about material far removed from them, material they know less well. To "own" texts about academic subjects, they need to know those subjects as well as they know their personal experience. Indeed, academic subjects must become part of their personal experience.

From the case studies, we can draw other conclusions about the assignments we give basic writers, particularly the value of summaries and other shifts in genre, the kind of vocabulary work we ask for, and the choice of topics we allow.

A sequence of drafts that is more or less linear, each one growing out of the previous one may not be the best. Both Tammy and Roberta wrote drafts that did not follow such linearity, both with considerable benefit to the final shape of the essay they composed. Each wrote at some point a draft in a different genre that seemed to be heuristic because of an effect from the genre.
Robert's essay proposal was an important document in the conceptual development of her essay. It contributed two important conceptual terms (unexpected and enjoyable date), one very important insight (the first generalization about communicative ability), and the first analysis of the outcome of each date. This draft makes proportionally greater conceptual contributions than any of the others, and the proposal, consequently, emerges as a very important document in the process of Robert's composing. Unlike the other students' proposals, it summarized the details of an already written document; it moved up the ladder of generality. Moving up, generalizing from an already written piece, the genre itself was heuristic. Robert's revision from the journal to the proposal is the same kind of bottom-up pattern of revision that we have seen on a smaller scale within a single draft. This assignment shows the value in summarizing one's writing at some point in the process of composing. Summarizing can force the writer to a different level of generality.

Because the nature of concept development looks, at times, like improvements in vocabulary, particularly when such development entails making a concept more specific (for example, "enjoyable date" instead of "fun time"), we might conclude that better vocabulary could
assist development on the conceptual level. Surely, it
would; but the corollary assumption that exercises
designed to improve vocabulary would directly touch the
conceptual level seems unlikely, given the complex
relationship between the surface and conceptual levels
of texts. The relationship of any particular vocabulary
item to the conceptual level is unpredictable.
Consequently, the more effective vocabulary work is
probably undertaken in the context of the individual
student's writing.

A final word remains about the assignments we give
basic writers. In order for a student to be engaged in
vocabulary work or indeed in any work related to their
essays— from proofreading matters to revision, they must
have a sense of text-ownership. Otherwise, the activity
is as artificial as drill. Allowing students to choose
their own topics is one very effective way of fostering
that sense in students. This reason argues strongly
that students should be allowed such choice. In
contrast, David Bartholomae (1983) argues persuasively
that teachers are responsible for stretching the limits
of their students' abilities by asking students to write
and think in new ways. Teacher-sponsored assignments
are not, however, the only means of achieving this end.
Methodology

Previous taxonomic research on revision, based on the model of transformational grammar, has been unable to describe the complexity of global revisions, a topic I discussed in Chapter II; but global revisions are the ones of most importance in a study of thinking and writing. I also explained in Chapter II that protocol research was not appropriate for this study because basic writers probably could not articulate as much as the text reveals about revision and thinking. As the study progressed, we have come to see more specifically the limits of protocol research with basic writers: these writers are unable to differentiate parts of the text from the whole. A further methodological consideration addressed in Chapter II is the limited kinds and number of textual changes that poorer writers make under test conditions.

In a classroom setting, with concrete guidance on revision, the basic writers in this study revised their writing. They wrote many drafts and made many conceptual changes. They demonstrated through their revision several important cognitive strategies: generalizing, synthesizing, abstracting, developing concepts and conceptual networks, and creating hierarchical structures composed of several levels of
generality. They drew inferences from my comments on their writing and used the inferences to guide their revision. They sometimes used my comments with prompts in the text to draw inferences about changes, and sometimes they inferred the need for change without any prompt from me; that is, they showed some measure of independence in their revising. The results of this study grow directly out of its methodology and force us to change the portrait drawn by previous research of how basic writers revise. Consequently, the methodology used here makes a considerable contribution to our knowledge about basic writers and their revision.

A second important contribution comes from using case studies. These studies make their contribution to research in several ways, one of which is by performing the exploration preliminary to theory development. The taxonomy I created to examine the interaction of revision and thinking is a flexible research tool with classroom application. Its categories (concepts and conceptual networks, levels of specificity, and the interaction between narrative and expository elements) are dynamic and interact with one another. This study has used the taxonomy to describe the revision of basic writers, to examine thinking in writing, and to guide the evaluation of drafts. It can contribute to theories
about all three: revision, cognition, and evaluation. To revision, it offers the possibility of describing global changes. To cognition, it offers the means of viewing and teaching crucial strategies, like generalizing and synthesizing. To evaluation, it offers a system for addressing the conceptual level of text.

Certainly one of the main contributions of this study is, however, pedagogical. The categories of revision are ones that adapt to instruction and evaluation when coupled with an understanding of the surface and conceptual levels of text and archaeological reading. As I explained above, we need categories of describing and evaluating revision that represent the kinds of thinking and writing we want our students to produce. Research has not yet demonstrated that revision produces better writing, but we do know that revision can produce better thinking from basic writers (or, more accurately, the written representations of better thinking). To teach revision, however, we need to know what cognitive strategies we wish to teach, which ones can be taught, what textual structures result from those cognitive operations, what happens to the text when students are learning those strategies, and how to respond to drafts so that students learn to use prompts in the text to develop those strategies. These
case studies, although not definitive, portray certain cognitive strategies that can be taught (specifying, generalizing); show how drafts change when writers use these strategies (narration to exposition; platitudes coexisting with insights); and explain, with examples, effective teacher responses to draft writing and independent student responses to prompts for revision. This study shows how we can teach revision to basic writers.
## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>CLASS WORK</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction and expectations; invention: free-writing, listing, outlining, journal keeping.</td>
<td>Diagnostic paragraph; RHG, chs. 1 and 2, pp. 173-75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diagnostic paragraph due; introduction to exposition; discussion of topic sentence, unity and paragraph objective 6.</td>
<td>Expository paragraph due; RHG, pp. 72-86 176-79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>Expository paragraph due; discussion of development and coherent arrangement; objective 6 (fragments).</td>
<td>Diagnostic paragraph revised; journals due; RHG, ch. 14 and pp. 390-91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Revised diagnostic paragraphs due; discussion of coherence and objective 7; freewriting and preparation for midterm paragraph; In-Prints.</td>
<td>RHG, ch. 8 and pp.139-46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Midterm paragraph; introduction to English 110 and the essay.</td>
<td>RHG, ch. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>Discuss midterm paragraphs; introduce essay proposals; discuss objective 6; In-Prints and sentence-combining.</td>
<td>RHG, pp. 277-80 and ch. I0; 1st draft of Essay 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion of subordination and coordination cont’d; in-class critique of essay proposals; invention exercise.</td>
<td>RHG, ch. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>No class; Staff Development Day (Pick up essay proposals from teacher or Workshop office Wed., Thurs., or Fri.)</td>
<td>In-Prints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In-class critique of introductions; workshop on revising 1st drafts.</td>
<td>Final draft of Essay 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>Review of paragraph-level and sentence-level errors; draft 2 due; In-Prints and sentence-combining.</td>
<td>Revised proposal and outline for Essay 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In-class workshop on draft 2; in-class critique of proposal for Essay 2; In-Prints.</td>
<td>Introduction for Essay 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Essay 1 due; invention activity and outlining for Essay 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>In-class critique of revised proposal and outline; review of effective introductions and conclusions; In-Prints and sentence-combining.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, January 29 class only. Friday, January 30 classes will meet.**

**Monday, January 19 Martin Luther King Day, no class.**
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In-class critique of introductions for Essay 2; discussion of Essay 1.</td>
<td>Rough draft of Essay 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>In-class critique of rough drafts; discussion of introductory and concluding paragraphs; In-Prints.</td>
<td>RHG, ch. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion of sample essays in terms of course objectives; in-class workshop on rough drafts.</td>
<td>Final draft of Essay 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Essay 2 due; in-class workshop on proofreading; In-Prints and sentence-combining.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion of successes and mistakes in Essay 2 in terms of course objectives; course evaluation.</td>
<td>Notebooks due; buy a folder in 053 Pressey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preparation for final exam; SET's; voting for In-Prints award winners; notebooks due.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL WEEK:** Final examination schedule appears in "Syllabus: Course Requirements for Writing Workshop Students."

*Specific assignments are made in class.*
APPENDIX B

REQUIRED TEXTS for English 100.03


OPTIONAL TEXTS for 100.03


## APPENDIX C

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION BY CLASS

#### Class I (1:30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>ACT/SAT</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3/10/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/9/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10/15/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11/12/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2/25/59</td>
<td>21  (married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/17/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2/14/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHtch</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11/6/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12/28/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10/13/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT (Chuck)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7/9/55</td>
<td>25 (married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11/6/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8/13/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10/4/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>12/16/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL STUDENTS:** 17

Male: 9  Female: 8  White: 12  Minority: 5

#### Class II (2:30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>ACT/SAT</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/3/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12/22/61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC (Tammy)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/25/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2/7/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1/29/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3/5/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3/22/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7/20/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS (Roberta)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8/29/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS (Sally)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2/14/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9/23/62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL STUDENTS:** 11

Male: 5  Female: 6  White: 9  Minority: 2

* Denotes missing data

Named students are the subjects of the case studies; the names are pseudonyms.
ASSIGNMENTS

Diagnostic Paragraph Topic

The topic for this assignment was uniform among all sections of Writing Workshop courses.

When you freewrote on your New year's Resolutions, you probably mentioned several that you had made or would like to make. Now choose one resolution and, in a 150 to 225 word paragraph, state the resolution and either explain why you made this resolution or describe the difficulties you foresee in keeping it. Or choose one reason why people should or should not make New Year's Resolutions and explain that reason.

Expository Paragraph Topics

I chose the topics for this assignment from a pool of topics used by the whole Workshop staff.
1) What is your one pet peeve? State what it is, and explain fully why (whatever it is) irritates you.

2) What is the single most prominent quality of a bad driver? Explain why that quality makes the driver a nuisance to other drivers or to pedestrians.

3) What is one thing you would change about O.S.U.? Explain fully what is wrong with this one thing and how it affects you or other students. You might even suggest how it should be changed.

4) What one thing do you hate most about winter? Why?

Midterm Paragraph Topics

From a group of seven topics approved for the midterm exam by the Director of the Workshop, I chose, according to my instructions to do so, the following five topics and gave them to my students a few days in advance of the exam. On midterm day, again following instructions, I reduced the choices to three topics (numbers 2, 3, 5) and asked students to write on one.

1) Many people charge that television has made Americans passive onlookers who watch rather than participate, who indifferently listen rather than actively converse. Do you agree with these charges? In a 150 to 225 word
expository paragraph, state and explain with specific facts the one best or worst quality of television. Be sure your paragraph has a clear topic sentence that states a specific attitude toward your topic (more specific than "good" or "bad," "best" or "worst" quality).

2) Who is the most irritating person in your dorm, in your home town, or in America? In a 150 to 225 word expository paragraph, state and explain through well chosen facts and examples the one personal characteristic that makes the person so irritating. Be sure the paragraph has a clear topic sentence that includes a definite attitude toward the topic.

3) Where do you go for entertainment or recreation? What makes it the perfect place for you to enjoy yourself? State and explain, with well chosen details and examples, the most prominent trait that makes it "your place." The expository paragraph should have a clear topic sentence that states a definite attitude toward the topic.

4) If you could describe yourself, a friend, a teacher, or anyone else in one word, what would that word be? In
a 150 to 225 word expository paragraph, use appropriate
details and examples to explain why the word describes
yourself or another person. Be sure your paragraph has
a clear topic sentence that includes a definite attitude
toward the topic.

5) Monday, January 19, has been declared a holiday in
Ohio in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King.
Although the former Nobel Prize winner will be
remembered for a number of accomplishments, what one
accomplishment, goal, or personal quality of the man
will be remembered longest? In a 150 to 225 word
paragraph, state that one accomplishment, goal, or
quality, and use appropriate details and examples to
develop your topic. The paragraph should have a clear
topic sentence and a definite attitude toward the topic.

Essay Topics

Students had complete freedom to choose their topics for
the two essays. The only constraint was that they were
to shape the topics into expository essays; pure
narrative or description was not acceptable.
Final Exam

Of the ten approved topics designated for the final exam, I chose the following six and announced them a few days in advance of the exam.

1) Students receive all sorts of advice from parents, teachers, and friends about attending college. What advice did you receive that helped you the most in college? Or, what advice did you receive that proved to be the most unfounded? Be specific. Identify the source of the advice, what the advice was, and how exactly it has helped or failed to help you. Make sure your expository essay is well-developed and has an introductory and concluding paragraph.

2) Do parents harm their children in the long run by making their lives too easy? Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Be careful to explain how children's lives can be made too easy and how this could hurt or help them later on. Make sure your expository essay is well-developed and has an introductory and concluding paragraph.
3) Enid Haupt of *Seventeen* magazine wrote, "I've never met anyone who wanted to be a teenager again." In an expository essay to be read by educated adults, explain what you believe is the most prominent feature of the teenage years. Your thesis should contain a specific attitude and your essay should reflect a rationale for why you selected the subtopics you did. Make sure your essay is well-developed and has an introductory and concluding paragraph.

4) Ah, springtime! A time to get out of school for a bit, to forget the memories of a harsh winter, to breathe fresh air, watch the flowers bloom, hear the lovely songs of the birds coming back north, and a time during which a young man's or woman's fancy turns to love. But spring is also the season when students start their scrambles for summer jobs, when they begin to critically evaluate their futures, or when they decide to turn off to school and just drop out to enjoy the activities connected with warm weather. In an expository essay to be read by your peers, explain the significance of springtime to you, or explain how the onset of spring presages anxiety or danger for the college student. Present a thoughtful, detailed, and
gracefully written expository essay that is well-developed and has an introductory and concluding paragraph.

5) In an expository essay directed at incoming Writing Workshop students, discuss the value of keeping a journal or any other record of your reactions to goings-on during your freshman year. **DO NOT** pick out subtopics at random. Make sure your essay has a unifying thesis and that your thesis and support contain a rationale for why you have chosen to discuss the points you do. Your essay should be well-developed and should have an introductory and concluding paragraph.

6) In a well-developed expository essay, explain what one aspect of writing causes the most difficulty for beginning or intermediate writers. Make sure your essay has an introductory and concluding paragraph.

Journal

Students were asked to write in their journals every day (for a total of five pages a week). The journals were collected eight times during the quarter. I read them, responded to their content or related the journal to
class activities, and graded them with checks, pluses, and minuses. The following is a list of directions and possible journal topics used Workshop-wide. I distributed it to my classes.

KEEPING A JOURNAL

Why keep a journal? Because it will help you to remember, collect, and explore your thoughts and experiences.

Remember—a journal is not a register of actions; it is a register of reaction. What got to you? What "grabs" you? A journal is your record of your "special" feelings, observations, confusions, and unexpected attitudes that you don't want to forget.

Additional Uses of Your Journal: Jotting down theme possibilities, practicing description, testing words. Your journal can hold: lists, dreams, letters, tentative poems, reminders, faces, schemes, remembered words, drawings, inspiration, lyrics, etc. It is a quarry; you write in it without any external pressure to be "right" or profound. There is no need for self-censorship. It
is your notebook where anything can be erased, modified, intensified, pursued.


SUGGESTED TOPICS:

Review a movie, restaurant, concert, television program. What makes your room or apartment "uniquely you"? What is the ideal date? What is the ideal job? Does your pet have a personality? How do you escape? What has a dream told you? Where do find "sanctuary" on or off campus? Who is a hero? Describe a hypocrite. What music is "required" listening for you? Devote several entries focusing on the times you laughed during a week. What, generally, can you say about your
sense of humor?

What stereotypes annoy you; which do you enjoy?

Describe your residence at 8:00 am, noon, 8:00 pm, and midnight. Use all senses possible. Discuss the unique atmosphere.

Describe an exciting/boring party. What makes each different?

What is the most unique feature of your home town?

What makes you feel "awe"?

What is vulnerability? How, specifically, have you felt it lately?

How are you "separate," but not "alone"?

Where can you get the best coffee, hamburger, pizza, beer, etc. in Columbus?

Write a letter to your high school principal now that you are at college. Tell him or her how the high school prepared or failed to prepare you for college. Make specific c and recommendations.

Which is more important for O.S.U.—a Rose Bowl team or more books for the library?

React: "Greeks," the biggest fools on campus!

"Greeks," the luckiest group on campus!

What needs changing most on campus?

Describe "your" color.

Has criticism of smoking gone too far?
How does loneliness differ from being alone?
When and how did you first notice the seasons changing?
Should there be more pass-fail courses?
Should the draft be reinstituted?
Why do/don't you go home on weekends?
Should attendance affect your grade in a course?
Is the U.S. too consumer-oriented?
Is "middle-class" a positive or negative term for you?
Should people have to retire at sixty-five?
What is the importance of your ancestry?
How significant is disco?
How does your "inside" differ from your "outside"?
Are life-long friends impossible?
Discuss a current political issue.
Who should be the next president?
What bad habits do you need to eliminate?
What is your biggest embarrassment?
Describe an object that is vital to you.
Write a letter that points out to a prospective employer your greatest assets.
Discuss the wisdom of what has been called the Tony Kubek commandment: "Play the ball. Don't let the ball play you."
What do you collect? Why?
If you could have five minutes of free air time at 9:00 pm on all three networks this Sunday, what would your message be to America?

What examples of chauvinism have you encountered today?

Are critics of television too fussy, unrealistic?

Do pro sports receive too much attention?

What is your best time of day?

Should Americans be forced to buy more energy-efficient cars?

What trait do you like least/best in others? In yourself?

Is the term "housewife" appealing to you?

Why are you going to college?

Compare your expectations of college to its reality.

In what do you take most pride?

Is self-esteem the same as conceit to you?

Discuss a diet that works.

Describe a time when you have had to lie.

What was the best part of your parents' raising you? the worst part?

What is your favorite magazine?

Construct a primer on body language.
APPENDIX E

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND GRADING POLICIES*

BASIC WRITING: 100.03

Course Objectives for Paragraphs:
1) The student can write a paragraph which responds to an assigned topic.
2) The student can write a topic sentence which focuses the paragraph on one main idea.
3) The student can write a paragraph in which all the sentences support the topic sentence.
4) The student can fully develop the central idea in a paragraph using specific examples or facts.
5) The student presents information in a paragraph in a coherent order, using transitions appropriately.
6) The student writes clear, complete sentences which use subordination and coordination correctly.
7) The student uses agreement and reference correctly.
8) The student uses words accurately and spells them correctly.
Grading policy:

A  The paragraph shows excellence in all paragraph-level skills.
B  The paragraph shows above average handling of all paragraph-level skills.
C  The paragraph shows adequate handling of objective (1) and at least two additional paragraph-level skills.
E  The paragraph shows adequate handling of only two, one, or none of the paragraph-level skills or has 6 or more errors in skills 6-8.

Course Objectives for Essays:

9) The student can write an essay in which all the paragraphs satisfy paragraph-level skills (2-5) and sentence-level skills (6-8).
10) The student can write a clearly focused thesis statement in the introductory paragraph.
11) The student can write a multi-paragraph essay in which all the paragraphs support and develop the thesis statement.
12) The student can present information in a coherent order, which includes the logical ordering of paragraphs and the appropriate use of transitions between paragraphs.
13) The student can write an essay in which the concluding paragraph restates and extends the thesis (points to the importance of the thesis).

**Grading policy:**
A Excellence in all essay- and paragraph-level skills.
B Above average handling of all essay- and paragraph-level skills.
C Adequate handling of all essay- and paragraph-level skills.
D Below average handling of essay-level skills or two paragraph-level skills.
E Below average handling of essay-level skills; or inadequate handling of sentence-level skills (e.g. approximately 15 sentence-level errors in a 500 word essay).

**ERROR COUNTING**

Keep in mind the distinction between marking and counting off. Mark or correct whatever you wish; just don't bleed over the paragraph [Ftn: this also applied to essays] so much that the students won't be able to
see what their major problems are. The errors that we do count off for can best be grouped under our Course Objectives.

Sentences

Punctuation

1. DO COUNT as an error

   a. Fragments (and sentence external capitalization errors)
   b. Run-Ons (main clause plus main clause with no punctuation between them)
   c. Comma splices (main clause plus main clause with a comma between them)
   d. Incorrect use of semicolon
   e. Incorrect punctuation that produces ambiguity or confusion
   f. Apostrophe errors

2. DO NOT COUNT as an error

   a. A comma between a subject and its verb
   b. A comma for a missing word (see "Omitted
c. Commas used incorrectly with restrictive and non-restrictive relatives
d. Commas used incorrectly after introductory material
e. No comma before coordinating conjunctions between sentences (e.g. sentence and sentence CORRECT TO: sentence, and sentence)
f. Placement of commas and terminal punctuation in relationship to quotation marks
g. Non-sentence external capitalization errors

Clarity: DO COUNT OFF for

1. Garbles—ungrammatical sentences, blurred patterns
2. CONFUSING dangling modifiers and faulty parallelism
Agreement, Reference, and Usage

DO COUNT OFF for

1. Subject-verb disagreement
2. Noun-pronoun disagreement
3. Count as ONLY ONE ERROR PER PARAGRAPH
   a. *I* alternating with *you*
   b. *A student* or *a person* alternating with *they/their*
4. Wrong word forms
   a. Tense shifts
   b. Wrong verb forms (e.g. *I done* for *I did*)
   c. Incorrect singulars and plurals

DO NOT COUNT as an error

1. Indefinite third person singular pronouns such as *everybody*, *no one*, *someone* referred to as *they/their*
2. *You* alternating with *one*
Word Choice and Spelling: Count off for

Misspelled words (COUNT ONLY ONCE PER PARAGRAPH)
Omitted words
Wrong words

1. Depend more on denotation than on stylistic connotation and exercise judgment about priorities. You may wish to do more marking than counting off.

2. Homonyms may or may not be misspelled, e.g. ther're home is a wrong word or homonym error, while there home is a wrong word or homonym error, but not a spelling error.
GR ABEDS

The examinations in all courses will be written and revised in a single class period. The examination topics are announced in advance. In order to prepare for the examinations, you need to perform all work as assigned. The nature of the two five-hundred word essays assigned in 100.03 will be discussed in class. Furthermore, a portion of your grade will be based on journals and paragraphs written out-of-class. Fulfillment of other course responsibilities includes attending and participating in classes, making and keeping appointments with your instructor or tutor, and handing in your notebook (including your journal) at the end of the quarter. Keep all your writing assignments including rough drafts, revisions, and graded work in your notebook.
Your grade is determined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percent of Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 1 (out of class)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 1 (out-of-class)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 2 (out-of-class)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other out-of-class writing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final examination</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment of course responsibilities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course grade:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These materials were standard throughout all sections of Writing Workshop classes; not only were teachers to follow them but they were also to distribute them (except for the document entitled "Error Counting") to their students.
Appendix F

Hillock's Modes of Instruction

Presentational Mode

Characterized by

(1) relatively clear and specific objectives, such as to use particular rhetorical techniques;
(2) lecture and teacher-led discussion dealing with concepts to be learned and applied;
(3) the study of models and other materials that explain and illustrate the concept;
(4) specific assignments or exercises that generally involve imitating a pattern or following rules that have been previously discussed; and
(5) feedback coming primarily from teachers (143).

Natural Process Mode

Characterized by

(1) generalized objectives, such as to increase fluency and skill in writing;
(2) free writing about whatever interests the students in a journal or as a way of 'exploring a subject';
(3) writing for audiences of peers;
(4) generally positive feedback from peers;
(5) opportunities to revise and rework writing; and
(6) high levels of interaction among students (143).

Environmental Mode

Characterized by

(1) clear and specific objectives, such as to increase the use of specific detail and figurative language;
(2) materials and problems selected to engage students with each other in specifiable processes important to some particular aspect of writing; and
(3) activities, such as small group problem-centered discussions, conducive to high levels of peer interaction concerning specific tasks (144).
Individualized Mode

In the individualized mode of instruction, students receive instruction through tutorials, programmed materials of some kind, or a combination (146).
Appendix G

Journal Entry - I

Roberta

1) It doesn't really matter where I go out for entertainment. 2) I believe that it is who you're with that counts.

3) I once dated a very boring guy. 4) His idea of fun was to talk endlessly about politics. 5) He took me out to a very nice restaurant. 6) One that I wouldn't go to everyday. 7) The meal consisted of rice pilaf as an appetizer, shrimp as a main course & chocolate mousse as dessert. 8) The food was terrific. 9) The atmosphere was elegant, soft music, dimmed lights and glowing candles. 10) It put me in a mood that what I wanted to hear was how beautifully my hair was styled, or how the color of my dress changed the color of my eyes to a deep blue. 11) All he wanted to talk about was how Carter's campaign failed, and what he should have done. 12) It would have been an interesting term paper for my Political Science class, however, what I
wanted to hear was far from that. 13) Any attempt to change the subject failed since he had a one track mind.
14) Dancing wasn't the best solution to end the political discussion, because he could talk and dance, both at the same time. 15) So much for a Sat. night.
16) An apposite to the above example is An example of a fun time 17) I planned to go to Kings Island one Sat. afternoon with another guy. 18) When we started Sat. morn, the sun was shining, there was a cooling breeze to cool the August heat and it was a perfect summer day.
19) It wasn't too long before after we arrived, that a rain began to fall. 20) Soon half of the rides were closed down and the shelter's were packed with peaple fearing to get wet the rain. 21) Seeing that we would be like a couple of sardines in a tin can, we decided to risk walk around the park, and see the sights deserted sights of Kings Island. 22) We talked, and laughed at the sight of each other's wet hair. 23) We both looked like we took a jump in the lake.
Essay Proposal - II

Roberta

1) Through experience I've learned that it doesn't matter where I go out for entertainment, it's who I'm with that counts. 2) Once I dated a very intelligent guy. 3) He took me to a very nice restaurant, where we had a very nice dinner. 4) The topic he chose to talk about all night bored me to tears. 5) I tried to change the subject by starting a new one, but we always ended up on the same boring subject. 6) I even suggested dancing in hopes of a better topic for our conversation. 7) That evening wasn't fun for me because my date was inconsiderate to my idea of an enjoyable evening. 8) On the other hand I had an enjoyable date at Kings Island during an unexpected rain. 9) We both were soaked through to the bone, and my hair was a mess. 10) My date was a casual and talkative person. 11) The difference between this date and the previous one is that we talked to each other rather than him dominating the whole conversation. 12) I had a very nice time, even though the rain tried to ruin it.
1) It doesn't matter where I go for entertainment; I believe it's who I'm with that determines how good of a time I have when I'm out with a guy, I like to have a fun time. 2) I am not particular about where we go on a date because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date, what I feel is important is my date's personality. 3) If he doesn't have a pleasant and interesting personality with just a dash of adventure, than even the liveliest party wouldn't be much fun while I was with him. 4) On the other hand, if my date has a combination of the three qualities, a boring party would even be fun while I was with him.

5) When I was invited to dinner by guy known to be intellegent, it was a promising Saturday night. 6) All dressed up we headed to one of the most expensive restaurants in town. 7) The atmosphere was elegant with dimmed lights, glowing candles, and soft music, setting a relaxed mood. 8) The fantastic dinner consisted of rice pilaf as an apitizer, shrimp & steak for the main course, and chocolate mousse for desert. 9) With all those wonderful __________ I was almost bored to tears. 10) His idea of fun was to talk endlessly about
politics, specifically why Jimmy Carter's campaign failed. 11) It would have made an interesting term paper for a political science course, however, that subject wasn't where my interests lay. 12) I would have loved to dance, or hear how beautiful my hair looked, but no, I was stuck with Jimmy's campaign manager for the next election year. 13) That promising Saturday wasn't the best because my date failed to relate to my idea of a fun time.

14) My next date started out on a very nice Saturday afternoon at Kings Island amusement park. 15) The ride to Cincinnati was great because the sun was shining and there wasn't a cloud in the sky. 16) It wasn't too long after we walked through the main gate that the rain began to come down in buckets, surprize! 17) Soon half of the rides were closed, and the shelters were packed with people fearing the rain. 18) Seeing that we would be a couple of sardines in a tin can, we decided to walk around the park and observe the deserted sights of Kings Island. 19) We laughed at the sight of each other's wet stringy hair, dripping clothes and of all the people jammed inside the rain shelters.
1) I am not particular about where I go out on a date, because that's not the important factor of an enjoyable date. 2) What I feel is important is my date's personality. 3) My date's personality should be daring to coordinate with my love of doing the unexpected. 4) Also he must communicate honestly with me because I enjoy getting to know my date through an open, two way conversation. 5) If my date has an interesting and pleasant personality with a dash of adventure, even a boring party would be fun while I was with him. 6) On the other hand, if his personality is dull and lifeless with a talent for being boring, than even the liveliest party would be a bummer while I was with him. 7) I base my requirements of personality on the experiences I've had while on two specific dates.

8) When I was invited to dinner by a very intelligent guy, it promised to be a fun Saturday night. 9) All dressed up in my new red dress with the slit up the side, we headed out to the Fisherman's Wharf. 10) The atmosphere of this expensive restaurant was elegant with dimmed lights, glowing candles, and soft music that
set a relaxed mood. 11) We were seated at a table for two in a cozy corner, and tried to read the menu by candle light. 12) We ordered a fantastic meal consisting of rice pilaf as an appetizer, shrimp and steak for the main course, and chocolate mousse to top it off right. 13) During desert I got tired of hearing my date talk endlessly about why Jimmy Carter's campaign failed. 14) I would have rather talked about him and his hobbies or what he does for fun on the weekends, but I was stuck listening to a talking term paper for a political science class. 15) My intelligent date was trying so hard to impress me with his knowledge, that he forgot to tell me what the real person inside of him is like.

16) My next date started out on a cool, summer morning driving to Kings Island amusement park. 17) As we rode to Cincinnati, the brightly shining sun increased the temperature rapidly into the nineties. 18) This sudden rise of heat wrinkled my freshly ironed cotton blouse, and gave an unwanted oily shine to my face. 19) When we arrived at the crowded park, we had to push our way through the thousands of people, when combined with the heat was most uncomfortable. 20) After a very tiring hour of trying to have fun, rain began to come down in buckets. 21) Our first reaction
was to run inside a shelter, but seeing that we'd be processed into sardines by the mob of rain-fearing people, we decided to rough it, and walk barefoot in the rain. 22) A constant downpour saturated our clothing and hair, but the rain was so cooling from the hot summer rays, we didn't care how silly we looked. 23) We splashed through the cool puddles, and totally enjoyed the deserted park. 24) We laughed at the sight of each other's stringy hair, wet clothes, and the sardines jammed inside the shelters. 25) Throughout the whole day, my date was willing to be himself. 26) He didn't run for cover from the rain just because everyone else did, which shows his daring personality. 27) I got to know my date and the real person inside him through his actions and our conversations. 28) We talked, what seemed to be everything about each other, his feelings, what he enjoys and hates and how I feel. 29) So inspite of the rain I had a fantastic day with my date.

30) Through these two specific dates, I have learned that it's not where I go on a date that determines if I have fun; it's who I'm with that really matters. 31) I prefer to be with a guy who has a daring personality about his feelings. 32) If he doesn't have these qualities, then I wouldn't have fun anywhere he took me.
Appendix H

Essay Proposal
Sally

1) The topic I want to write on is teaching music to young children. 2) I feel I want to teach music because I've grown extremely fond of the many aspects of music & I feel inside that that's what I want to do as a career. 3) I feel that music is a very important part of everyone's lives & I want to teach children because that's when they are first exposed to many things, especially music & I want to bring music into many children's lives. 4) I also believe instrumental music is an important part of society today with our orchestras, concert bands, singing groups & their bands, & the many other instrumental groups that there are. 5) Children are exposed to music this way, but I want to teach them so that maybe one day that can be that part of society too.

Thesis idea - I want to teach music to young children because music is an important part of life & it's important that children are exposed to it well & in many areas.
Rough Draft

Sally

1) Why do I want to teach instrumental music to children? 2) Well, I truly enjoy instrumental music & want to share it with children. 3) Learning music can be a very enriching part of a person's life, & I want to be able to enrich people's lives when they're young. 4) I want to be a part of young people's lives when they are learning music & finding out that it can be a rewarding & important part of their lives. 5) I now have been teaching the piano to young children for 2 years. 6) I have seen what can happen to a child who takes music lessons. 7) The child can either do well or not. 8) Usually since it is a new adventure & the parents are encouraging the child, the results are good. 9) When results are good, I feel good because I feel like I've taught them something meaningful. 10) When results are bad at times & then soon look much, much better from more specific instruction, it gives me pleasure in knowing that I have the ability to teach someone from my own knowledge. 11) I teach from first day beginners to more advanced students & when the beginners first learn the different notes on the piano or know & can tell me what note I'm
pointing to, it makes me feel I've taught something new & exciting in their lives & because they've passed that first step, they are anxious to learn even more.

12) There are many major steps in teaching music to children & when they pass each of them, step by step, I feel rewarded because I can see the excitement & joy on their faces from their accomplishments. 13) For example, after they have learned to read their notes, they learn to play songs. 14) Then they advance to more difficult pieces & when they can play all the music assigned to them, it not only gives me a sense of accomplishment, but they feel good because they've worked hard & learned something that can enrich their lives. 15) The next stop is teaching them exercises, since they have gotten accustomed to the instrument better, to develop their fingers better. 16) Passing each & every step means they are further down the line to playing better & better or as some of them sometimes say to me "as good as you do." 17) Seeing the results from a child who is learning something new in his life is very meaningful to me because it means he is further down the line to being in more advanced stages. 18) A particular example that sticks in my mind that will always mean a lot to me & sometimes gives me encouragement when times are rough in school is
something one of my best students said to me recently.  
19) He has learned a lot & has advanced well in the 2 yrs. he has played & enjoys playing the piano. 20) One day at his lesson he said to me, "Someday, I want to teach piano, too". 21) That almost brought tears to my eyes from the overwhelming feeling that I was able to teach so well & enrich someone's life so much that they wanted to pass their ability on also. 22) If he keeps on playing & practicing the way he is now, he will be able to pass on good traits & experiences to someone else quite well.

23) I've learned a lot from teaching piano & have enjoyed it. 24) Oh, sure there are many unfavorable moments & times when no practicing is done or the child just can't understand me, but the rewards from the accomplishments & enrichments in their lives so far outweighs the unfavorable times. 25) But I also want to be able to pass on my knowledge & ability to young children on musical instruments. 26) Perhaps, one day, one of my students will feel as I do!
Final Essay

Sally

1) Why do I want to teach instrumental music to children? 2) I know now that I want to teach instrumental music because of the experiences I've had from teaching the piano. 3) I have seen the excitement, joy, and eagerness on the children's faces from their accomplishments. 4) Teaching music to children has been an exciting, rewarding, fulfilling, sometimes disappointing, but also a learning experience that gives me a sense of accomplishment.

5) I have been teaching the piano to young children for two years. 6) I have seen what can happen to a child who takes music lessons. 7) They usually like it and progress, and when they progress, sometimes their excitement is overwhelming and they feel good because they've learned something new. 8) Some children do well and others not, but usually since it is a new adventure and the parents are encouraging the child, the results are good. 9) When results are good, I feel good because I feel as if I've taught those children something meaningful. 10) When results are unfavorable at times and then soon look much, much better from more specific instruction, it gives me pleasure in knowing that I have
the ability to teach someone from my own knowledge. 11) When for example, I was teaching scales to Kent, one of my students, he would have trouble remembering and playing one particular difficult scale because he couldn't remember the number of flats and because of that problem he couldn't play the A flat major scale. 12) He worked on that scale for a week and when he came to his next lesson he still had trouble. 13) At that lesson he showed me his problem of forgetting the number of flats in the scale and I showed him an easy way to visualize the position of the flats on the keyboard so that he could remember the scale.

14) There are many major steps in teaching music to children and when they pass each of them, step by step, I feel rewarded because I can see the excitement and joy on their faces from their accomplishments. 15) For example, after they have learned to read notes, they learn to play songs. 16) They advance from simple songs like "The Postman" to more difficult pieces like "Home on the Range" and when they can play all the music assigned to them, it not only gives me a sense of accomplishment in teaching them something new, but they feel good because they have worked hard and learned something that can enrich their lives.

17) The next step is teaching them exercises, since
they have gotten accustomed to the instrument better to develop the strength and mobility in their fingers. 18) One exercise that good is to start with the thumb on C and put each finger on each of the keys going up till they get to C. 19) Then they have to try to run their fingers up and down in that fashion a few times. 20) Then they progress to both hands doing the exercise at the same time. 21) This helps their fingers gain more coordination. 22) Passing each and every step means they are further down the line to playing better and better to more advanced stages. 23) A peticular example that sticks in my mind that will always give me encouragement when times are difficult in school is something Kent, one of my best students said to me recently. 24) He is not like some children who are a ham and plays the piano to show off, but he always knows his music well, he asks questions and he is eager to have more work to do. 25) One day at his lesson when he had done extremely well, he suprised me by saying, "Someday, I want to teach piano too". 26) That almost brought tears to my eyes from the overwhelming feeling that I was able to teach so well that he wanted to pass on his ability also.

27) I've gained a large amount of knowledge from teaching piano and have enjoyed it. 28) Certainly,
there are many unfavorable moments and times when no practicing is done or the child gets upset because he can't play his song, but the rewards from the accomplishments and enrichments in their lives and seeing the joy and excitement on their faces when they learn their songs, far outweighs the unfavorable times.  

29) Perhaps, one day more of my students will feel as I do!
Appendix I

Essay Proposal

Tammy

1) My topic is about the Musical I was in my Senior year and what I learned about myself from this special part in my life.

2) I loved every moment of this production, even the hours of rehearsal that was spent putting the show together. 3) This play is very special to me because I learned that if I have confidence in myself when I'm reaching out for something, like a lead roll, that I can do it, but only if I really want it and work for it will I receive. 4) I learned that I can perform in front of an audience by singing, dancing, and express a feeling of a character. 5) The singing was pretty easy, the range was, since I was a soprano in choir and I tried out for a lead roll, alto part. 6) So, most of the songs were in my range. 7) The dancing was the funnest part. 8) The practices were long and difficult. 9) I knew that putting the show together would take a lot of time, but I just didn't realize the time spent would be the whole evening during the week and weekends.
10) First we practiced our lines, just speaking them with a little action by using some of the props and each day increased, until we were ready to perform on stage.  
11) First we had to learn the terms to be able to work on stage. 12) Terms like up stage, which is furthest away from the audience and down stage, closest to the audience once we knew this we just put the acts together that we learned while working in the choir room. 13) Gradually everything started coming together. 14) and the more we rehearsed the more we knew our lines by memory.  
15) The time came for the show to be put on, time really flew by it seemed like we just started practicing and then we were getting costumes ready and making posters to inform citizens about the production.  
16) The show we started and played for 4 nights.  
17) We wanted to keep the play going for at least another weekend, but we couldn't.  
18) So much time spent, for just a few days played.
1) Our high school choir holds an annual musical usually held on a Thursday for the members of the school including the students and faculty. 2) Then the show would be put on the following weekend for anyone else who had been informed about it and was anxious or willing to pay the price of admission. 3) There was a lot of time spent on this production, which made it more than worth while to see.

4) Once everyone found out if they made the part they tried out for, the members who had a part in the play began practicing shortly afterward. 5) On weekdays, after school, we practiced in the choir room where we put together the basic parts of the show. 6) Our director was mainly trying to get everyone to know his or her own character in the play. 7) Each of us had to be a different person when we acted so that the audience could depict what we were portraying. 8) The part I had to play was a totally opposite character of my personality in real life and so was everyone elses. 9) I had the part of a dance hall girl who had waited "fourteen years" to get married to a gambler, Nathan Detroit. 10) The Name of the show was "Guys and Dolls"
and I played the part of Adelaide. 11) This character role was hard for me to act out, since I wasn't used to being as boisterous as the part of Adelaide. 12) While we worked in the choir room I had gotten used to being sweet to Nathan and at the same time I had gotten used to being upset with him. 13) I had to jump from a happy to an unhappy character in short intervals. 14) The hardest part for me to do was when I got so upset at Nathan that I was suppose to cry. 15) I didn't do a very good job at this, because at first I wasn't taking the emotions of my character serious. 16) Everyone, including me, was getting too confident about his or her part. 17) We had to move on to something more complicated.

18) After we had gone through the whole play in the choir room we began to work on the stage. 19) This part in the constructing of the show took the longest, because we also worked with the different props that were required in each scene. 20) The dances and the songs were also being worked on during this time. 21) Usually it was Saturday when the people involved with a dance or had a song to sing in the musical that had to show up at these practices. 22) The dialogue had to be memorized, so the more we rehearsed the more the part stuck in our heads. 23) We rehearsed the first act one
day and the next day we went over act two. 24) Each day the play went smoother, faster and more professional.

25) Before dress rehearsal everyone had to get his or her own costumes together. 26) Some were made, some rented and some were bought. 27) It cost a lot of money to put this production on. 28) The money spent on the costumes, back drops, media, and the dialogue books had all come up to quite a sum. 29) We needed a large majority of our town to attend the show to make it a total success. 30) Keeping this in mind and hoping for others who where there to recommend seeing the show to friends we made sure the dress rehearsal had gone smoothly.

31) The show itself was a success, but the attendance wasn't the best. 32) It just so happened that the Catholic high school's basketball team in our town, Sandusky Saint Marys was going to state the same weekend that we put on "Guys and Dolls." 33) The large audience we had hoped for suddenly decreased. 34) The majority of the audience were parents and relatives of the members in the musical. 35) It was a shame that the attendance wasn't a full house, but the participants of the show will always remember this experience and cherish every minute.
Final Essay
Tammy

1) My senior was the best year I ever had, simply because I was involved in extra curricular activities.
2) The highlight was when I performed in the high school musical, "Guys and Dolls," as Adelaide, a lead role which I was afraid I wouldn't be able to handle. 3) But the confidence others had in me, gave me confidence in myself. 4) Without their help I wouldn't have made it through the long hours of preparation.
5) My friends at school helped me build up my confidence by saying the nice comments, which are expected from friends, such as: they were glad I got the part and that they were sure I would do a great job. 6) This meant a lot to me, and I appreciated it, but the one person who I got the most help from than out of any of my other friends was my cousin. 7) I spend a lot of time with my cousin, since we were in the same homeroom and we walked home from school together everyday. 8) Everytime I saw him he would call me Adelaide, and he got other people to call me by the same name. 9) This extra attention in school made me feel like a real star. 10) When we walked home from school he would ask me to sing a song from the play. 11) At first I was a little
shakey about singing in front of my cousin, but he made me realize that if I couldn't sing or act in front of him, one person, that it would be difficult to sing in front of a group of people. 12) I knew he was right, so, everyday after school he listened to me sing as we walked home. 13) I sang my songs so much that he became very familiar with them, and started singing along with me.

14) As soon as I got home I played the record from the musical, which my mother bought for me. 15) My mother helped me a lot and not only financially, but also by spending her time helping me get prepared for the show. 16) I was worried about the costumes I needed to get and all I knew was that I had to have at least seven outfits. 17) I didn't know what kind of outfits I was suppose to wear or where I was going to get them, until my mother helped me. 18) She went through the dailogue of the play and found some hints and examples of what to wear for each scene in the show. 19) All I did was to make a list of everything I needed and my mother started to put my outfits together by borrowing, buying, and even making some of them. 20) She made a pair of pants and a shirt, then my sister helped her make a dress for me. 21) It seemed like a never ending job. 22) I tried to help her as much as I could, but without her help I
wouldn't have been as organized and prepared for the show. 23) I spent as much time as I could helping my mother, before I had to get back to school for practice with the whole cast.

24) At school the choir director, who was the director of the play, helped me with my dialogue. 25) He would first let me act out the part as I saw fit and then he would give his interpretation on how he thought it should be expressed. 26) He also told me what should be accented when I spoke my lines, and that hand gestures would make me even more expressive. 27) An important part of the dialogue was also the facial expression. 28) Sometimes this was the hardest part of all, getting my facial expression to explain how I was suppose to be feeling during a certain scene. 29) It was really hard for me, in one particular scene, where I had to make my face look like I was crying, and I very seldom did it right. 30) I practiced everyday of the week for three or four hours a day and I had a lot on my mind. 31) I needed to cry to get rid of some of my worries. 32) Any way, the director had told me that I never hit the right pitch yet, in one of the songs I had sung. 33) I felt that I was trying too hard to get such a harsh comment, but it wasn't anything I should have cried about. 34) I cried anyway, even though, I didn't
mean to and I couldn't stop. 35) My crying fit right in with the next scene in which I was suppose to cry. 36) No one could believe how well I acted, I never did that scene as well as I did that night. 37) Sometimes I wonder if my director planned it that way, just to let me know that I could do it if I really wanted to.
Appendix J

Essay Proposal
Chuck

1) For the beginning 35 MM photographer, developing and printing your own "black and white" photographs will help you past being an amateur and put you well on your way to being a professional photographer. 2) a beginner's course in black and white photography will save time and money. 3) A lot of people, when they first obtain a 35MM camera, start clicking away and in a short time will have used up their first roll of film. 4) No big deal, just take the film down to the store and have it developed and printed. 5) That's when they get their first surprise. 6) The novice finds that their "35MM Gizwitchit" is going to cost them an arm and a leg. 7) Developing and printing one roll of color film, 24 exposures, at today's prices can be done for about a little over eight dollars. 8) The film will cost about two-fifty. 9) Already there's around ten bucks wrapped up in the first try. 10) When the film gets back, it's time for the second surprise. 11) Some of the pictures didn't turn out. 12) Why? 13) You don't know!
14) Because no one told you what could go wrong. 15) Hopefully the store you took your film to has a "goof proof policy" and will buy back up to half of your 24 prints. 16) Then, you should either think about giving it up or taking a course in black and white photography. 17) A beginning course in black and white photography not only offers an instructor who will give useful information on camera operation and how to take pictures, (which saves money) but the equipment necessary to develop and print film. 18) It is through developing and printing that the amateur learns what is going on when he or she takes the picture. 19) There are many people interested in photography. 20) Those people who really enjoy it will take at least one course. 21) Just being exposed to people discussing their work in photography will help to develop your own skill.
1) For the beginning photographer a course in 35MM black and white photography will save precious time and money. 2) More often than not, when a novice first finds himself with a 35MM camera, he will start clicking away and in a short time will have used up all of the first roll of film. 3) No big deal, just take it down to the store and have it developed and printed. 4) That's when they get their first surprise. 5) The novice finds that his "35MM Gizwitchit" is going to cost him an arm and a leg. 6) Developing one roll of color film, 24 exposures, at today's prices can be done for a little over eight dollars. 7) The film will cost about two-fifty. 8) Already there's around ten bucks wrapped up in the first try. 9) When the film gets back, it's time for the second surprise. 10) Some of the pictures didn't turn out. 11) Why? 12) Mr. Novice doesn't know. 13) Why? 14) No one told him what could go wrong. 15) Hopefully the store he took the film to has a "goof proof policy" and will buy back up to half of the 24 prints. 16) Then, Mr. Novice should either think about giving it up or taking a course in black and white
photography.

17) A beginning course in black and white photography offers the amateur photographer the necessary equipment and information that will help make each exposure count. 18) The photographer saves time and money this way. 19) The amateur might learn on their first day of class that color film is more expensive to buy and process than black and white film. 20) For the amateur, there will be quite a few mistakes made in the beginning, so why pay more for them if it is not necessary? 21) Color film requires a much stricter adherence to the processing instructions and must be processed and printed in absolute darkness. 22) The student doesn't have to wander around in the dark when he is in the darkroom because black and white printing can be done with a "Red" safe light burning the entire time. 23) Most black and white printing papers are not sensitive to red light. 24) This type of printing paper is called orthocromatic.

25) The class will be informative and almost always interesting. 26) The students that are there have an expressed interest in photography. 27) Being exposed to other people interested in the same area can also help in learning the different aspects of photography. 28) Sharing the "how and why" a picture was taken will
expand your knowledge of the subject. 29) This can work in two ways. 30) First, if there is something wrong with your print, other students may spot it and offer solutions on how to correct it. 31) Secondly, you may see an interesting technique used. 32) Asking how this was accomplished will expand your knowledge of photography. 33) Even in the darkroom there is always someone who will lend a hand when needed. 34) Just speak out, "My print came out black". 35) Someone will just as easily answer, "Decrease your exposure time".

36) The Instructor will explain camera operation fully. 37) Light, and how to deal with it, is the sum and substance of photography. 38) Therefore, camera operation is taught with this in mind. 39) The instructor will explain how aperture (f-stops) and shutter speed regulate the amount of light that reaches the film (focal plain). 40) How different films except light faster or slower. 41) The darkroom enlarger works much like a camera. 42) It too has f-stops and exposure times. 43) With the enlarger you are taking a picture from the film onto your paper. 44) The composition of film is important. 45) Explanations about film (silver salts suspended in a clear jell on an acetate backing) are essential in processing and printing film. 46) The instructor will explain the rules of the photographer at
the end of the last day of class tell you that it is not how well you stick to the rules that will make you a professional, but how well you break them.

Rough Draft

(III)

Chuck

1) For the beginning photographer a course in 35MM black and white photography will save precious time and money. 2) More often than not, when a novice first finds himself with a 35MM camera, he will start clicking away, and in a short time will have used up all of the first roll of film. 3) No big deal, he thinks, just take it down to the store and have it developed and printed. 4) That's when he gets his first surprise.

5) Mr. Novice has found, upon picking up his film, that his 35MM camera is going to cost him an arm and a leg. 6) Developing and printing one roll of color film, 24 exposures at today's prices cost's around eight dollars; the film another two dollars and fifty cents. 7) He kisses the big ten and each of the two hard earned quarters good-by. 8) He finds that its very expensive
to learn this way. 9) When he looks at his prints he will find that about half of them didn't turn out. 10) Why? 11) Mr. Novice doesn't know. 12) All hes sure about is his new found hobby is getting more expensive by the minutes. 13) Hopefully, the store he took the film to has a "Goof-proof policy" and will buy back up to half of his 24 prints. 14) Then Mr. Novice should either think about giving it up or taking a course in 35MM black and white Photography.

15) A beginning course in 35MM black and white photography offers the amateur photographer the necessary information and equipment that will help make each exposure count. 16) The photographer saves time and money this way. 17) The amateur photographer may learn, in the first class that color film is more expensive to buy and process than black and white film so he'll begin with black and white. 18) There will be quite a few mistakes made in the beginning so why pay more for them if its not necessary.

19) The class will be informative and almost always interesting. 20) The students that are there have an expressed interest in Photography. 21) Being exposed to this enviroment will help in learning the different aspects of photography. 22) Sharing the "How and Why" a picture was taken will expand your knoledge of the
subject. 23) This is where the greatest savings in time occur.

24) Knowing how to develop and print the comparatively inexpensive black and white film will help to save money when using color film, even if the color film is sent out for processing. 25) Black and white photography parallels color therefor; the knowledge gained through experience, when taking the class will be of benefit even if you aren't developing and printing your own film. 26) Turning an outrageously expensive hobby into a pleasurable inexpensive hobby is achieved in the way.

27) The instructor will explain the rules of the photographer at the end of the last day of class. 28) He will explain that a photographer doesn't waste expensive film, which is a hard and fast rule. 29) Then he will explain other rules about creativity, film and camera operation. 30) He will end by saying that it's not how well you stick to these last three rules that will make you a professional, but how well you break them.

Please make all comments here (explain fully)
Final Essay
Chuck

1) For the beginning photographer a course in 35MM black and white photography will save precious time and money. 2) When a beginner finds himself with a 35MM camera, he will start shooting away, and in a short time will have used up all of the first roll of film. 3) Taking the exposed film to the store will be a learning experience for the beginner. 4) He will learn that half of the prints didn't turn out the way he had intended them to turn out. 5) He will also learn that his new hobby is expensive. 6) It is surprising to find that to buy, develop, and print one 24 exposure roll of color film will cost over ten dollars. 7) Unfortunately, those were only two things learned.

8) In a beginning course of 35MM photography, one would learn that color film is more expensive to buy and process than black and white film; there will be alot of mistakes made in the beginning so the student will start with black and white film. 9) Why pay more for mistakes if it's not necessary?

10) A basic course offers the amateur photographer the necessary instruction on camera operation that is needed in order to get the correct exposure. 11)
Aperture, opening, shutter speed, and film type all play critical roles in getting the correct exposure. The effort that is put into learning these aspects of camera operation will be rewarded in the future by a savings of both time and money.

13) The class will be informative and almost always interesting. 14) The students have an expressed interest in photography. 15) Sharing thoughts on "How or Why" a picture was taken will expand one's knowledge of the technical and creative aspects of photography. 16) Being creative or getting the picture technically correct are the two main reasons people buy 35MM cameras. 17) Although no course can guarantee creativity, a basic 35MM black and white photography course will provide the technical knowledge and experience that will free the amateur photographer of the common mistakes and allow him to work on proficiency or creativity. 18) Thus, the student's greatest savings in time occur this way.

19) Turning an outrageously expensive hobby into a pleasurable, inexpensive hobby is achieved either by taking one basic course in 35MM black and white photography or by taking many years, using hard earned money and learning by trial and error.
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