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ABSTRACT

This study examined the teaching and learning of analytic writing in response to literary and informational readings in an intermediate, undergraduate English as a Second Language (ESL) composition course. An ESL composition instructor and her two sections of an ESL composition course (N=29) were selected to collaborate with the researcher. For a period of ten weeks observational and case study techniques were employed to describe and analyze the instructional context. Twelve of the 29 students were selected for extended analyses of their written work in order to document their development as analytic writers, especially through their three major writing assignments. Also, three students were selected for case studies from these twelve to study the students' experiences in the writing course. Four types of analyses and their corresponding measures were used to study knowledge for analytic writing at both the local and global level of text: (a) syntactic complexity (T-unit), (b) classification of statements of content (type of statement), (c) essay genre (structural analysis), and (d) level of abstractness (focused and unfocused analysis). Data from classroom observations, tutorials, interviews, declarative knowledge probes, questionnaires, and essay analyses were used to describe thoroughly the processes involved in teaching and learning to write analytically, and to describe change over time in the writing in response to reading of a sample of ESL writers. Results indicate that daily classroom interaction shapes the students' interpretations of what it means to write analytically, and of their
expectations for this writing course. The students' personal and educational backgrounds also influence these interpretations. In this particular classroom, activities relating to procedural knowledge about issues of content were excluded, while the only expectations enacted in the classroom were those shared by all the agents involved in the conceptualization of the targeted course. Results from the essay analyses offer limited support to the idea that the students were developing as analytic writers. Although students had internalized the genre conventions for analytic writing, there was only limited development of their interpretive skills necessary for analytic thinking and reasoning. Two major implications from this study concern (a) the importance of integrating both discourse structure and students' thinking to enable students to write analytically in a second language, and (b) the realization that learning to write analytically is a complex process that necessitates institutional support at all levels of its implementation and conceptualization
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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

TEACHING AND LEARNING ANALYTIC WRITING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Introduction

Learning to write analytically is one of the most important components of academic success for non-native speakers (NNSs) of English. Writing in a manner appropriate to the academic community is a key issue for foreign students wanting to pursue their educations in the United States. These students must learn to write a variety of essays using a range of modes (narration, exposition, persuasion, description) with which they may not be familiar. It follows, then, that successful learning of acceptable essay genres—as defined by the academic community of native speakers (NS)—becomes a high stakes issue for NNSs attending English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in the United States.
Success in academic writing does not always come easily to NNS who must learn five basic skills in mastering a new language: (a) speaking, (b) reading, (c) writing, (d) listening, and (e) the social dimension of learning a Second Language (L2) as defined by Yalden (1987). This last fifth skill is often described as a "cultural or disciplinary conversation, a process not unlike an invitation to a social club" (Graff, 1992, p. 77). In this sense learning to write depends on having a sense of what other writers are concerned with, what topics they focus on, and the kinds of arguments they expect to encounter.

Historically, writing has been regarded as the least important of these language skills, especially as far as programs for the beginning and intermediate learner are concerned. Rivers (1968) refers to writing as "the handmaid of the other skills." (p. 241) and this attitude was particularly evident during the preponderance of audiolingualism. Although recent developments in teaching methodology have argued for the increased importance of writing in the teaching of foreign languages, some students in other countries may have very limited exposure to these new developments (Reid, 1996). This is often complicated by cultural and societal factors that may be in conflict with current trends in American pedagogical approaches. Particularly amenable to such conflicts are approaches to language instruction such as communicative learning, learner-centered, and process-oriented that demand increased student involvement in the learning environment.

The current American concern with writing in an L2 may, therefore, not be shared by the rest of the world. English as a Second Language composition instructors must be aware of the diverse writing backgrounds of NNSs. Nothing
should be assumed regarding these students' previous writing education, even in the case of students who have achieved high degrees of literacy in their first languages (L1). Accordingly, the ESL writing curriculum should encompass the teaching and learning of both structural knowledge and procedures for writing analytically about ideas and experiences. The community of ESL composition scholars seeks a balance between the process and the product aspects of teaching writing. Neither content nor essay structure must be neglected in any viable approach to the teaching of ESL composition. Theories of writing instruction--both in English as an L1 and in ESL--take this fact into account (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Hillocks, 1986, 1995; Johns, 1990; Langer & Applebee, 1987; Leki, 1991; Raimen, 1991; Silva, 1990; Valdés, Haro, & Echevarriarza, 1992).

For this study, analytic writing about reading is defined as writing that moves beyond restatement of content, as in summary writing, to more focused examinations of evidence of literary interpretation, requiring the students' own ideas. Analytic writing most commonly takes the form of a series of statements presented through thesis and support to establish relationships between ideas and events. Although summary writing is an art in itself that requires mastery of its idiosyncratic skills (Braine, 1995), the current study focused on the transformation of ideas and knowledge inherent to analytic writing, for these are the writing skills that pose special problems to both native speakers (NS) and NNSs (Belcher, 1995a, Durst, 1987). Accordingly, analytic writing is a skill that needs to be fostered, developed, and practiced in NS' and NNS' classrooms alike.
Learning to write analytically is central to achieving academic success (Applebee, 1981, Belcher, 1995a, Durst, 1987, Greene, 1993), for analytic writing is a powerful tool in the academic world that fosters the development of critical thinking skills on which is based the academic exchange of ideas. Perhaps most importantly, such writing tasks require the intellectual contribution of ideas on the part of the writer including analyzing and synthesizing ideas and experiences. Although the need for ESL students to learn critical thinking skills is questioned by some writing scholars (for example, Leki, 1995), this researcher sees both critical thinking skills and analytic writing as indispensable for surviving in the academic world and for learning to reason and think systematically about new information and facts.

Analytic writing is particularly important for ESL students pursuing their studies at an American university. Studies of ESL writing argue that ESL students want guidance from their writing instructor (Belcher, 1995a, Casanave, 1995), and that this guidance often takes the form of direct instruction on essay organization; that is, structural knowledge (i.e., modes, genres, and conventions) designed to support learning to write analytically. The challenge in teaching ESL composition, then, becomes one of enabling students to use structural knowledge as a framework or organizational tool for their ideas or literary interpretations.

Many ESL composition researchers believe academic writing can be taught and learned with thoughtfully conceived curricula and instruction. Cumming (1995) thinks students who have not yet developed as analytic writers need to be directly taught how to do so, as opposed to being exposed passively.
to different kinds of texts, and for this he favors a holistic approach—including, but not limited to, modeling and evaluation—to the presentation of the writing task. Reid (1993, 1996) believes coherence to be very important in the ESL composition curriculum, because "although ESL language errors may indeed interfere with successful communication,... more global differences in situational and rhetorical background knowledge may form the basis for ineffective ESL academic prose and/or reader misunderstanding" (Reid, 1996, pp. 219-220).

Although not always (Ackerman, 1993), analytic writing is often credited with providing for manipulation of content, which increases retention and understanding (Langer & Applebee. 1987) resulting in tasks that provide learning opportunities for writers (Kroll & Reid. 1994; Reid & Kroll, 1995). Belcher (1995a) sees the teaching of analytic writing, or critical writing, as a way of empowering critical participation in academic discourse:

It is argued that critical writing will help students begin to see themselves as experts-in-training, to overcome their reluctance to challenge established authority, and to understand the social dynamics, or the ongoing dialectic, of their fields of study (p. 135).

How might ESL composition instruction and curriculum for analytic writing be conceptualized in a way that captures issues of both essay organization and thoughtful content? Hillocks (1986) presents the distinction between declarative and procedural knowledge of form and content for writing that instructional programs must include.

A writer calls upon lexical, syntactic, and generic forms to generate a discourse. In addition, as various studies suggest, writers have to call upon strategies which enable them to process the raw data which is to be the substance of the discourse. It is useful to think of the repertoire as including two types of knowledge--what several writers have called
declarative and procedural knowledge—or, to put it more simply, knowledge of what and knowledge of how (pp. 232-233).

Although this distinction may not always be so apparent during the act of composing, it offers different types of knowledge needed to write effectively in a particular academic genre that requires analytic writing. Accordingly, declarative knowledge can be taught and learned more or less explicitly in the classroom, while procedural knowledge is the more tacit how-to knowledge gained experientially during the act of composing. What then is the appropriate blend of declarative and procedural knowledge for the development of analytic writing skills in the ESL writer? Should structural knowledge be taught explicitly using model essays or indirectly using general procedures for drafting and revision? These are some of the questions that shaped this study of teaching and learning analytic writing in ESL composition classrooms.

The field of ESL composition acknowledges that (a) different rhetorical structures affect the writing of ESL students (Johns, 1993, 1995a; Leki, 1991), (b) the ESL composition student population might not be familiar with rhetorical structures used in American writing programs (Bernhardt, 1991; Mohan & Lo, 1985), (c) it is often mistakenly assumed that ESL students are familiar with these rhetorical structures (Reid, 1996), and (d) learning academic genres for writing often becomes a matter of academic success or failure in an English medium university (Dudley-Evans, 1995). Because these assumptions are so widely accepted, almost every composition program focuses on attempting to teach prescribed genre structures for academic writing. The present study sought to look, in some detail, at the teaching and learning of analytic writing in
an ESL composition classroom at a major research university, and specifically, at how an instructor's concern for both declarative and procedural knowledge of format and content resulted in the ESL students' sometimes uneven learning to write analytically about literary and informational texts.

Significance of the Problem

Although current ESL composition theory stresses the importance of rhetorical structure in the final written product, few ESL composition studies thoroughly describe or attempt to understand the teaching and learning of structural knowledge and the role it plays in analytic writing. A more unmitigated inquiry into the particularities of the way ESL students develop as analytic writers in ESL composition courses at the undergraduate level would provide both theoretical and pedagogical answers to the question of how academic skills can be fostered in such classrooms. What kind of instructional support fosters the development of analytic writing skills if, for example, structural knowledge for analytic writing is emphasized? What may be missing from ESL students' writing experiences? What are the students' perspectives on the value of the instruction they are receiving? What do the teacher's conceptions of writing analytically about reading contribute to both the teaching and to ESL students' learning to write for the academy?

When it comes to learning analytic writing, the stakes are particularly high for ESL writers. Socialization into the academic community is necessary for NSs (Bartholomae, 1985; Rose, 1989), as well as for NNSs who must also
learn to write academic prose despite differences in culture, language, schooling, and literacy. English as a Second Language students need to be given the tools necessary to enter the written intellectual exchange of ideas which is at the base of academic discourse, and one way to do so is to foster their analytic writing skills. Moreover, research in the field of ESL composition should benefit from studies of instructional contexts that may, at some point, provide knowledge for the development of a comprehensive theory of ESL writing instruction.

The present study also has implications for the individual teacher's understanding of his or her implicit theory of writing instruction. Although not always explicitly stated, it is true that every teacher, and every researcher, relies on a theory of writing instruction. Johns (1990) states that "as teachers, we will benefit from becoming aware of our theories and the assumptions that underlie them" (p. 24). A description of the instructional context for the development of analytic writing in an ESL composition classroom will begin to provide valuable information into the teaching/learning processes and factors that shape them.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and understand, in as much detail as possible, the writing development occurring in two ESL composition classrooms of undergraduate, intermediate, international students at a major research university. Special emphasis was placed on the development of the
students as analytic writers in the context of instruction and in writing in response to literary and informational readings.

The research questions were:

(1) How does daily classroom instruction provide a context for learning to write analytically?
   (a) What specific instructional activities and routines does the instructor use on a daily basis?
   (b) How do these activities and routines help the students gain declarative knowledge for analytic writing?
   (c) How do these activities and routines help the students gain procedural knowledge for analytic writing?

(2) How are the courses' broader curricular expectations and structures operationalized in this particular classroom?
   (a) How does the enactment of the curricular expectations and structures affect the way the students learn to write analytically?

(3) How do the students' experiences with, and perceptions of, the readings get transformed into analytic writing?
   (a) How is procedural knowledge put to work in the tutorials?
   (b) How is procedural knowledge put to work in the classroom?

(4) How do the students' previous writing experiences affect the way they learn to write analytically?
   (a) How do the students' personal backgrounds affect their ability to write analytically?
(b) How do the students' writing instruction histories affect their ability to write analytically?

(c) How do the students' declarative knowledges about structural knowledge for analytic writing shape the way they develop as analytic writers?

(5) How do the students' written works evidence their progress and ability to write analytically about literary and informational readings over the 10-week period of the course?

(a) How do measures of syntactic complexity account for student progress throughout the 10-week period?

(b) How do measures of level of abstractness portray the students' ability to write analytically about readings?

(c) How does an analysis of the structural framework of the essays uncover the students' development in their use of rhetorical conventions?

(d) How does a content analysis of the essays reveal the development of ideas and critical thinking skills in the students' essays?

The answer to these (and other emergent questions) should help to understand some complex dynamics that are part of the context for learning to write analytically and should provide a deeper understanding of the broader concept of learning how to write in a second language within the academy.
Definition of Terms

Analytic Writing

Also referred to as "critical writing" (Belcher, 1995a), analytic writing is a complex writing task in which logic rules both organization and argumentation (Applebee, 1981, 1984). A central component of analytic writing is the use of logical or hierarchical relations among points (Durst, 1987), that require the essay to move beyond chronologically sequenced frameworks to interpretive frameworks to explain cause and effect relationships. For this particular study, "logic" is defined by American English standards.

Content Analysis

Examination of essays' content for the purpose of studying the development of ideas and critical thinking. The system, adapted from Newell (1996), uses the T-unit as the unit of measure to categorize various types of response to a literary text. It is presented below with examples

Descriptive Statements

Statements in which some part of the story is literally retold. Quotes and low-level inferences are also descriptive statements. Includes statements in which the story's form, language, characters, or setting is described. (Example: "Susan Rawlings, a middle-aged woman, was found dead by suicide by breathing gases at Fred's Hotel in room 19.")

Personal Reaction Statements

These are statements of the writer's own reaction to or engagement with the story. Almost always stated in the first person, these may contain elements
of interpretation or evaluation, but can be distinguished from both by their focus on the subjective and on the emotional. Accordingly, these statements capture the ways a student might interpret ideas differently from others. These statements may express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the author's methods. (Example: "I don't like this story because of the ending.") Or, they may focus on reactions to the world of the story as if it were not fictional, including moral appraisals or expressions of liking for specific characters, and personal statements of how people "should" act. (Example: "The way she thought about her life and future made me admire her.")

**Associative Statements**

These statements include references to, or narration of, writers' experiences and knowledge that they use as examples or illustrations of their understanding of the text. These statements include explicit references to books, movies, actions, and experiences of other people, and aphorisms. (Example: "For example, most banks employ computers to manage all accounts.")

**General Statements**

Statements in which the writer's perceptions of the text are revealed through generalities about their prior knowledge of the world, sometimes tying them to events and characters in the text. (Example: "A house with a small garden in the backyard, weekend trips, weekend shopping, breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Those are what people with money can have.")
Interpretive Statements

In general, these are statements that go beyond what can actually be found in the story—an inference is made based on the text. These inferences help the writer make sense of ideas or decode symbols. (Example: "Also, after the 'problem' came, Susan's love for Matthew was no longer the same.") The writer may discuss motivations or make generalizations about characters or settings in the story. (Example: "She must have had a mental disorder that no one, including herself, realized.")

The writer interprets the events and characters in the reading through his or her own values and perspectives. These statements are often expressed by rhetorical questions or by comparisons between the self and the characters and events in the reading. (Example: "What prevented her from being alone in her life?")

Evaluative Statements

Statements in which the writer uses the criteria of affective or aesthetic appeal, focusing on quality. He or she may speak to how the author has constructed the work. (Example: "In Berry's essay, examples are not enough to support his persuasions.") Evaluation includes a more intellectual reaction to the events of the reading, maybe a judgment about what is "right" or "wrong." (Example: "She is wrong.") Evaluative statements can also be used to judge the sufficiency of what the work is presenting, including its credibility, thematic importance, and moral significance. These may be value statements about the author's methods or ideas. (Example: "In addition, his example is not good.")
**Critical Thinking**

Reasoning and "responding in an evaluative, analytical way" (Belcher, 1995a, p. 135). Accordingly, critical thinking skills are at the base of what academic learning should be about.

**Declarative Knowledge**

Knowledge of the essays' genre conventions, usually presented in the classroom through teacher lectures and/or teacher-led discussions. Hillocks (1986) calls it "knowledge of what" (p. 233), that is, knowledge which permits the identification of forms and their parts at the level of syntax or text. In the context of this study, it is evidenced by students' performance on the knowledge probes.

**Genre Conventions for an Essay**

Include the thesis statement, topic sentence, introduction, and conclusion, among others.

**Instructional Context**

All classroom activities that focus on the instructor and student interactions including lecture and discussion. They are described based on classroom observations in order to understand the shaping influence of instruction on learning.

**Level of Abstractness**

Procedure involving holistic coding of written work to determine the degree to which the writer is able to move beyond summary and restatement to
a focused analysis and interpretation. It is based on the work of Durst (1987), and includes the following levels:

**Thesis and Summary Restatement**

An essay that begins with a thesis statement but reverts to a restating of the reading passage with little attempt to argue and present evidence for the thesis.

**Unfocused Analysis**

An essay that includes a thesis but the body of which contains a series of points or minor claims strung together without explicitly supporting, elaborating, or connecting them.

**Focused Analysis**

An essay that moves away from a restating of plot and/or ideas from the reading passages to form a thesis statement (e.g., claim or generalization that is clearly supported with and argued for using textual evidence and/or personal experience.)

**Modes**

Structural models used when building key parts of a text. The present study dealt with four modes for expository writing:

**Cause and Effect**

Writing that examines the reasons, or explains and/or predicts the consequences, of one or more events.

**Classification**

Writing that sorts items into rational categories for purposes of exploration.
Comparison and Contrast

Writing that points out similarities and/or differences between events, ideas, or people.

Exemplification

Writing that uses examples to illustrate the point being made.

Personal Background Information

Information about the students' individual histories, obtained through the needs analysis questionnaire.

Portfolio Letter

The introductory letter all 29 students wrote to preface their showcase portfolios. The letter provided information about the students' views and interpretations of what they considered to be their best written work.

Procedural Knowledge

"How to" knowledge about writing which is tacit and intuitive and which permits writers to manipulate forms and their parts. Evidenced by the students' ability to follow the genre conventions when writing analytically and to recognize good and less effective writing. Illustrated by interviews and tutorials, and in the way students make decisions about their writing and apply problem-solving strategies when writing.

Students' Profiles

Individual descriptions of each of the students as developed by their interviews, retrospective accounts of composing, classroom observations, and written work.
**Structural Framework Analysis**

Examination of the genre conventions used in the students' essays. It includes the number of paragraphs, the presence or absence of a thesis statement, the thesis statement's position within the essay, the presence or absence of topic sentences, the topic sentence's position within its paragraph, and the presence or absence of a conclusion.

**Syntactic Analysis**

A measure of syntactic complexity (T-unit analysis) used to examine student development throughout the quarter. The various measures included are (a) T-unit count, (b) mean length of T-unit, (c) mean number of error-free T-units, and (d) total word counts.

**T-Unit**

An independent clause and all its related dependent clauses. For example, "The man who was angry ran out of the house" contains one T-unit.

**Tutorial**

One-on-one conference between the teacher and a student designed to provide instructional support, and, in this particular case, lasting twenty minutes.

**Writing History**

Information containing the students' previous experiences with writing, both in and out of the classroom, in both their L1s and in English, and obtained using a writing questionnaire.
Written Work

Three essays written by twelve students that will be analyzed in order to see change over time in the students’ development as analytic writers.

Theoretical Assumptions

In conducting this study, the researcher assumed the following: First, that instruction plays a significant role in shaping the way students interpret the purposes of academic reading and writing. Second, that, in the context of this study, analytic writing is a complex writing task requiring the writer to present and argue for a particular point of view or interpretation. Third, that analytic writing provides the means to the development of critical thinking skills, and that it benefits the overall academic development of the students, especially critical ways of reading literary and informational texts. Fourth, that writing tutorials provide a rich context for the enactment of students’ understanding of structural knowledge for analytic writing. Fifth, that the process of learning to write is facilitated by the “environmental mode” (Hillocks, 1986, 1995) instructional approach--based in process-oriented approaches--which supports students in managing the complexities of learning abstract writing tasks.

Limitations

In interpreting the results of this study the goal is to understand and to describe how one instructor provided opportunities for learning a combination of declarative and procedural knowledge for formal analytic essays leading to
successful analytic writing in an ESL classroom. Also, one should not
generalize from previous L1 and FL research because this study will deal with a
SL setting. Other differences at issue are examined below.

Differences in L1, L2, and FL learners

Composing in an L2 involves interference (both positive and negative)
from the L1 (Odiin, 1989). This occurs not only at a more practical, semantic
level (Lay, 1982), but also at a more profound, structural one (Edelsky, 1982;
Zamel, 1982, 1983). In other words, when students write in a SL (or in a FL),
they utilize resources known to them in their L1, and they follow procedures
familiar to their L1 composing habits. Moreover, as L1 writing research has
employed systematic empirical methodology, L2 writing research has benefited
from developing its own parallel research agendas. It is not surprising then,
that, as Krapels (1990) says, "In general, second language composition
researchers have adopted L1 writing process research designs, and more often
than not their findings have concurred with those of their L1 counterparts" (p.
38).

There are psychological and physiological differences in L1 versus L2
learners. In addition, differences should be expected in SL versus FL learners,
mainly in the amount of input and output available to them. It seems, however,
that a good starting point would be to assess what already exists in the learner's
cognitive structure. Ausubel, Novak, and Hanesian, in the introduction to what
has become one of the most prominent books of the twentieth century in
educational psychology (1968), say: "If I had to reduce all of educational
psychology to just one principle, I would say this: The most important single
factor influencing learning is what the learner already knows. Ascertain this and teach him or her accordingly" (p. vi). Tapping into the students' knowledge of genre structures is a prerequisite for the teaching of any rhetorical structures and can be accomplished by looking at relevant L1 rhetorical structure research. Accordingly, this researcher developed various questionnaires designed to elicit information about the ESL students' intellectual development, including his or her knowledge and experience with school writing. Also, classroom observations and student interviews were included to account for what writing experiences ESL students bring to their analytic writing assignments.

English as a Second Language learners are also being informally exposed (outside the classroom) to English. Moreover, ESL university students are also formally exposed to English in their content courses. It becomes extremely difficult to know the extent of such exposure, especially because it includes the five language learning skills (listening, reading, writing, speaking, and the social component) This fact limits the claims that can be made about the effects of classroom instruction because it may be that outside exposure is the factor producing changes in the students' writing.

L1 versus L2 Writing Theories

The present study used both L1 and L2 writing research as its theoretical base. The ESL composition research community is divided on the issue of the extent to which the use of L1 research methodology is appropriate to conduct L2 writing research. This study is based in the belief that the use of L1 writing research tools is appropriate at this point in time in L2 composition research.
Because the field is relatively new, it would benefit from the sound research methods developed and tested in L1 writing research. Adjustments were made when necessary to accommodate the different L2 context.

Summary

The design of the study is an in-depth case study, the purpose of which is to understand how analytic writing was taught and learned within a context typical of ESL composition instruction, not to provide generalizable results. The researcher has, however, provided as many details as possible to facilitate the possibility of transferability of the findings to other settings and to raise issues for further research. In other words, case study methods were used, not to generalize to other populations, but to contribute to a broader conceptualization of how analytic writing is taught and learned in a particular ESL composition program.

Overview of the Dissertation

The present chapter establishes the central problem and theoretical framework for this study and presents the issues that form the context from which it arose. Moreover, it discusses the purpose and rationale for the research. Chapter two reviews research in areas relevant to the conceptualization of this study, namely (a) the importance of instructional contexts in the development of writers, (b) the significance of structural knowledge in analytic writing, (c) learning to write analytically, and (d) writing
analytically about reading. Chapter three describes the sample, the methods, and the procedures that were used to conduct this study. It includes a description of the system utilized for the analysis of the data, and the approaches followed in interpreting the information resulting from data analysis. Chapter four incorporates the results of the data analysis described in chapter three, including classroom observations and a rich description of the instructional context. Chapter five starts with the profiles of the case study students, and then presents the results and discussion of the analysis of the written essays. Chapter six consists of a description of emergent patterns and differences found in the analysis of the data. It concludes with a discussion of implications for future research in ESL writing development and pedagogy. A complete reference list and appendices follows chapter five. The appendices include all elicitation formats used in the study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter the researcher will first examine recent research in the four relevant areas presented below. Then gaps in the research literature, and ways in which the present study attempts to fill these gaps are discussed.

The research areas deemed relevant to the conceptualization of this study were the following: (a) The importance of instructional contexts in the development of writers, (b) the significance of structural knowledge in analytic writing, (c) learning to write analytically, and (d) writing analytically about reading.

Instructional Contexts

Although some ESL researchers, like Cumming (1992), believe that most research relating to ESL writers is, by extension, research into writing instruction and classroom interaction, this researcher believes descriptive
research into the instructional context of ESL classrooms is somewhat limited. Classroom instruction, whether in composition or content area classes, plays a pivotal role in the acquisition of writing, in general, and of academic literacy (Geisler, 1994), in particular. The instructional context helps the students define the purpose of academic reading and writing tasks, and, most importantly, shapes the students' interpretation of the tasks (Herrington, 1988). It is important, in studies of writing acquisition, to consider the way students envision the tasks set before them. Task interpretation data can be an important source of triangulation in data analysis. For example, in Herrington's (1988) study the class was atypical in that her findings showed that both the instructor and the students perceived the teacher's assignments to serve both transactional and expressive functions. In other words, both the instructor and the students believed the purpose of the writing assignments was to demonstrate, to convince, and to explore one's ideas. Herrington believes that any instructional context should provide students opportunities to both learn from their writing, and to present their ideas through writing.

In recent years L1 writing theory has described this learning process as "instructional scaffolding." Scaffolding is especially important in providing students with support for complex writing tasks and for the interpretation of these tasks without the teacher preempting students' own ideas and knowledge. Two L1 writing theories use the notion of support: Langer and Applebee's (1987) instructional scaffolding, and Hillock's (1986, 1995) environmental mode.
L1 Theories of Writing Instruction

Langer and Applebee's Instructional Scaffolding

The concept of instructional scaffolding is borrowed from the field of child
development, especially Vygotsky's (1981) discussion of scaffolding as a way to
foster general cognitive development. He was interested in exploring and
explaining the development of the human mind (Lantolf & Appel, 1994) within a
sociocultural context. Accordingly, for Vygotsky language became important as
a tool to help develop lower order functions (those mediated by direct links) into
higher order functions (those that are symbolically mediated). Basic to the
explanation of language—or, in general, cognitive—development, is the "zone of
proximal development," defined as "the distance between the actual
developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the
level of potential development as determined through problem solving under
adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p
86). Second Language Acquisition research has also taken an interest in a
Vygotskian approach to language development in the context of sociocultural
theory (Donato, 1994; de Guerrero, 1994; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Villamil & de
Guerrero, 1996).

Langer and Applebee (1986) see a similar role for scaffolding in the
development of a writer, particularly in enabling students to accomplish more
difficult tasks such as analytic writing. When the teacher modifies task demands
for the learning, he or she simplifies the situation, clarifies the structure, and
provides the framework and rules of procedure that will be gradually
internalized by the students. However, as students internalize new procedures
and strategies, it is expected that the instructional support will not be needed as students become more capable of performing the functions in question without the teacher's help.

Instructional scaffolding includes five basic components as Langer and Applebee define it: (a) ownership, (b) appropriateness, (c) support, (d) collaboration, and (e) internalization. Ownership refers to the students' sense of responsibility and caring about their work. Students must have something important and relevant to say about the topic at hand. Appropriateness refers to the proper sequencing of items in the instructional process. Ausubel, Novak, and Hanesian (1968) would say appropriateness depends on the existence of proper relevant ideas in the students' cognitive structure that are able to subsume the new idea. It can be accomplished by building on the skills the students already possess, and by creating relevant anchoring ideas, possibly through the use of advance organizers, before introducing the idea in question. In the case of writing instruction, advance organizers may consist of personal responses to the topic presented for writing in classroom discussions or "model" essays to shape students' expectations of genre conventions.

Support, a key element of the scaffolding metaphor, is provided by careful structuring of the activities. By providing effective routines for the students to internalize, by clear presentation of the materials, and by explaining the expectations for the writing task the teacher offers a coherent approach. Collaboration between teacher and students becomes possible as the teacher provides appropriate support and delays evaluation until students have had an opportunity to revise. Finally, internalization occurs when the teacher removes
the scaffolding when students no longer need help in accomplishing the tasks presented to them. In the case of this particular study, these elements of instructional scaffolding helped shape the interpretation of the instructional context—to what extent does the instruction effectively support students' attempts to write analytically?

Understanding the five components of Langer and Applebee's theory is a precursor to examining their results. Langer and Applebee (1987) examined writing assignments "to determine their use in fostering learning and integrating new information with previous knowledge and experience" (p. 3). They claim teachers rarely use writing assignments for such purposes, and they think it is because teachers do not realize how powerful a learning tool writing can be, and because they do not have models for planning and implementing instruction to support students' analytic writing. Langer and Applebee emphasize the fact that the theory of instructional scaffolding needs to be placed in a broader context before being introduced into the classroom. They point out, for example, that "without new models for evaluating student learning, teachers will continue to rely on old indicators and, in doing so, abort the deeper process of instructional change they meant to embrace" (Langer & Applebee, 1987, p. 137). They also stress the need to define and examine the purposes that a certain activity will serve for both the teacher and the students before attempting to introduce any curricular changes.

The ESL composition classroom can benefit from such findings. Instructors need to keep in mind the different functions of writing when designing a writing task: "To draw on relevant knowledge and experience as
preparation for new activities ... to consolidate and review ideas and experiences ... to reformulate and extend knowledge" (p. 42). These three functions may be used both to foster new learning and to evaluate knowledge and skills. Writing assignments can be used to "reformulate and extend students' understanding of [a] particular content" (p. 52). English as a Second Language students need opportunities to contextualize their writing development, not only within their idiosyncratic processes of SLA, but within their academic fields as well. and instructional scaffolding may be a good way to provide such contextualization.

**Hillocks' Environmental Mode**

Hillocks (1986, 1995) presents the "environmental mode" as an alternative to what he calls the "presentational" and the "natural process" modes. He defines the presentational mode as the traditional transmission of information from the teacher to the student with the assumption that, once learned, the rules and examples presented by the teacher will serve as guides for the development of the student's own writing. The natural process mode sees the teacher as a facilitator "whose role is to free the student's imagination and promote growth by sustaining a positive classroom atmosphere" (Hillocks, 1986, p. 119). Potentially, every child is a good writer, and it is the teacher's job to help good writers blossom. Although skeptical of the usefulness of the natural process approach, Hillocks (1995) credits it with making important "breaks" with the presentational mode including (a) a shift away from the importance of lectures, (b) a move toward the use of writing processes, and (c) increased significance of a positive disposition towards writing. Like the other
modes, the environmental mode emphasizes process and student interaction, but also provides clear and definite structure of materials and activities. The roles of the teacher and of the students are more balanced in the environmental mode approach to the teaching of writing. Hillocks (1995) defines it as "teaching that creates environments to induce and support active learning of complex strategies that students are not capable of using on their own" (p. 55).

The environmental mode, as presented in Hillocks (1986), is characterized by (a) clear and specific objectives, (b) specificity of the aspect of writing to be treated, and (c) high levels of peer interaction. In an effort to refine and extend the environmental mode, Hillocks (1995) later argues that "although this operational definition was useful to the small community of researchers who were familiar with the implications of the terms of the definition, it was not very useful to anyone who wished to put it into action" (p. 58). Accordingly, in the more recent of these publications, Hillocks develops a fuller notion of the environmental mode.

The environmental mode is best suited to treat specific writing problems (e.g., how to support a thesis.) After these aspects are operationally clear to students, activities are designed to enhance particular areas in writing development, such as the use of specific details in descriptive writing, or lack of elaboration in narrative writing. These clear and specific objectives require materials selected to focus on specific aspects of writing with the student’s needs, motivations, and interests in mind. This leads to the last defining characteristic of the environmental mode: It is conducive to high levels of peer interaction. The tasks in the environmental mode are structured for minimal
teacher interference, although teachers are expected to model the task in question through group activities. The materials (with the help of teachers and peers) provide support for the students to work in groups and to strengthen their work before working independently on similar tasks.

In his meta-analysis of what works in writing instruction, Hillocks found the environmental mode to be "over four times more effective than the traditional presentational mode and three times more effective than the natural process mode" (p. 247). The environmental mode might be particularly suited for ESL composition instruction because it provides for a clear structure of materials and activities, as well as clear and specific objectives. Once particular problems have been identified, instruction can proceed in trying to enhance development in those areas. For example, specificity of the treatment of writing can accommodate different degrees of background knowledge, various rhetorical problems, and even pre-determined language difficulties. The main strength of the environmental mode may be that it provides extended guidance in the development of writing abilities. Guidance is accomplished through teacher direction, prewriting activities, group work, and feedback. In the context of this study, it is the elements of the environmental mode that provide a theory-driven scheme for the analysis of the instructional context, and for the way that a blend of declarative and procedural knowledge work to shape the process of learning to write analytically.

Both instructional scaffolding and the environmental mode stress the importance of classroom instruction for the development of writers; the classroom is the place where students interact between themselves and with
the teacher, and this interaction provides the arena for the growth of writing skills.

**L2 Theories of Writing Instruction**

There are few studies of the way the instructional context shapes the development of ESL writers. Moreover, an analysis of existing theories of L2 writing instruction indicates that they seem to neglect the power of the instructional context to shape learning. Silva (1990) thinks any theory of L2 writing should include implications about the way the writer interacts with the text as well as implications about the way the reader interacts with the text, and the overall context of the situation. He sees an appropriate theory of L2 writing as one that takes a holistic approach to writing, that includes a historical perspective, and that is sensitive to the students' idiosyncratic backgrounds.

Johns (1990) uses Berlin's (1988) four principles of rhetorical theories (the writer, the audience, reality and truth, and sources of language in written text) to categorize three approaches to L2 composition theory: (a) the process approaches, (b) the interactive views, and (c) the social constructivist views. Process approaches are divided into the "expressivists" and the "cognitivists," with the former defining good writing as the result of personal engagement, and the latter assuming that audience and form are key issues in the process of writing. For example, extensive planning is a sine qua non for cognitivists, who base their theory on the skills of the expert writer as they like to follow procedures of the type outlined by Flower and Hayes (1981). Teachers subscribing to the interactive views envision "the writer as a person involved in a dialogue with his or her audience" (Johns, 1990, p. 26). The interaction stems
from the fact that reader and writer "balance" the amount of effort needed to understand the text. Within the social constructivist view, there are those who think academia should adapt to the different cultures, and those who think tasks and language conventions can and should be taught to students. Regardless of which group does the adapting, social constructionists think writing is a social act defined by context and audience, i.e., the discourse community.

Another perspective into L2 writing theories is that of Valdés, Haro, and Echevarriarza (1992) who argue that any viable SL writing theory should attempt to explain the differences and similarities between the acquisition of literacy skills both in the L1 and in the L2; and that it should be able to account both for cases of high transfer of literacy skills and for cases of low transfer of them; but "the most important consideration in the development of such a theory is that it be based on existing knowledge about the writing processes and on a detailed analysis and description of both second and FL writers and their writing" (p. 348). Accordingly, because exploratory studies are of key importance to providing knowledge about writing development, the current study was developed expressly for this purpose.

Raimes (1991) sees five emerging traditions to unify ESL writing instruction: (a) recognition of the complexity of student composing, (b) recognition of student diversity, (c) recognition of the complexity of learners' processes, (d) recognition of the politics of pedagogy, and (e) recognition of the value of practice as well as theory. She hopes these emerging traditions will guide the way for a unified approach to the teaching of ESL writing.
The fact that these theories place only minimal emphasis on describing the instructional context (defined as classroom activities) as an instrument in the development of ESL writers is puzzling. As teachers, we need to believe that we can make a difference in the classroom, and we need to transfer this belief to the students. As Johns (1990) reminds us, it is critical for teachers to be aware of their theoretical beliefs when it comes to the teaching of writing. A teacher who is conscious of his or her beliefs has more power and better capabilities of developing a teaching program that will help him or her accomplish set goals.

Focusing on the classroom may very well be what ESL composition researchers need: keeping in mind that "although schools are clearly the dominant influence on student writing, according to some investigators, few young people in other cultures are explicitly taught how to write in school" (Leki, 1991, p. 130). Also, Grabe and Kaplan (1996) state that "writing abilities are not naturally acquired, they must be culturally (rather than biologically) transmitted in every generation, whether in schools or in other assisting environments" (p. 6). For the majority of ESL students, the classroom is the primary vehicle of receiving the "training, instruction, practice, experience, and purpose" (p. 6) necessary to developing academic writing skills.

In spite of the importance of the instructional context in the development of ESL writers, few studies address it. A couple of studies that do deal with the instructional context focus exclusively on task interpretation (Prior, 1991, 1995). Through time the methodology for Prior's studies has evolved, and so has his theoretical understanding of the issues regarding task interpretation. In Prior
the third in this series of studies. he states that "a triangulated, ethnographic examination of how academic writing tasks are cued, produced, and received by particular people in particular settings provides a very different perspective on such tasks than that inferred from texts and perceptions alone" (p. 49).

One interesting look at ESL classroom instruction is Cumming's (1992) analysis of instructional routines in three ESL composition classrooms. The study was conceived because of what he termed "lack of information about the usual practices of ESL composition teaching" (p. 18). After naturalistically observing three different experienced ESL composition instructors, Cumming found six instructional functions that were actualized through six verbal routines. He classified these routines on two intersecting continua: more to less proactive, and more to less responsive. He defined the former as those routines planned in advance, and presented to the class as a whole, while the latter were unplanned exchanges negotiated between the instructor and the students.

Especially relevant to the present study is the fact that Cumming considers proactive and reactive routines to be competing demands in the teaching of ESL writing. "Conventional expectations for learning and classroom organization would suggest that both functions need to be fulfilled. But neither can practicably be realized at the same time, nor would it be appropriate to emphasize one function over the other" (p. 30). In other words, what is seen as conflicting strands in other forms of cognitive learning, proved to be the "norm" in the classrooms he studied. Moreover, the two tendencies were well reconciled by the instructors. It is important to point out that Cumming made no
claims about the effectiveness of such routines, since he did not investigate student performance. The present study does look at student performance, and it explores the relationship between students as analytic writers and the instructional context of which they are a part.

Studying the instructional context can also help understand the development of academic literacy. For example, in Spack's (1997) three-year longitudinal study of a Japanese student acquiring academic literacy in English, classroom observations helped establish "the personal and social context within which [she] devised strategies to read and to write productively in different courses" (p. 10).

The present study is innovative because it looks at the way the instructional context shapes the process of learning to write analytically over the course of an academic quarter (10 weeks). Moreover, the theoretical background established by current L1 and L2 writing theories combined with the data obtained from the instructional context--through grounded theory--may serve as the basis for the development of new L2 writing theoretical tenets. The current knowledge of writing theories is thus used as a framework for data analysis and classification.

The Structure of Analytic Writing

Although analytic writing is the most often assigned task in both secondary schools and colleges within the United States, few studies of L1 writing have examined the interaction of structural knowledge and the act of
composing. Applebee, Durst, and Newell (1984), and Durst (1987) used Meyer's (1985) measure of hierarchical content organization, as well as other measures of text structures for analytic writing. The former studies found that students relied fairly heavily on narration or sequencing of related ideas while more mature analysis emphasized argumentation and limited discussion of events to support particular points. Durst's study focused on the structure in students' writing discourse when they wrote analytically about social studies texts. Durst (1987) believed the genre conventions students used in constructing analytic essays could "help students master both content information and writing skills" (p. 349). He assumed that text structure is a window onto the cognitive and linguistic properties of analytic writing, and found that although his high school students used analytic strategies as they verbalized their writing of analytic essays, they were less successful in actually using the genre conventions in their written products.

A different approach was followed by Greene (1993) who used think-aloud protocols, students' reading-writing logs, and classroom observations to study the way writers structure meaning as they organize and select information from readings. He found that the two tasks he studied (report and problem-based essay) and their interpretations shaped students' approaches to restructuring information from sources. For example, "report" required students to use information from sources while problem-based (analytic) writing required them to contribute new information from prior knowledge and experience. However, both groups included their own ideas and experiences in their writing, presumably because of the instructional support received.
Given the complexities of logical modes of argument and organization, structural knowledge plays an important role in the development of analytic writing, a role that goes beyond the issues of contrastive rhetoric and the ESL writer. Most ESL composition teachers know that students require support and guidance in their writing (Belcher, 1995a; Casanave, 1995; Casanave & Hubbard, 1992); however, instruction often takes the form of prescribed rhetorical structures and ignores procedural strategies and processes. The challenge in teaching analytic writing is to consider the intentions of the writer while simultaneously teaching rhetorical structure as a framework or an organizational tool for the development and presentation of ideas. The most productive approaches integrate imitation and structural presentation of the student's meaning.

Rhetorical devices can help ESL students (a) restructure previously learned writing strategies (Valdés, Haro, & Echevarriarza, 1992), (b) move the focus of concern of writing instruction from sentence to paragraph to full essay (Leki, 1992), (c) take advantage of their previously learned discourse schemata (Leki, 1991), (d) foster creativity (Casanave, 1995), (e) learn "the norms of academic activity while preserving the integral complexity of written communication for academic purposes" (Cumming, 1995, p. 382), (f) facilitate the reader's comprehension, both by properly framing their work (Tedick & Mathison, 1995), and by the use of metadiscourse features (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995), (g) learn to read more effectively (A. Hirvela, personal communication, Winter 1995), and (h) become more successful writers in general (Hirose & Sasaki, 1994).
Many questions remain regarding the use of structural knowledge in the teaching of analytic writing. Should rhetorical knowledge be taught explicitly or indirectly? Do students understand that structural knowledge, rather than an infallible recipe for academic writing, is useful in exploring and thinking through their own ideas and experiences? What do instructors do to foster or short-circuit such an approach to analytic writing?

Most experienced ESL composition instructors believe rhetorical structures are best taught by a combination of declarative and procedural knowledge (Hillocks, 1986, 1995). There are, however, differences in the emphasis that is placed on one particular kind of knowledge by practitioners, by students, and in the perceptions of both instructors and students about said emphases. At this point we know little about the effects of such differences, and instructors also seem confused about a "balanced" approach. For example, Casanave (1995), in her study of contexts for composing in a graduate program, found that one of the case study professors confessed to a concern with independent thinking and the development of ideas, while "his authoritative manner, meticulously prepared lecture notes, generally flawless delivery, and relatively highly structured writing assignments suggested that he believed that students needed a great deal of structure and guidance in their initial training" (p. 99). This dilemma confused the sociology students who felt uncomfortable questioning his authority.

The ESL writing community continues to debate the relevance of teaching structural knowledge explicitly. Cumming (1995) and Dudley-Evans (1995) believe there should be a procedural and a declarative component for
the development of writing skills. The former argues that declarative knowledge can make students feel they are gaining control over their growth as writers, while procedural knowledge provides "more conducive environments for the textual, cognitive, and social dimensions" (p. 393) of the process. Dudley-Evans thinks declarative knowledge (in the form of genre analysis) fosters the acquisition of discourse conventions of the academic community at large, while procedural knowledge (in the form of collaborative teaching) teaches the students to adapt to the particular demands of their disciplines. Powers and Nelson (1995) see three main advantages to procedural knowledge in general, and writing tutorials in particular: (a) They make it possible to focus on specific problems and contexts. (b) They function developmentally to address writer's growth, and (c) they facilitate cultural adaptation for the ESL students. Blanton (1994), however, thinks the ESL academic community should stop both the practice of teaching students how to write in academic disciplines and the modeling of students' written discourse after writing presented in class. Johns (1995b), citing Elbow (1991) feels "we must devote class time to academic styles within discourse communities and the purposes they serve" (p. 279). A view of writing instruction that includes both declarative and procedural knowledge allows for writing to be used both as a means of communication and as a way of developing knowledge (Hamp-Lyons, 1991a, Langer & Applebee, 1987).

Interestingly enough, students often feel teachers emphasize style over content, while teachers claim their formalist concerns to be driven by content (Leki, 1995). "Where the students may see a strict formalist concern for
rhetorical matters, the teachers' real focus may, in fact, be on content mediated through directives to develop ideas, to write good introductions, to come to conclusions" (p. 34) [emphasis in the original]. Carlisle and McKenna (1991) also suggest that "essay readers tended to pay less attention to surface errors than to content and structure in their assessments of ESL/EFL writing" (p. 198).

The ESL writing community seems to be divided over how to teach structural knowledge for formal academic writing. Although its importance is understood, divisions remain in the way to present structural knowledge, and in the amount of time that should be devoted to declarative and procedural structural knowledge. The present study seeks to understand the way that declarative and procedural knowledge interact and the way they facilitate the learning of analytic writing. It also looks at the relationship between structure and content, an issue overlooked in previous ESL writing studies.

Learning to Write Analytically

Analytic writing is a powerful tool in the academic world because it helps students develop critical thinking skills and achieve academic success. Belcher (1995a) and Durst (1987) state that less successful writers have trouble making the change from summary to analytic writing. and Connor (1991), in her evaluation of ESL student writing (according to Toulmin's analysis of reasoning-in Toulmin, Reike, and Janik, 1979). finds that "students from all countries may require considerable practice in developing good warrants for their data" (p. 220). (A "warrant" is a conclusion drawn from claims and supporting data.)
Moreover, Allison (1995) also lists "assertions without proper warrants" as one of the recurring problems in ESL writing.

The process of teaching analytic writing to ESL students is complicated further by their previous experiences with writing. Although ESL composition students are literate in their own L1s, many have had little or no experience with writing instruction, in general, and with writing as "process," in particular (Benson & Heidish, 1995). Familiarity with process approaches to writing is important since "a major element of process writing pedagogies is to make students aware that writing is often a process of discovery in which ideas are generated and not just transcribed" (p. 35). A different view is offered by Leki (1995), who says "we need to at least consider the possibility that an assumption that ESL students do not have and must be taught critical thinking skills may be altogether presumptuous" (p. 43). Both Mathisson (1996) and Grabe and Kaplan (1996) doubt whether current ESL writing pedagogical practices are a useful learning experience, and Zamel (1987) states that "what we have learned from process research is not informing pedagogy" (p. 697).

Mathisson (1996) studied 32 students enrolled in a Sociology of Religion course who wrote critiques. She reported that students found it hard to produce a disciplinary critique (as opposed to a personal response) of the assigned texts. They were able to report on disciplinary issues from source texts, but could not make the analytical leap into their own disciplinary stance. The writing valued in most disciplinary communities is, however, analytic writing. Grabe and Kaplan (1996) also agree that "writing is not a linear process; instead, it involves the complex combination of content information, rhetorical
demands, and reader interpretation" (p. 19). Furthermore, many ESL students find it hard to contribute something new to their writing (Bloch & Chi, 1995; Leki, 1995), especially when writing in response to reading; and some researchers (Ballard & Clanchy, 1991) question the practice of trying to develop ESL students "as independent learners, with the competence to analyze, to question, to criticize, to evaluate" (p. 23). This controversy stems from the fact that the process approach has not been free of blame in the history of SL writing instruction. Leki (1992) says the process approach brings particular problems to ESL learners, the biggest one of which is the focus on personal experience. Summarizing recent L1 studies, Langer and Applebee (1987) indicate that "process-oriented approaches to writing instruction have been relatively ineffective in helping students to think and write more clearly" (p. 7). Moreover, with more complex tasks such as analysis, teachers may need to reconceptualize "process" to include supporting students in doing specific tasks. The process approach has, nonetheless, provided more unifying theoretical and methodological principles for the teaching of SL writing that any other approach (Raimes, 1991).

English as a Second Language composition instructors owe it to their students to prepare them for successful participation in academic life and to provide them with opportunities for the development of ideas (Hamp-Lyons, 1991b; Hamp-Lyons & Mathias, 1994). Analytic writing is a viable means to achieve these goals--the present study is important because it contributes to the understanding of the process of learning to write analytically, paying close
attention to the shaping influences of the interaction between the instructor and the students.

Writing Analytically About Reading

The present study focuses on analytic writing in response to literary and informational texts. Literary and informational texts can be particularly important for ESL students. First, literature can help students learn to interpret complex ideas. Second, it can become a means to understand and analyze cultural values and systems of thought that ESL students are experiencing for the first time. Third, writing about reading requires the practicing of skills that can help get students initiated into the academic community (Belcher, 1995a). Fourth, longer texts (in writing about reading) can increase the opportunity for the development of critical thinking skills in ESL writers (Connor & Kramer, 1995). Finally, given the importance of writing in response to reading, these tasks can function as a developmental tool in the assessment of ESL writing (Johns, 1991).

Historically, reading in the writing classroom was used exclusively to model texts and rhetorical structures (Reid, 1993). The use of reading in the writing classroom can go beyond reading to develop rhetorical awareness to focus on examination of ideas in texts and students’ reactions to these ideas. This, in fact, is the goal of analytic writing about reading.

Also important is the idea of "rhetorical reading," that is, using a planful approach to a reading task to enhance comprehension and retention. Johns
(1991) cites "lack of planning in approaching reading or writing" (p. 168) as one of the areas contributing to academic illiteracy. She interviewed several faculty members who indicated that "academic writing first requires an ability to plan, read, and process the text before writing about it in a way that satisfies the experts in an academic discourse community" (p. 176). She concluded her study by making recommendations for how ESL instructors might use reading-to-write assignments at different proficiency levels. Beginning students should write in response to a reading passage, upper-division students should use shorter readings with lengthier writing assignments, and graduate students should focus on lengthy writing that requires the integration of different reading sources. Moreover, language instructors should focus on the interaction between language and rhetorical function and its value to the student's language development (Johns, 1995a, p. 185).

But what exactly do students gain from performing reading-to-write tasks? In a study about writing patterns of English-speaking students learning Spanish, Valdés, Haro, and Echevarriarza (1992) found that beginning Spanish writers used organizational patterns characteristic of the English language (a case for L1 literacy transfer). More advanced students seemed, however, to be aware of different writing styles, and began using writing patterns characteristic of the Spanish language. The researchers attributed this change in the use of writing patterns to the students' exposure to Spanish literature.

Greene (1993), in his study about the way two different writing tasks (report- and problem-based-essay) affected the development of students' thinking, found that both tasks contributed new information from prior
knowledge and experience to their writing, even though the report writing did not lead students to interpret the task as requiring independent idea contribution. "They strategically placed information in the texts they wrote and used points of information presented in the source texts to support a claim in order to fulfill their goals as writers" (p. 68). These results may indicate a reading-to-write task to be especially beneficial to ESL students, who also must learn to negotiate the demands of academic literacy. The present study focuses on the way ESL students write analytically about readings, and it uses the previous studies as a theoretical framework for designing the data collection, for developing the research questions, and for analyzing and interpreting the data.

Summary

The present study is innovative in that it (a) explores the role the instructional context plays in the development of ESL students as analytic writers (a perspective not thoroughly explored in previous ESL composition studies), (b) examines structural knowledge for analytic writing as an organizational tool for the development of ideas, and the role of declarative and procedural knowledge in shaping writing development (previous studies are not so comprehensive), (c) describes the development of analytic writing skills (previous studies stress the need to understand the way ESL students develop as critical thinkers), and (d) considers the complexities of analytic writing in response to literary and informational readings (previous ESL studies have not necessarily used literature as a base for reading-to-write tasks). It is expected
that these foci will provide a better understanding of writing acquisition in general, and of the development of ESL students as analytic writers in particular.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Overview

The present study examines the shaping influences of one instructor's approach to academic literacy on the written products of two classes of undergraduate ESL students in an intermediate composition course. To consider a full methodological perspective, the present study employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative procedures for analyzing how an instructional context shaped the learning of analytic writing in response to a variety of reading passages. The field of ESL composition is relatively young, especially in its understanding of how analytic writing can be taught effectively. Using the standard dichotomy of experimental and observational approaches (Creswell, 1994), the latter was considered more appropriate for the goals and questions shaping this study. Recall that the main goal of the study was to describe and understand the development of these ESL composition students as analytic writers in the context of classroom instruction. Accordingly, through emergent qualitative inquiry, exploratory case study methodology was
employed to clarify and illuminate the relationships between instructional context and writing development. Although results obtained from case studies are not always generalizable to other contexts, an in-depth case study research can lead us to understand and to describe as thoroughly as possible (Culbertson, 1981) the specifics of teaching and learning analytic writing in an intermediate ESL composition course. Furthermore, the results and conclusions may contribute to conceptualize and develop further educational theory, as Glesne and Peshkin (1992) suggest for general qualitative research methodology. This seems an especially valuable agenda in light of growing concern for the teaching and learning of academic literacy in ESL composition programs (Belcher & Braine, 1995).

An issue that becomes important in qualitative research is an awareness of the conditions surrounding the interpretation of results. Peshkin (1988) discusses the importance of acknowledging the researcher’s subjectivity in a research project, and of doing so systematically as part of the emerging data collection. Only then can the researcher be consciously aware of the interaction of subjectivity and data analysis. This relationship becomes all the more important when one works in a classroom with an instructor and students over extended periods of time trying to develop collaborative and honest relationships. Accordingly, subjectivity was considered and monitored by (a) keeping a researcher’s log, (b) conducting member checks, and (c) using a peer debriefer.

This chapter begins with a description of the design of the study, placing the participants and site in context and explaining the procedures used for data
collection. Then, measures, instruments, and techniques used in data analysis are described.

Design

The data collection procedures were planned so as to maximize access to the different sources of information: (a) the instructor, (b) the case study students, (c) the general population of students in the two sections of the writing course, (d) the students' written products, and (e) the instructional context.

In order to consider what goes on in the classroom in its entirety, and to monitor data collection, triangulation—both of methods (instruments) and of researchers—was used. The goal was to examine classroom context from different perspectives. This included the use of interviews and systematic and extensive observations. Figure 1 represents the triangulation of methods for classroom observation.

Triangulation of the data analyses, especially when examining the students' written products was obtained through a range of text analytic schemes. Figure 2 shows triangulation of data analysis methods for the three essays written over the 10-week period. To examine the contrasting effects of time of writing task (first, second, or third assignment) on students' written products, the study employed analysis of variance tests.
Research Site and Participants

The population consisted of international students attending The Ohio State University, and enrolled in English 107: Advanced English as a Second Language. Two sections, taught by the same instructor were included in this study. However, to understand the motivations and institutional forces shaping the instructor's and students' approaches to analytic writing, a description of the program context for English 107 is in order.

The ESL Composition Program

Almost 85% of the international students that arrive at The Ohio State University participate in English as a Second Language Programs. The ESL Programs are part of the School of Teaching and Learning within the College of Education, and they strive to help the students develop academically and culturally. Accordingly, language is placed in broader contexts and is not limited to discrete language skills. Within the ESL Programs, The Composition Program works "to bring students' expository writing skills to a level at which the students can successfully compete in regular University courses with American and other English-speaking students" (http://www.esl.ohio-state.edu/COMP HTM).

Upon enrollment as an international student at The Ohio State University, students need to take a one hour placement test in written composition that places the student in either English 106, 107, or 108, or allows them to forego this post-admission program and enroll in English 110 (Freshman Composition). According to the Composition Program's written goals, English
"is designed to help the student command the basic rhetorical structures, grammar, and syntax needed for academic writing," while English 107 "is designed to further acquaint students with the conventions of academic prose through a combined focus on academic reading and writing skills," and English 108 "is designed to help students evaluate and represent the opinions and arguments of others and to respond to these in their own persuasive writing" (http://www.esl.ohio-state.edu/COMP.HTM).

Although separate sections exist for graduate and undergraduate students, the focus of the present study was on an undergraduate section. The researcher's interests were focused on the development of undergraduate ESL writers, because they are assumed to have less experience with academic writing (Belcher, 1995a) and, as a result, many were just beginning to write analytically about their reading.

The Course: English 107

The main content of the course included (a) a review of the major genre conventions of the expository essay (introduction, conclusion, thesis statement, topic sentence, etc.), (b) the teaching of four major rhetorical modes (comparison and contrast, exemplification, classification, and cause and effect), and (c) an emphasis in writing in response to literary and informational readings. In general, the first half of the 10-week course concentrated on the teaching of the rhetorical conventions and the modes, the second half became more interactive, with small group discussion, peer editing, and more talk about reading and writing in general. Accordingly, the first half of the course introduces students to analytic writing deductively, working from models and
definitions, and the second half assumes that students can benefit from learning inductively, using structural knowledge of genre form to present their own ideas.

Students were required to write three major out-of-class essays; each was a response essay based on an assigned text. (See Appendix A for a summary of the readings in question.) Essay one required the students to respond to a newspaper essay by Wendell Berry (1990a) entitled "Against PCs: Why I'm not Going to Buy a Computer," two letters (Inkeles, 1990; Koosman, 1990) written to the newspaper in response to Berry's essay, and Berry's (1990b) rejoinder. Essay two was in response to either "Reflections of a Seventeen-Year Old," by Sylvia Plath (1990), or "Child of the Dark: The Diary of Carolina María de Jesús," translated by David St. Clair (1990). Essay three was based on the short story "To Room Nineteen," by Doris Lessing (1963). Given the length of the story (35 pages), students were assigned the story in six segments and then given a series of choices as to how they might write about their responses. (See Appendix B for the complete written instructions the students received for essays one, two, and three.)

Of special importance is the reading-to-write component of English 107. The director of the ESL composition program thinks that teaching ESL students to write about what they read can help them do other kinds of writing that are required in other courses, especially with undergraduate students, who are exposed to many different kinds of writing in their content courses. Accordingly, the reading-to-write component of the course provides manipulation of content. The ideas presented in the readings are discussed both in small groups, and in
general classroom discussions. Moreover, the readings introduce cultural content to the students' overall ESL instruction.

The Students

Case study students were chosen by stratified purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990). Stratified purposeful sampling helps focus on variations, as opposed to generalities; the object of this type of sampling is not to pick typical cases, but to study specific, interesting ones. Three case study students were chosen with the help of the instructor. The researcher asked for a mix of more- and less-abled writers, and then made the final decision according to student availability and willingness to cooperate with the researcher. For the essay analyses, an additional nine students who wrote readable and coherent essays were selected to obtain a broader picture of the students' writing performances.

A survey that focused on the personal characteristics of the students was given to the population in order to become more familiar with the students' backgrounds (see Appendix C). The purpose of this needs analysis survey was to understand the students' reasons for learning English, and their individual experiences as ESL learners. A writing questionnaire (see Appendix D) was also administered in order to become informed of the students' writing history, and to connect the students' current work to their previous experiences with writing. Thus, the survey and questionnaire provided access to both the personal and the academic backgrounds of the students in as much detail as possible. These data proved helpful in understanding them as writers and as students from various cultures who speak different languages, and who learned to write in a variety of school contexts. Also, the students completed structural
knowledge probes which helped the researcher describe the students' prior knowledge of discourse terms, that is, their declarative knowledge of key terms for describing the structure of essay genres.

The Instructor

The instructor was a graduate assistant working in the second year of her Ph.D. in Foreign and Second Language Education in the Department of Educational Studies at The Ohio State University. She had previous experience teaching this particular course, and had received good evaluations from her supervisor and mentor. Although the instructor’s scholarly interests in Foreign Language Education were not in composition, she developed an interest in ESL while teaching the composition course. Her decision to teach composition came from wanting to learn more about ESL to increase her marketability as a language instructor.

Procedures

In an attempt to better comprehend the teaching and/or learning of analytic writing in an ESL composition classroom, various methods of data collection were used: (a) interviews with the instructor, the course coordinator, the program director, and a subsample--random purposeful sample (Patton, 1990)--of the student population, (b) participant classroom observation, (c) audio-recordings of classroom lessons, (d) audio-recording of a representative twenty-minute tutorial, (e) examination of the form and content of the students’
three main writing assignments, and (f) examination of the letter the students wrote as an introduction to their portfolios.

All interviews were semi-structured to facilitate the inductive process of discovery (Fontana & Frey, 1994); they were coded according to the procedures established by Schatzman and Strauss (1973), and Guba (1981). Participant observation was also an important means of data collection. About 20 hours of classroom instruction were observed. Working in cooperation with the instructor, the researcher attempted to focus on the occasions when declarative knowledge of genre form was to be imparted in the classroom. Because the content was basically the same for both sections on any given day, either one of the two classrooms that are part of the study were observed on a given day.

The methods used to provide triangulation, along with the reasoning behind the choices, are presented in Figure 3.

Gaining Access

On the first day of classes of the Winter Quarter, 1995, the students in English 107 received a letter (see Appendix E) informing them (a) of the presence of the researcher in the classroom, (b) of the interviews and observations to be conducted, and (c) of the fact that peer debriefers would have access to the data. The students knew the researcher was interested in observing teaching and/or learning processes in general, but did not know the exact nature of the inquiry. Assurances of confidentiality and anonymity were made. Students also completed the needs analysis and the writing.
questionnaire designed to provide background information on the group in
general, and writing history information in particular; this information later
became part of the students' profiles during data analysis and coding. A letter
was also sent to the ESL composition director (see Appendix F) requesting
permission to carry out research in the ESL composition program.

Instrumentation

Classroom Observations

An observation checklist (see Appendix G) was tallied after each
classroom observation to serve as a raw count of classroom activities and the
time allotted to them. Results of frequency of activities and mean percentage of
time spent on each activity are presented in chapter four. Analytic induction of
field notes provided the categories for data analysis. These categories were
generated in order to describe the instructional context and the type of
instructional support students were receiving when learning to write analytically
They included the amount of instruction devoted to the direct study of rhetorical
structures and modes for analytic writing, as well as ways in which structure was
taught and discussed in the classroom. This researcher also examined the
exercises and activities used by the instructor to impart both declarative and
procedural knowledge in the classroom.
Declarative Knowledge Probes

The instructor periodically asked the students to complete knowledge probes in the classroom. The purpose of the knowledge probes was to measure the students' command of structural knowledge about genre conventions.

Essay Analyses

The 36 essays were examined with four different analyses in order to examine the corpus for content, global, and local text features, and to see change over time in analytic writing. These analyses included: (a) syntactic complexity, (b) a description of the genre conventions, (c) an examination of level of abstractness, involving focused or unfocused analysis, and (d) exploring students' ways of responding to source texts. Results are presented in chapter five.

Interviews

Interviews were coded by analytic induction. Data analysis in qualitative research does not progress in a linear fashion (Bogdan & Bilken, 1982). When data collection starts, the researcher looks for key issues, trends that may at some point become coding units. As these foci arise, data collection becomes more geared towards better defined purposes. Through the interaction of the researcher and the data a model arises that provides the framework for coding of the data and writing of the findings. For this particular study, the researcher developed several coding categories after repeated reading and handling of the data. For example, after reading and studying the interviews with the
instructor, the course coordinator, and the program director, then relating the
interviews to the primary theme in this study—the teaching and learning of
analytic writing—the importance of "expectations" as a category was
established. Further data manipulation revealed several sub-categories (a)
program expectations, (b) course expectations, and (c) students' expectations
for the teaching and learning of analytic writing. For the interviews with the case
study students, the coding activities focused on one hand on their interpretation
of the instructional context, and on the other on developing profiles for each
student. The information obtained from the interviews is presented in chapters
four and five.

Data Analyses

Data analysis started concomitantly with the onset of the observations,
and continued throughout the project, with the bulk of the coding and analysis
taking place during the Autumn Quarter of 1996. Field notes were preliminarily
coded and annotated the day they were obtained. Interviews were transcribed,
or at least listened to, shortly after being conducted. This made it possible for
the researcher to notice emerging trends, and to perform member checks. In
addition, a researcher's log was kept in order to monitor subjectivity, and as a
means for recording emerging thoughts and ideas on the teaching and learning
processes, an important component of the inductive analysis of data.
Analysis of Classroom Observations

The observations of classroom instruction aid in explaining how the instruction supported students' efforts to write analytically about source readings. Of special interest was how the instructor aided the students in (a) reading and thinking analytically, (b) writing more effectively, and (c) feeling comfortable about writing. To present these findings the researcher (a) described the strategies the instructor used to present the rhetorical conventions and the modes and the kind of framework that resulted from various presentations, (b) focused on the way the students reacted to the instruction, and (c) studied the interaction between the instructor's instructions and the students' performance. The researcher studied the classroom observation logs--and the ensuing observation checklists--to find patterns that described the instructional strategies the instructor used to present declarative knowledge about genres. Classroom observation logs, interviews with case study students, and the researcher's log provided data about how the students reacted to classroom instruction. The data collected in the classroom also provided a context for understanding the results of the essay analyses, establishing a link between the students' declarative and procedural knowledge about analytic writing.

Writing Tutorials

The students' procedural knowledge for analytic writing may be most evident in the transcribed audio-taped tutorials between the instructor and the student. Transcripts from the tutorials and the interviews were examined to
describe ways in which the instructor's efforts to teach procedural knowledge helped the students think critically and write analytically. The researcher worked with a second rater to examine transcripts from the tutorials and highlight situations that evidenced procedural knowledge at work. The two raters would read the transcripts together and pinpoint examples of the use of procedural knowledge. Differences were settled through discussion.

Prior Knowledge of Discourse Structure Terminology

The students' knowledge probes were analyzed by two raters trained through a thorough discussion of the meaning of each of the concepts, and through instruction in the application of each of the appropriate definitions. Percent of agreement was calculated (98%) and disagreements were settled by discussion.

Essay Analyses

The students' written work was analyzed for (a) syntactic complexity, (b) level of abstractness, (c) structure of the essay, and (d) responses to the readings. The rationale behind each of these choices, and further explications, follow.

Syntactic Complexity

A measure of syntactic complexity was included in this study to describe students' control over and development of the local or sentence level of their analytic essays. Although English grammar instruction per se is not a focal point in English 107, it is important not to lose sight of the students' use of the conventions of written English, especially because the researcher included
number of error-free T-units as a variable in this analysis. Although the findings regarding the reliability of T-unit length as a measure of syntactic fluency have been inconsistent, it is currently a very reliable method of syntactic complexity, especially for writing with a shared purpose (Hillocks & Smith, 1991); moreover, error-free T-units is commonly added as a variable in SL studies that utilize T-unit analyses (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). The analysis included (a) T-units counts, (b) mean length of T-units, (c) mean number of error free T-units, and (d) total word counts. Results were tabulated to help examine the effects of writing task on syntactic complexity. Qualitative measures were also employed to match the case study students' profile to the results of the syntactic analysis.

Level of Abstractness

The analysis by level of abstractness is based on the work of Durst (1987), and it was piloted for use in the present study (Newell, Gargia, & Peterson, 1996). This procedure involves holistic coding of each essay for the degree to which the writer is able to move beyond a summary of the reading passage to develop a focused and coherent interpretation. Two raters read all 36 essays and coded them holistically with 88% agreement. Differences were settled through discussion. Essays were coded according to the following three categories, in ascending order of abstractness:

Thesis and summary restatement:

An essay that begins with a thesis statement but reverts to a restating of the reading passage with little attempt to argue and present evidence for the thesis.
Unfocused analysis:
An essay that includes a thesis but the body of which contains a series of points or minor claims strung together without explicitly supporting, elaborating, or connecting them.

Focused analysis:
An essay that moves away from a restating of plot and/or ideas from the reading passages to form a thesis statement. Includes a claim or generalization that is clearly supported with and argued for using textual evidence and/or personal experience.

Structural Analysis of Essay Genre
An analysis of the structure of the essays was undertaken with the purpose of uncovering the genre conventions for the essays used by the students. This researcher developed a structural grid in which to tabulate (a) the number of paragraphs, (b) the presence or absence of a thesis statement, and an overall qualitative rating for it, (c) the thesis statement's position within the essay, (d) the presence or absence of topic sentences, (e) the topic sentence's position within its paragraph, and (f) the presence or absence of a conclusion.

The thesis statement was rated holistically, on a scale of 1 to 3, according to whether or not it contained the "controlling" idea of the essay, and whether or not it included the students' personal opinion. A thesis statement receiving the rating of 3 evidenced both control of the topic, and included a personal opinion (Example: In the story 'To Room Nineteen,' I notice that Susan had been different in her thoughts, love to her husband, and intelligence in the beginning...
of her marriage toward the end of her life."), a rating of 2 evidenced either control or opinion (Example: "Being poor affect changes in these people's life."), and a rating of 1 did not clearly evidence either control or opinion (Example: "In their responses, Inkeles and Koosman have some reasons to disagree with Berry's article."). Two raters--one of whom was the researcher--discussed several examples as a measure of calibration. They then rated the thesis statements in the essays and compared results. There was 96% agreement, and differences were settled through discussion. Once again, results were tabulated. Qualitative measures were also employed to match the case study students' profile to the results of the structural analysis.

**Content Analysis of Students' Responses to Texts**

A content analysis of the essays was used to study the development of ideas and critical thinking in the students' essays. This content analysis is based on the work of Purves and Rippere (1968), and Newell (1996), and was modified to provide a better fit for this particular student population and for the goals of this study. Two raters (one of whom was the researcher) read and discussed several essays in an effort to calibrate the rating. They discovered, then, that it would be better to adapt the existing system (Newell, 1996) and create a new category: general. After thoroughly defining each category, they proceeded to rate the essays independently. Percent agreement in a subsample of essays was 78%. Differences were settled through discussion, and the rest of the essays were rated accordingly.

The system codes individual sentences or T-units as falling within one of the alternative categories of response: (a) descriptive (involve retelling or
description of some part of the story.) (b) personal (personal reactions to either form or content.) (c) general (involve general knowledge about the world or the way things operate.) (d) associative (use knowledge or experience to illustrate understanding.) (e) interpretive (include inferences about the story,) and (f) evaluative (involves the writer's assessment). (See "definition of terms" for definitions and examples of response statements.)

Results were tabulated to help examine the influence of writing task (or time of task) on the content of the three major writing assignments. Qualitative measures were also employed to match the case study students' profile to the results of the content analysis. The quantitative data from the essay analyses were analyzed using version 7.1 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test the hypothesis for each factorial design. Level of significance was set at .05. Results are presented in chapter five.

Pilot Study

The data collection methods used in this study were piloted in the Fall of 1994, in a comparable class within the same setting. Observations of classroom instruction were conducted and field notes corroborated through member checks. Observation checklists (see Appendix G) were developed and tested in different sections of the same class to assure that they were comparable in content. Interviews were conducted and transcribed, then shown to the respondents for member checks. The needs analysis and the writing
questionnaire were developed and tested during the Winter Quarter, 1994. The guiding questions for the different interviews were also developed, with the help of the researcher's co-adviser, at this point.

The analytic procedures used for the three main writing assignments were piloted during the Winter Quarter, 1996, and preliminary results appear in Newell, Garriga, and Peterson (1996).

Students' Backgrounds

Student Profiles

The purpose of studying the student profiles was to understand the way students develop as analytic writers and the factors that affect such development by beginning with an understanding of their earlier writing experiences. This analysis examines (a) their personal and educational background, (b) their command of declarative knowledge for analytic writing, and (c) their graded performance in the course. Data analysis that revealed the students' perceptions about writing and about the ESL composition course, as well as information about their writing processes, is presented in chapter four.

The needs survey and writing history are used to develop their personal and educational background profiles. Both questionnaires were analyzed based on frequency counts and percentages of students' responses to the individual items, and resulted in a summary evaluation for the case study students.
The knowledge probes were used to measure the students' acquired declarative knowledge about the genre forms for analytic writing. They were also used to triangulate when classifyiing the students as more or less successful writers. Declarative knowledge probes were coded for organization and fluency using an adapted version of Newell and MacAdam's (1987) procedures for analyzing topic knowledge. Two raters (one of whom was the researcher) read all the knowledge probes written by all 29 students and independently made a list of the facts cited by the students for each one of the terms appearing in the declarative knowledge probes. There was a 98% agreement and differences were settled through discussion (See Figure 4 for the declarative knowledge instrument.) The declarative knowledge instrument then, presents the possible range of scores the students might obtain on their declarative knowledge probes. For example, 4 was the highest possible score obtainable when defining both thesis statement and topic sentence.

Appendix H presents information about the students' graded performance in the classroom; these grades were obtained from the instructor. The information is presented to give a picture of the more "tangible" results the students observed in their academic development, but the researcher did not use data from the graded performance to cross reference other information in data analysis. It is evident that other factors, such as attendance, completion of work assigned, and timeliness in the completion of the work assigned—among others—affected graded performance, so it was not used as an element of triangulation. Nonetheless, it was important for the overall design of the study to
be aware of these results, because success in college courses is determined by the students' graded performance.

In summary, the results of the analyses for personal and educational background, together with information about the students' command of declarative knowledge and graded classroom performance is presented below, first for the general classroom population, and then for the case study students.

The General Population of the Two Sections of English 107 Studied

Personal background

Students in the 2 classrooms ranged in age from 17 to 28 years of age, with 37% of the students being 19 or 20 years of age. There were far more males (63%) than females (37%). Nationalities were varied, but Indonesians (25%), and Koreans (19%) were the most represented. Only one student was married, the rest were either single (84%), or didn't answer the question (13%).

The students were aware of the importance of learning English. When asked if they would want their spouses to know English, 25% marked "it would be very important." 66% said "it would be nice," and 6% would not even bring it up. As for their children, however, 56% found it "extremely important," 41% thought "it would be nice." and none of them thought they wouldn't bring it up. that is, all of the students would like, to some degree, for their children to learn English. Most of them (75%) reported not knowing another foreign language, but of those who did, Chinese was mentioned twice, and French, German, Arabic, and Japanese one time each. Only one of the 29 students in the project worked (9 hours per week).
At the onset of the study, students' length of stay in the United States ranged from a minimum of 4 months to a maximum of 5 years, with the average being 12.6 months. Their date of arrival at this particular university, however, varied from 4 months to 18 months, with the average being 6.4 months. Of the students enrolled in English 107, 13% expected to graduate in 1996, 48% in 1997, 25% in 1998, and 14% in 1999. Engineering was the major most commonly represented (34%), followed by business (19%). Most of the students (72%) had not declared a minor.

When asked about what they perceived their level of proficiency to be in English, 78% said low-intermediate, 16% high-intermediate, and 3% advanced. The instructor, however, classified them all as advanced students. The students had diverse reasons to be studying in the United States: 28% wanted to get their degrees from an American university, 22% thought learning English was very important in life, 12% thought they would find a better job if they knew English well. 9% thought studying in the United States would help them speak English better, another 9% thought it would help them write English better, and 6% just wanted to "escape" their homes. As for their academic future, 34% planned to continue graduate studies, 22% did not, and 44% were not sure.

It appears, then, that these young students had both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to learn English, and that, although committed to their academic studies, they underestimated their language skills.

As for the students' non-academic interests, home entertainment (radio and television,) going to movies, and talking to friends appeared to be very popular, while cultural and community activities were rarely mentioned. Sports
and reading were somewhat popular. Most students reported using most of their English "in the classroom," with their professors and classmates. Interestingly enough, when asked how long they used English for on a typical day, 22% said for 3 hours, 18% for 5, and 16% for 12. Numbers ranged from a maximum of 14 to a minimum of 1/2 an hour. Another interesting finding about these students' uses of English is that they listed listening and reading consistently over speaking and writing (in that order) when asked to rate their own uses of each language process. This means that actual production time was very limited, that is, although they heard and read English often, their opportunities to practice English were limited. This finding was confirmed by a similar question framed in a different way: When asked to divide the time they spent working on their language learning skills according to percentages, the students reported: Roughly 38% of their weekly time was devoted to listening, 25% to reading, 20% to speaking, and 16% to writing. On the one hand, this is surprising considering we are dealing with a SL environment, which is generally regarded as providing more opportunities for practice. On the other hand, it is understandable for an academic environment at a university with a large population of ESL students.

**Educational background**

The 29 students attending the two sections of English 107 reported engaging in different writing activities in their university coursework. Academically, most of them wrote short answer replies to questions on tests (37%), followed by essays (31%), research papers (16%), essay tests (12%), and various kinds of technical writing (4%). Outside the classroom, they wrote
letters (68% in their L1s and 56% in English.) journals and or diaries (8% in their L1s and 38% in English.) stories (12%, only in their L1s.) and poems (12% in their L1s and 6% in English.)

As a group, 48% of the students found writing in response to reading to be the most difficult kind of writing they were assigned, followed by research papers and cause and effect papers (24% each.) and mini-essays (4%), and they attributed this difficulty to the fact that writing demands the use of logical or critical thinking skills that they did not possess. The easiest writing for the students was free topic writing based on personal experiences (57%), mini-essays (29%), and exemplification (4%). A full 10% of the students found no kind of assigned writing to be easy for them. More than half (58%) credited English 107 with helping them write "organized essays." Organization also topped the list of advantages of a tutorial (66%). The other most popular benefit of the tutorial mentioned by the students was help with topic development (33%).

If they could have had more one-on-one conferencing with the instructor, 50% of the students would have liked help with grammar. 21% would have liked more help developing the actual essay, specifically going from outline to first draft, and from first draft to final draft. Help with the development of ideas and with sentence structure tied at 14%. The students also thought that the readings they did in 107 helped enrich their ideas before writing (77%) and improved their vocabulary (23%). The majority of the students (95%) agreed that the most important general advice given by the instructor related to the use of genre conventions. Once the essay was started, though, the instructor provided help
with grammar problems (56%), guidance on staying within the boundaries of
the mode chosen for the essay in question (28%), and correcting the outline
(17%).

A large majority of the students (88%) found the outline very helpful when
writing an essay, but a small percentage (12%) disliked having to use an outline
for their essays. It is interesting that 77% of the students thought of themselves
as poor or less successful writers. 26% of those classified themselves as poor
writers because they found the L2 medium (English) placed too much of a
constraint on their writing skills, while 74% of those who thought they were not
good writers felt frustrated by the constant need for instruction and their inability
to focus on the subject of the essay.

The students’ experiences with writing instruction prior to English 107
were somewhat varied, but the main differences between their ESL composition
instruction and the writing instruction they received in their native countries as
(a) writing in response to reading (40% had no experience with it), (b) multiple
drafts of written work (30% was used to doing only one draft of any written
work), and (c) instruction on declarative knowledge for structure in writing (30%
reported not having been exposed to any kind of instruction regarding structure
in writing).

It seems that all 29 students in English 107 had limited opportunities to
produce English in their daily interactions. Academically, they wanted to work
on sharpening their critical thinking skills, but also wanted more help with
grammatical issues. Moreover, it seems that instruction on genre conventions
had been lacking in the students’ previous educational background, and that
the current writing assignments the students were receiving in other university courses required higher-order thinking skills.

**Declarative knowledge about rhetorical conventions**

The analysis of declarative knowledge had two components. First, this researcher examined the knowledge probes. Results--expressed as mean percentages (M) between subjects--are presented as Figure 5. (Recall that Figure 4 explains the instrument used for rating the declarative knowledge probes.) Results indicate that all students had high declarative knowledge for "introduction," "outline," and "classification." They had less developed knowledge of "cause and effect," and somewhat better knowledge of "exemplification," "comparison and contrast," "conclusion," "thesis statement," and "topic sentence." Results from the analysis of the students' experiences and thoughts about writing instruction indicate that they felt less comfortable writing cause and effect essays. This trouble might be the reason why the students were not able to properly define it, or it might be a consequence of the fact that they were not able to properly define it.

Second, this researcher examined the students' grades in the course as reported by the instructor. Results are presented in Appendix H, and include grades for all their quizzes, the three assigned essays, the midterm, the final, the in-class presentation, and the portfolio. The instructor explained the purposes of the various testing procedures. The quizzes were given to make sure that students came to class on time, since they were always given at the beginning of the class period. They were also designed to monitor the students' completion of their homework. Many of the homework assignments consisted of
readings, with quizzes to check for comprehension. The students' written work was graded with four main purposes in mind: (a) conventional essay organization (the rhetorical conventions,) (b) a skillful combination of appropriate rhetorical modes, (c) strategically placement of references to the text, and (d) appropriate technical control. The midterm and the final added the element of time constraint since they were in-class assignments. The purpose of the portfolio was made very clear to the students; it was designed to demonstrate the effort they had put in the class and their development as writers during the course of the ten weeks. The in-class presentation was designed to help them with rhetorical reading. They had to locate and work with the modes they found in the assigned readings.

The instructor used a grading scale that assigned students an A if their grade was between 90 and 100, a B if the grade was between 80 and 89, and a C if their grade was between 70 and 79. Results from the different types of assessment indicate that the students' performances on quizzes were below the average arbitrary value of 75 set for this particular grading scale (67% for all of them). Because the quizzes were designed to test students' comprehension of the reading assignments, a below-average performance might indicate that students were not fully comprehending the written texts. Lack of comprehension of the source text would have repercussions in the students' written response—their essays. However, their performance on the three major writing assignments was good (82% on average), which would seem to indicate that the students were able to better comprehend the source text after classroom discussions. The students also improved their grades from essay
one (79%) to essay two (82%) to essay three (89%). This improvement was particularly important since each subsequent essay constituted a bigger part of their grade. The students' grade improvement would also seem to indicate that they became progressively more aware of the instructor's criteria for grading writing. The students' average performance on the midterm (76%) was similar to that of the final (76%). Based on her previous experience with teaching English 107, the instructor also believed the students did a "very good job" on their presentations (87%) and a fair one on compiling their portfolios (77%). The overall grade for the students in both sections of 107 was 79.85%. The fact that the overall percentage for the population of English 107 in their graded work in the classroom was above the average 75% mark is important when cross-referencing with the results presented in chapters four and five, because the grades the students received seemed to indicate that the students were making progress in their development as analytic writers.

From the general group of English 107 students, this researcher chose three case study students, based on teacher recommendations and willingness of the student to be interviewed. The brief sketches that follow provide some additional information about these case study students.

The Case Study Students

Kamran

Personal data and educational background

Kamran, a 20 year-old Pakistani student majoring in marketing at the time of the study, had only been in the United States for 4 months. Although the instructor classified his use of English as "advanced," he classified himself as
having "elementary" knowledge of the language. His main goal in learning English was "to write and understand English completely." Of the three case study students, he was the one using English the most outside of the classroom: his roommate was a NS and he consistently engaged in activities requiring English (for example, talking and reading books).

Most of the writing Kamran did for high school education in his country was writing short answers to questions for diagnostic purposes. He admitted not having any previous exposure to academic writing, but he thought academic writing was something easily learned, once the modes were learned and a good outline was written. Educationally, he had never encountered direct instruction on essay structure in his writing instruction (neither in English nor in his L1) which focused on "the use of correct punctuation and grammar."

The most difficult kind of writing for him was writing in response to reading. He did not like to have to articulate his responses to texts nor use examples from the readings to make a point. "It [writing in response to reading] helps me to some extent but cannot be regarded as very helpful, for we have to write from our own mind and not from the ideas in the readings." This is consistent with the fact that his favorite kind of writing was "free choice," where he felt free to write on any topic and use his own ideas. In summary, what Kamran did not like was to have to base his ideas on suggestions from the readings, because then the written product was "not from the reading, and not from [his] head." Put another way, Kamran found analytic writing to be difficult, particularly integrating knowledge from personal experiences with the information obtained from the source texts.
Declarative knowledge

When classified according to his response to the structural knowledge probes, Kamran's command of declarative knowledge was mediocre at best. He was not able to explain either "exemplification" or "comparison and contrast" as rhetorical modes. For example, he defined "exemplification" as "Using the causal chain to explain the essay," and for "comparison and contrast" he wrote, "This should consist of either one topic or more than one, and it must have two to three paragraphs." He also had trouble, to some extent, thoroughly defining "thesis statement." although he knew that the instructor suggested the thesis statement be the last sentence of the first paragraph, he did not articulate the form or the purpose of this element. For "topic sentence" he wrote: "Refers to the first sentence of a developmental paragraph. There should be three or four developmental paragraphs." Based on what the instructor had repeatedly emphasized both in the classroom and in the tutorials, this definition is incomplete in that it fails to mention that topic sentences should be linked conceptually to the thesis statement and that they should make sense without reference to other text elements. When explaining "conclusion," Kamran wrote "It is a summary of all what is discussed with a few added points about your personal opinion. It should be like two or three sentences." This definition differs from the one presented by the instructor, who never recommended including personal ideas in the conclusion. Kamran's incomplete command of declarative knowledge about issues of structure seemed to hinder his development as an analytic writer, because he was acting according to his set
beliefs about the genre conventions studied rather than according to the
direction of the instructor's directions.

**Sung-Ho**

**Personal data and educational background**

Sung-Ho was a 24 year-old Korean student who had only been in the United States for fourteen months—when he started at this university—and who wanted to major in journalism. He considered himself to be a "high intermediate" when it comes to English proficiency, though both his pronunciation and his grammar were plagued with problems. He wanted to become more proficient in English so he "[could] be better prepared to study his major." He liked to listen to the radio, watch television, and go to movies with friends. He estimated he "used" English for about 2 hours each day. Out of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), he thought he spoke English most and read it less (with writing and listening somewhere in the middle.) He thought his studies in English would help him in his career; he wanted to eventually return to Korea and work at a broadcasting company.

Most of the writing he did for his university courses was in the form of essays, and his personal writing (in his L1) was mostly letters and entries in a personal journal. He thought grammar was the most difficult aspect of writing, and writing an outline was the easiest. He liked the one-on-one tutorials used in English 107 because they helped him with both his structure and his grammar. He preferred to base his writings on reading passages because the readings helped him get ideas for his writing. It was his opinion that the instructor was mostly interested in teaching genre structure, "like thesis
statement, body, and conclusion." He believed that once he started an essay, the help he got from the instructor was limited to grammar instruction. To him, writing an outline was the basic part of writing an essay. He did not consider himself a good writer because he "still need[ed] a lot of practice."

Sung-Ho regretted the fact that "in my country essays are not important. only work for college entrance." He said he was never asked to write essays in his high school education in Korea. "All writing I had in Korea was very informal. American academic writing is very formal." This fact about his education seemed to frustrate him, and he often struggled to organize his thoughts and ideas in the new formats and styles required in English 107. He also believed that writing was supposed to help him do just that, but that for some reason he could not do it. "I have trouble writing about what I think when I don't have the thoughts clear in my head." Although he would have liked to concentrate on making his thoughts clear when he wrote, his grammar was so deficient that grammar instruction overrode any other kind of help he might have been able to get. He did not like it when the teacher focused on his grammar mistakes, and he would have liked to focus more often on making his ideas clear in the essay. However, Sung-Ho's essays often were difficult to comprehend.

Declarative knowledge

Sung-Ho also had a very poor command of declarative knowledge of rhetorical structure. He defined "thesis statement" as being "the main idea," and neglected to refer to placement within the paragraph, length, and the inclusion of original ideas. He also failed to include the supporting details of the
definition of "topic sentence," and he was not able to define "cause and effect," "classification," and "exemplification" effectively.

Yucuanto

**Personal data and educational background**

Yucuanto was a 21-year old Indonesian majoring in Electrical Engineering who was determined to learn English well. He had also only been at this university for four months, but he came to the United States a year before that. Although his English speaking and writing skills were much better than Sung-Ho's, he considered himself to be 'low intermediate' in proficiency. He liked to talk to his friends and to read comic books, and liked participating in small-group work in the classroom. He estimated he "used" English for maybe 2 or 3 hours a day, but he said most of it was listening to English, and least of it was writing in English.

Yucuanto intended to stay in the United States for a graduate education. Most of the writing he did in school was short answers to questions and essays. His personal writing consisted mostly of letters in his L1. He found cause and effect to be a difficult mode to write in, and, of the three essays, he found the third assignment the most difficult as he reported having trouble keeping track of his reactions to the lengthy reading assignment, and trouble incorporating his ideas into his response essay.

Although, in his opinion, writing in response to reading was the most challenging aspect of English 107, he also realized that the readings helped enrich his ideas. Yucuanto found exemplification the easiest mode to work with because "I just need to give examples to support the topics I choose." He
credited English 107 with helping him express his ideas, especially the tutorials which he felt offered two advantages: "The tutorials are not only helping me in fixing grammar mistakes but also helping me in finding new ideas." He also commented, however, that he would have liked more help with organization and sentence structure.

Although he had been exposed to genre structure in writing instruction in his country, he said it was never emphasized. His previous writing instruction focused on spelling and organization, and adhering to the topic assigned by the instructor. The two major differences he found in writing instruction when he started English 107 was writing in response to reading, and the multiple draft approach to the process of writing an essay.

**Declarative knowledge**

Of the 3 case study students, Yucuanto had the strongest command of declarative knowledge of structural knowledge for writing. He included extra details and explanations about the definitions he presented in the knowledge probes: "The introduction is used to introduce the essay. It should be interesting so that the readers will have a desire to read the whole essay. There are four types of introductions: funnel, story or quote, turnaround, and dramatic entrance." He also drew visual aids in his definitions, suggesting that he had learned a range of ways of representing what he understood.
Summary

In this chapter the research agenda to describe an instructional context and to understand ESL students' interpretations of that context was framed within the qualitative paradigm. The chapter also detailed the methods and procedures followed in the data gathering processes during the study, for the analysis of students' written work, and for the examination of the instructional context. The procedures for data collection and analysis were designed to explain and understand how the instructor's teaching of declarative and procedural knowledge of genre form helped the ESL students learning to write analytically when writing in response to reading. The chapter concludes with a detailed analysis of the students' personal and educational backgrounds. This information should help us understand and interpret what the 29 students enrolled in English 107, in general, and the three case study students, in particular, took from the instructional context. Moreover, a better understanding of the personal and educational needs of these ESL students proved valuable in examining the efficacy of the instructional context presented in chapter four, and in the interpretation of the analyses of the 36 essays included in chapter five.
Figure 1: Organization of the different sources affecting the instructional context of the teaching and learning of analytic writing in an ESL classroom.
Figure 2: Analytic schemes to examine the development of the students as analytic writers in the three major writing assignments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source and Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>Taken by the researcher in both sections over the ten weeks of the quarter. Classroom observations provided insight into the nature of the instructional support for the development of analytic writing. About 20 hours of classroom instruction were observed for this project. Information gained through observation was also used to develop a profile of the instructional context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>Interviews with the instructor, the course coordinator, and the program director provided a series of individual perspectives on the ESL program and the instructional context. They were conducted at the beginning of the quarter, and there was also an exit interview with the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questionnaire</td>
<td>The questionnaires provided personal background information on the students and information on the type of instruction they had previously received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Types of data analyses related to the three major writing assignments.
Figure 3 (continued)

| retrospective accounts of composing researcher's log knowledge probes writing samples |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Three case study students were interviewed after each essay and asked to reconstruct their writing processes and to tap into their perceptions of the instructional context. There was also an exit interview for each of the three case study students. |
| A researcher's log was kept to help acknowledge the researcher's subjectivity (Guba, 1981), and as a means of stimulating data analysis. |
| The knowledge probes consisted of students' free responses to prompts related to structural knowledge. Their purpose was to examine the students' knowledge of the structural components of rhetorical instruction for analytic writing. |
| The three main writing assignments were collected and analyzed in four different ways to see the progress made over time in analytic writing. |
Thesis Statement (4 points)

main idea / controls
placed at the end of the introduction
should include opinion and not only facts
preferably one sentence in length

Topic Sentence (4 points)

main idea of paragraph
placed at the beginning of each paragraph
should support the thesis statement and/or be able to stand on its own
preferably one sentence in length

Outline (1 point)

plan for the essay that should include all ideas

Introduction (1 point)

usually the first paragraph that presents ideas

Conclusion (2 points)

should not include any new ideas
should summarize and/or rephrase the thesis statement and topic
sentences

(continued)

Figure 4: Instrument for rating the declarative knowledge probes of structural knowledge for the analytic essay.
Figure 4 (continued)

Cause and Effect (1 point)
    should present ideas systematically relating them by cause and effect

Classification (1 point)
    should base the organization on identifying characteristics

Exemplification (1 point)
    should base the organization on providing support for the thesis statement and/or topic sentences

Comparison and Contrast (1 point)
    should base the organization on examining similar and different aspects of the ideas discussed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre Conventions for the Academic Essay</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cause and effect</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classification</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exemplification</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparison and contrast</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesis statement</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic sentence</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outline</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Results from analysis of the declarative knowledge probes. M stands for mean percentage obtained by all 29 students enrolled in English 107
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT FOR LEARNING TO READ AND WRITE ANALYTICALLY

Introduction

To provide a broad view and understanding of the teaching and learning processes, it is important that any study of the instructional context be nested within the institutional framework (Cazden, 1988). Furthermore, the teaching and learning of academic writing are complicated social and cognitive activities given the fact that ESL composition classes exist and function within an institution, the different parts of which often hold diverse and perhaps conflicting expectations. In order to nest this study of analytic writing in an ESL composition classroom, this chapter begins with a description of the expectations of various stakeholders for the ESL Composition Program in general, and for English 107 in particular. Knowledge of the expectations for the program will lead to a detailed study of the instructional context, examining
issues of the general curricular approach followed in 107. how students interpreted the assigned writing tasks and how the instructor built a rhetorical context for the three major writing assignments. The analysis of the instructional context will also consider how the instructor approached issues of content and issues of essay structure, and how she attempted to build a bridge between declarative and procedural knowledge for the organization of formal academic writing. Then, a detailed look at the case study students and at their experiences with writing, and their thoughts on the ESL composition course will help portray the students and the instructor as active participants within the instructional context. The discussion section presents an analysis of the data related to the instructional context, and introduces issues concerning the context and structure of the students' written products to be developed more extensively in chapter six.

Expectations for the ESL Composition Program: Who Wants What?

The purpose of studying the stakeholders' expectations for the program was to understand how and why the instructor enacted the English 107 curricular expectations and structures in the classroom, and, in turn, how the enactment of said expectations and structures shaped the way the students responded to the reading and writing tasks. In other words, this chapter explores how the different players (from the program director to the ESL students) shaped and to one extent or another participated in the classroom interaction. Figure 6 depicts all the expectations for English 107 and the persons who most exemplified any specific expectation. Interviews with the
case study students, the instructor, the course coordinator, and the program
director were coded according to different expectations for English 107. The
categories were created after repeated reading, coding, and recoding of the
data. The students' writing history questionnaires were also used as data
sources because they included references to what the students expected to
learn in English 107. Each "X" on the figure stands for one instance where the
particular expectation was mentioned. Figure 6 indicates that, in general, the
students and the instructor seemed to favor expectations related to academic
writing and rhetorical control, while the course coordinator and the program
director seemed to favor expectations related to the combination of declarative
and procedural knowledge. It is interesting to notice that the expectations
related to rhetorical control were shared by all the parties involved while other
expectations were conflicting. A more detailed analysis follows.

A review of the formal (written) program description and the interviews
with the course coordinator and the program director suggests the expectations
for English 107 were informed by and based on L2 writing theory and research,
for example, the process approach (i.e., Raimes, 1984), scholarship on
academic writing (Belcher, 1995a), and the reading-writing connection (i.e.,
Carson & Leki, 1993). English 107 seemed to effectively incorporate elements
of existing L1 and L2 writing theories in order to prepare students for different
kinds of academic writing in a range of disciplines.

A triangulated analysis of the various stakeholders' expectations for
English 107, including the perspectives of the students, the instructor, the
course coordinator, and the program director, revealed three basic categories:
(a) the teaching and learning of academic writing, (b) direct teaching of discourse conventions and structures for academic writing, and (c) the balancing of declarative and procedural knowledge about issues of structure and issues of content for analytic writing. Focusing on academic writing included an emphasis on elements like support, clarity, and conformity, and related mostly to content and ideas. The expectation of academic writing was not a unified expectation for all participants. The expectation of teaching conventions and structures of academic writing was defined by an emphasis on "rhetorical reading," preparation for content courses, some kind of predictability or macro-structure, and issues of assessment. These expectations were more clearly expressed first by the course coordinator, and then by the students, although they were also mentioned by both the instructor and the program director, making rhetorical control the most unified expectation for English 107.

The interaction of declarative and procedural knowledge for analytic writing as an expectation for English 107 surfaced when explaining issues of creativity, assessment, and grammar in the ESL composition classroom. These issues were mentioned more often by the course coordinator, and then by the program director. Both the instructor and the students were aware of the importance of dealing with both declarative and procedural knowledge, but they only mentioned them briefly, and indirectly, in the interviews. The expectation of balancing declarative and procedural knowledge for issues of content appears, then, to be a source of conflict for the active designers of classroom interaction.

To better understand how various stakeholders perceived the purpose of the ESL composition program, in general, and of English 107, in particular, it
becomes important to look individually at the expectations of the many people involved in the conceptualization of expectations in the classroom, namely, (a) the program director, (b) the course coordinator, (c) the instructor, and (d) the students. What follows is a description of the various stakeholders expectations followed by a summary of how they relate to the overall categories as defined after triangulation of sources.

The Program Director

In general, the writing program director stated her main expectation for ESL students leaving the program as “I want them to be able to produce comprehensible texts.” She seemed to be concerned with balancing the discourse structure and content for analytic writing, and she did not see these two concerns as conflicting, but rather as complementing one another.

I don’t think that they [discourse structure and content] are opposed, because I think that structure can work heuristically, that structure can help you generate ideas, it can give you a way of organizing your thoughts, or viewing some things that can help you come up with new ideas, of new ways of looking at things (Interview, 1/95).

This suggests that the act of writing is in itself a means of generating ideas, which makes writing instruction important in its own right, not merely as a skill to serve the other language learning skills. She did acknowledge, however, that ESL students are somewhat hesitant to experiment with their writing; they like formulaic approaches to the learning of academic writing. She also believes that the cognitive load on ESL students writing in a second language is significant enough to overwhelm and confuse them. Consequently, as undergraduates they would rather not have to worry about studying the
conventions for discourse in their particular fields, a concern of some importance for ESL composition programs in general.

The fact that the program director points to the interaction between two purposes—writing to clarify one’s thoughts, and writing to learn formal discourse structure—is a key fact in the interpretation of the results obtained from the analysis of the instructional context. The coexistence of these two purposes exemplify the interaction of declarative and procedural knowledge for both issues of structure and issues of content. Also important is the fact that she envisions both purposes, that is, content and discourse structure, as components of a pedagogy that helps students “produce comprehensible texts.” These ideas are key to the interpretation of the results obtained from the examination of this particular instructional context because they firmly situate the expectations for the ESL composition program within current trends of ESL writing pedagogy.

So coming back to whether or not students want structure, and whether or not we should please them. I guess what we are trying to do is strike a balance. We are giving them what they want, but we are also giving them what we think they should have (Interview, 1/95).

The interviews with the case study students demonstrate, however, that they wanted direct instruction in discourse structure because most of them were lacking familiarity with the conventions of academic writing. Instructors in non-ESL courses at the college level often assume ESL students possess some basic rhetorical knowledge (Cumming, 1995), and these ESL students are most likely aware of this limitation (Spack, 1997).
Rhetorical reading—examining the text for author’s purposes and ways of arguing and organizing ideas—is another important expectation for the program director. She feels that examining the rhetorical structure of published writing can help the students decode the text, and she thinks it is helpful for students to examine how such writing is organized and how ideas and experiences are presented.

What we are trying to get them to do is think of the fact that there are these different ways of looking at how the texts can be structured and to start thinking in those terms when they read themselves, at least part of the time pay attention to how texts are constructed (Interview, 1/95)

In summary, the program director’s expectations are (a) to make texts comprehensible by teaching discourse structure, and by stressing an element of predictability in texts, and (b) to foster thinking by using rhetorical structure heuristically as a means of generating ideas. These expectations relate equally to the teaching and learning of rhetorical structures and to the teaching and learning of both declarative and procedural knowledge of both content and organizational structure as stated above. Specifically, they include the issues of predictability and rhetorical reading for the former, and fostering critical thinking and new understandings in the latter.

The Course Coordinator

In this particular ESL composition program, the course coordinator was responsible for developing the English 107 syllabus, choosing the textbooks, developing the main writing assignments, and supervising the instructors. His main expectation was to “get students to deal successfully with other kinds of writing they are expected to do.” The course coordinator emphasized
"rhetorical control." He wanted, above all, to prepare ESL students for other kinds of writing they would encounter in their academic careers, and to stress rhetorical reading as a powerful learning tool. "They [non-ESL composition courses] seem to assume that students already have a pretty strong rhetorical background, so it becomes important to us to insure that all students come out of our courses with that knowledge" (Interview 2/95). To help the students gain some working knowledge of basic rhetorical conventions (like thesis statement and topic sentences) he likes them to focus on the reading-writing connection, and on the way reading skills can inform writing skills and vice versa. "What I am trying to do is to get them to see these rhetorical devices as reading devices as well. That you don't just write using comparison and contrast but that you read using that as well" (Interview 2/95).

The course also spent some time in grammar study, but the coordinator emphasized that 107 was not a grammar course. The instructor was told to direct students to appropriate sections of the reference grammar book, and only on occasion should class time be given to issues of grammar. Grammar was also tackled indirectly through the sharpening of editing skills. Not only did the students--in the researcher's opinion--seem to enjoy editing their papers, but it gave them the opportunity to target specific problem areas.

The course coordinator also wanted the ESL students to explore various ways of presenting ideas by mixing the modes, and by responding personally to the readings.

The reader [anthology of readings] combines literary and informational texts. There was no literature at all before I took over the course, but I wanted to bring literature in because it challenges students as readers in
ways that academic [or informational] texts don't. At some point along the way in order to write papers for other courses they need the ability, not only to absorb information, but also to analyze a text in order to write about it (Interview, 2/95).

Because literary texts do not often employ the rhetorical modes, reading and interpreting literature requires more in-depth analysis. He acknowledged that often in their reading students do not find the rhetorical modes being used overtly, and then they have to be more creative in their application of their rhetorical knowledge. This was another way, together with rhetorical analysis, in which students were guided in their exploration of both American/Western rhetoric and their unique personal interpretation of it. Specifically, rhetorical analysis is also designed to help students write more effectively.

This rhetorical analysis they do is based very much on their ability to recognize how, well ... I talk about 'how a text means' and not 'what a text means.' So analysis means being able to look at a text and to determine what the writer has done to produce that particular text, what the writer has done rhetorically. They are also analyzing themselves as readers, increasingly, as the course goes on, they are asked to write about how they have read a text. So, getting into reader response, how they have actually reconstructed the text (Interview, 2/95).

Accordingly, he believes rhetorical reading has two purposes: (a) to serve as a practical tool to help the ESL students with reading difficulties, and (b) to support the students' development of rhetorical control over their own writing. His expectations focused first on the teaching and learning of rhetorical structures, and second on the teaching and learning of both declarative and procedural knowledge for reading and writing a range of informational and literary texts. Perhaps most interesting, however, is his use of literary texts to foster more self-analytic and metacognitive awareness of academic literacy.
The coordinator viewed growth in academic writing as developing from the outside (what others have written) to the inside (what I understand). Accordingly, one question for this study is the extent to which the instructor believed in and implemented such an approach to teaching academic writing.

The Instructor

For the most part, the instructor wanted the students to focus on textual support and structural clarity when writing their essays. She expected them to support any general statements they made in their essays either through elaborations or examples garnered from the text. Accordingly, most of her expectations focused on the teaching and learning of her concerns for academic writing, requiring her to teach quite deliberately discourse structures that she believed were the mark of successful college-level writers.

I want them to write clearly, and in a way that academic readers are going to expect to find. Something like an introduction and a conclusion, and a thesis statement in their introduction, although I tell them it is not always the case that it is in the introduction. I want the reader to be able to anticipate what he or she is reading. The thesis statement stated very clearly at the beginning, and also what I call a hint which is an idea of what is coming along. I also want a very clear topic sentence that can be understood on its own at the beginning of each paragraph. I also try to get them to write a little conclusion sentence at the end of each paragraph to restate what they said (Interview. 3/95).

The instructor believed in the intrinsic value of the forms of academic writing, especially because they were never taught to her and she believed it should have been a part of her writing instruction. "To this day I hate the fact that my introductory writing course in college was not academic writing. We had these strange assignments like narratives, stories, creative writing. I guess" (Interview 3/95). Her high esteem for academic writing also included the idea of
conformity to academic standards. Conformity, to her, meant abiding by both explicit and implicit "rules" when writing for the academy. In reply to one student's comment, written on the presentation letter accompanying the portfolio (a collection of what the student considered to be his or her three best written works) about his quest for originality in his writing, the instructor wrote: "Unfortunately, creativity is seldom the most valued criteria (sic) in 'academic writing.' If you value academic success, you will need to explore the area of 'conformity' also." Although it is not clear what circumstances prompted this remark, what is clear is that the instructor distinguishes academic success and creativity. References to "conformity" seem to suggest adherence to conventions of academic writing and references to "creativity" suggest literary writing. Most students, as observed by the researcher and confirmed by the program director, welcomed the rules of conformity, but interestingly, they never expressed this expectation explicitly in their interviews.

The instructor believed that mastering the conventions of formal academic writing would help the students organize their thoughts and ideas in a more coherent way. Improved organization would, she believed, not only help them as writers, but as readers as well. For example, when evaluating writing, the instructor focused first on rhetorical control (adherence to a pre-set organizational format), and then on editing skills. In other words, her aim was to down play the development of new ideas (but not discourse) and to focus on competence in a certain kind of analytic writing, generally described as thesis and support. Interestingly, the instructor acknowledged that the training she received in preparation to teaching English 107 focused on different issues.
We did not talk much about structure, but about responses to the students' writing. A lot of time was spent looking at case study papers, and talking about what possible comments we would make to students in a tutorial, or on their papers (Interview, 3/95).

It seems, then, that the instructor relied more heavily on her own definitions of and experiences with both assessment and academic writing instruction when teaching English 107 this particular quarter. Because she had been a successful student, her beliefs regarding formal writing evolved out of her own successes or frustrations with college writing. Although she was aware that the training received in preparation for teaching English 107 instructed her to focus on the development of students' intentions and meanings, she was not able to comply entirely with the training received. Lortie (1975) has argued that teachers have a difficult time overcoming images of their own schooling and therefore might limit their views of learning to what they have experienced through the "apprenticeship of observation." What the instructor observed her teachers do (or not) that led to success (or failure) was based largely on knowledge attained as a student rather than as a reflective practitioner.

Although the instructor expressed the fact that clarity was more important to her than originality or creativity--"I don't care what they are writing about, I just want them to write clearly"--in the classroom she repeatedly mentioned the importance of using a variety of formats. In practice, however, she encouraged students to select a particular mode of discourse and to demonstrate competence with that mode.
Accordingly, on the one hand, as will be seen later, the instructor mentioned the importance of content and creativity, but on the other, she rarely expressed these concerns in the interviews. Put another way, she focused almost exclusively on issues of clarity, support, predictability, and the use of rhetorical devices, and ignored the more personal and expressive aspects of writing that the program coordinator sought. This orientation had, in turn, a significant influence on the students' understanding and enactment of the expectations for English 107.

The Students

The students wanted to have a "well-organized" essay, with "adequate support," that is, assurance that each sentence within the paragraph supported the topic sentence, and that each topic sentence supported the thesis statement.

As the quarter progressed, the students also wanted to write essays that were clear and comprehensible. For example, in the second interview, looking ahead to essay three, Sung-Ho said: "For essay three I will try to have organization, make clear organization, clear introduction, and body, and clear conclusion." The students seemed to develop a deeper, more refined understanding of these expectations as the quarter progressed, mostly because of classroom instruction and the tutorials.

From the tutorial, I knew not only which problems I had, but also the spirit of American writing. We don't need to have too much introduction in an essay even in every paragraph. All we need is to write the topic and the point directly and clearly. (Interview, 2/95).
The students were also very conscious of the importance of rhetorical reading.

After the first essay, I started to read, study, and understand my assignments in a different way. For overall, my reading techniques improved. I wrote my opinion on the events of a story and underlined important sentences in a story, which I had never done before (Interview, 3/95).

Other students began to understand how rhetorical reading leads to the development of a written response to a text. This particular student realized the importance of the reading processes in the formulation of a written response to the source text.

While I was reading 'To Room Nineteen,' the first step for organizing essay three, I realized that my reading process was changing. In the beginning (segments A and B,) I did not really pay attention to the connection to the essay, or I did not think deeply. But as the segments progressed, my interpretation also progressed, and many ideas and questions came up to my mind. In other words, I was reading them more effectively to the writing assignment (Interview, 4/95)

Not all of the students, however, believed solely in following the instructor's concern for essay structure. The following comment prompted the previously presented instructor's comment that describes her belief in conformity over creativity in academic writing. This student wrote:

My effort in this course may not be obvious, however, I have done more than anyone in this class. I am very creative. I like to think independently. I would be very upset if I had to do something boring again and again such as my first essay. In essay one, one does not need to think or understand the writings, but still can have the similar final paper as others. Thus, after the first essay, I started to read, study, and understand my assignments in a different way. I do not mean I skip all I have learned in English 107. Actually, I just read the essays many times, and I tried to express my ideas which are not copies from anyone. All the ideas in my paper belong to me. I worked so hard to create these ideas. For example, I try to imagine myself as the main character and try to
understand him or her. Also, I compile some ideas that I have learned from the sociology class. I believe this is a good way to improve my English writing (Portfolio letter, 3/95).

This particular student, however, was the only student whose clearly expressed expectation for the English 107 course was in direct opposition with the instructor's expectations for the course. Otherwise, the students had internalized well the expectations of organization presented by the instructor. They became more aware of these expectations, and eventually made them their own as the quarter progressed. Rhetorical reading and clarity were accordingly very important to them. As an observer and interviewer of several students, the researcher believes that the students did think about content and ideas and does not understand why the students never mentioned expectations related to the development of content when they were interviewed.

Summary of the Expectations: The Many Perspectives of Teaching and Learning Academic Writing

The expectation of teaching academic writing included the elements of support, clarity, and conformity, and was primarily supported by the instructor, and hence the students. The element of rhetorical control was mentioned more often in interviews by the course coordinator, the students, and both the instructor and the program director (in that order), and it encompassed the areas of rhetorical reading, preparation for other writing experiences, predictability, and assessment. The third expectation encompassed the combination of declarative and procedural knowledge, and dealing with issues of content and issues of structure. This balance relates to issues of creativity, assessment, and grammar.
The fact that English 107 needed to prepare the students for other kinds of writing required in the academy and that students may be required to do in their careers was well understood, and articulated by all stakeholders—the program director, coordinator, instructor, and students. Both the instructor and the program director wanted the students to use discourse structures as a way of organizing students' thoughts and ideas, creating a pattern or organization that would eventually help the reader. Assessment emphasized rhetorical control first, and editing skills second. Creativity and originality were more important for the course coordinator, the program director, and a few of the students. The importance of critical manipulation of content was the reason why the course encouraged the mixing of modes, and the reason why literature was used as part of writing in response to reading. The training in assessment received by the composition instructor focused on a combination of form and substance. A lot of time was spent looking at model essays, and talking about what possible comments they would make to students in a tutorial, or on students' papers. The improvement of the students' command of grammar was also a very important goal of the program. However, it was accomplished with "as needed" instruction, with an emphasis on the semantic implications of grammatical mistakes.

Although some of the expectations were shared by all the stakeholders, some were not, and this diversity produced tension in the enactment of the English 107 expectations in the classroom. For example, the main expectations of teaching academic writing and organizational structures for various modes were valued and enacted by the students, the instructor, the course coordinator.
and the program director. However, while the coordinator wanted the students to use the modes to present their own ideas, the instructor wanted the students to learn how to organize each mode. She had an ideal text in mind usually composed of thesis and support. Moreover, the English 107 expectations became clearer to the students as they were operationalized in the classroom and the tutorials, making the instructor the catalyst for their enactment. Although not widespread, some of the instructor's expectations seemed to conflict with the expectations of the director and coordinator. In addition, some of the students' comments suggest a desire to have more range of freedom to explore their own ideas and literary responses. Because in each classroom students learn what counts as interesting and appropriate, what can be said or written, and how to say or write it, an examination of the instructional context for English 107 follows.

**Instructional Context**

The purpose of studying the instructional context was to better understand the way instruction shapes the students' development as analytic writers. The effects of classroom instruction become most evident with the interpretation of the task at hand and are visible through both the revising and rewriting process, and through the instructor's final assessment. The study of the instructional context includes a look at (a) the general curricular approach followed throughout the quarter, (b) the building of a rhetorical context for the writing assignments, and (c) the balancing of declarative and procedural knowledge about rhetorical structure for analytic writing.
General Curricular Approach

This study of the general curricular approach to English 107 across the quarter was shaped by four questions: (a) How was the course work sequenced? (b) how and in what sequence were discourse structures covered in classroom discussions? (c) how much time was spent on various activities to support student learning? and (d) how did the instructor enable the students in learning new routines and strategies for analytic writing by balancing declarative and procedural knowledge?

Classroom sequences and students' interpretations of the main writing assignments

Task interpretation is an important element in understanding the instructional context because by examining how the instructor supports the students' task interpretations one can better understand the classroom dynamics, in general, and the teaching and learning of analytic writing, in particular. The written instructions the students received before writing the three essays were very specific. (See Appendix B.) The retrospective accounts of composing revealed that students followed the detailed instructions very closely, including little, if any, personal interpretation of the written task. The written instructions for each task, designed by the course coordinator, always followed the same basic pattern: (a) a length requirement, (b) an emphasis on the reading-writing connection, (c) somewhat of a theoretical background supporting the specific requirements, (d) specific requirements (such as length), and (e) guidance questions.
The written product of each of the three essays was supposed to be between 500 and 600 words in length, and each was to be written in response to a literary or informational text. The students were required to read the source text and to take reading notes as part of their prewriting experiences. The most consistent requirement was a response to the content, development, and/or arrangement used by the author in the text. Two points were made very clear in the written directions to the students: First, that the guidance questions were offered only as suggestions and that the students should not feel compelled to follow them; and second, that they should use a combination of discourse modes that best suited the expression of their ideas. The instructor also stressed these two issues when discussing the written instructions in the classroom.

With these directions, the instructor chose to limit her role in task interpretation to paraphrasing or explaining what the written instructions meant. When distributing them, she read them aloud with the students and then answered their questions. On at least one occasion, the instructor gave examples that were more specific than the ones presented in the directions. She based these examples on the experiences the students had been having in class. For instance, after studying comparison and contrast, and in preparation for essay two, for which the students had read two short stories on the lives of troubled female characters, she led a discussion on possible themes that could be compared: comparing one of the character's lives to the students' own life, comparing the lives of the two characters, and comparing the effect of the two readings on the student as a reader.
The interviews with the case study students revealed that they made serious efforts to follow the written instructions. The students believed that they were expected to (a) read the assignments carefully, (b) write their personal reactions to the readings, and (c) use at least two rhetorical modes. The students' interpretations of the assignments were, however, also shaped by how they comprehended the readings to which they were to respond. For example, one case study student explained that he based his writings on the parts of the readings that he understood better: "We had two readings in the class; but the one I could most understand was about Sylvia, so I chose that one." Also, the students seemed to know the importance of including their personal opinion on their essays. A student described his task interpretation procedures as follows:

I just read the directions and tried to understand what they wanted me to do. They wanted me to write my opinion of the reading. So I think brainstorm in a piece of paper, and then I make the outline (Interview, 2/95).

Accordingly, issues of task interpretation seemed to be easily interpreted by both the students and the instructor, and the writing tasks seemed to be designed to effectively prompt the students to write analytic essays. However, because the writing assignment permitted choice and exploratory approaches to the readings, it is useful to consider how the instructor supported the students in doing so.

The Sequencing and Presentation of Discourse Knowledge Across the Quarter

In teaching the students to write effectively about the readings, the instructor reviewed the ground rules for arguing and reasoning with ESL.
students who were relatively new to the academic culture and academic writing. This was accomplished by introducing the genre conventions for the academic essay early on in the quarter. The course progressed over the 10-week period from a mainly teacher-led discussion to increasing student involvement. Accordingly, at the beginning of the quarter the discourse conventions and the modes played a bigger role in instruction as compared to the end of the quarter, when students were expected to make some of their own choices.

When presenting declarative knowledge about discourse structures in the classroom, the instructor followed the same basic pattern. Each mode was introduced separately, but in a similar fashion. With the instructor reading from the textbook (and explaining the structure and core of the mode), and then discussing the discourse mode with the students. For example, on one occasion she directed the students to "remember you will be taking sides, and everything you say should serve your thesis statement." In this way, she was able to both reinforce knowledge about discourse conventions for argumentation and remind students about the task demands of the specific assignment.

After reading and explaining from the textbook, the instructor would then draw outlines on the blackboard representing the mode in question. For example, when discussing comparison and contrast the instructor presented two alternative patterns: point-by-point and all of one/all of the other. She would engage the students by asking them which things they would like to compare. In the case of comparison and contrast they decided to make the media presence of Michael Jackson and O.J. Simpson the subject of their
outlines. The students thought of three categories of comparison: their backgrounds, careers, and pending court cases.

After discussing the outlines, the instructor would then distribute a model essay and give the students specific questions to focus on as they read it in class in preparation for a group discussion. First, she would ask them to decide if the reading in question would qualify as an academic essay. Specifically, she wanted them to consider how the typical outline of the mode discussed fit the text they were reading. She would ask them to try to outline the reading and to think of the passage's strong and weak points when it came to genre organization. After the students had an opportunity to work on their papers, she would initiate a class discussion and eventually reconstruct the outline of the reading on the blackboard.

Then, as homework, she would assign a mini-essay using the mode to be practiced. The mini essay is "a condensed, one paragraph version of an academic essay. It contains a thesis statement, topic sentences, support, and a conclusion" (Peterson, 1996) (For an example of a mini essay, see Appendix I.) The following day the instructor would review the mini essays and then work on transition words. At this point she clarified questions and reviewed general grammar problems.

The presentation of declarative knowledge of structure for the writing assignments, as was evident in the classroom observations, was based on certain current theories of SL writing instruction. Controlled practice in both editing and writing, continuous revising and rewriting, classroom discussions, and other activities enabled the students to build an understanding of the genre.
conventions for academic writing. The presentation of the modes, and of the relevant discourse conventions provided students with a structure or outline around which they could organize their ideas, and they also provided useful vocabulary. The students' confidence was also boosted by the practice they received in the classroom environment; for example, one case study student commented on his increased ability to manipulate texts rhetorically, that is, to put procedural knowledge about structure to work in the classroom.

Classroom activities: Enabling students in learning new routines and strategies for analytic writing

The instructional emphasis on control over structure coexisted with other important activities in the classroom. For example, the instructor constantly emphasized taking reading notes, in particular, and rhetorical reading in general, that is, "looking for ways in which the modes are being used in other people's writing."

Instructor - When you are reading, what kinds of things can you do to ensure that classroom discussions run smoothly?
Student - Take notes
Instructor - Yes, take notes. Also, what about underlining? Your school life will be easier if you underline or take notes while you read. How can you read without a pencil? (Classroom observations. 2/95).

In addition to stressing the rhetorical structure of the modes and the importance of rhetorical reading, the instructor regularly spent class time on sharpening editing skills, reviewing grammar, and doing group presentations. Students worked on these areas both individually and in groups. Reading,
editing, and getting ready for the tutorials helped sharpen the students' analytical skills. The instructor gave specific instructions before each reading: "I want you to look for what makes this reading good, the general techniques that are used, and what things can be improved." They were also encouraged to take "reading notes," which consisted of comments, or even questions, they might had about the readings.

Figure 7 shows the mean percentages of time on task spent on various classroom activities on the day that classroom observations were carried out. Length of time on the activities was timed (in minutes) and then a percentage was computed based on total class time. Finally, mean percentages were calculated. Both sections presented the same material each day, but since both sections were not observed on the same day results are presented by section.

A teacher-led discussion (26%) was the favored way of presenting new material, and that amount of time is matched by the amount of time spent doing group work (26%). Reading aloud and student presentations were sporadic activities that did not take much of the class time (2% and 3% respectively), while lecture (17%), silent reading (10%), and writing (7%) were somewhere in between. These figures seem to indicate that the instructor balanced the time she spent on explaining new routines and strategies with the time she gave the students to work in groups practicing these skills. It would seem, then, that the gross amount of time spent in imparting declarative and procedural knowledge about genre conventions in the classroom was roughly similar. A more in-depth analysis that follows on the second part of this chapter will reveal how the amounts of time spent imparting declarative and procedural knowledge about
issues of content were not similar. This part of the analysis indicates, however, that the instructor used both whole-group and individual approaches in enabling the students to learn the routines and vocabulary necessary to master discourse terminology.

Figure 8 reveals the percentage of each activity as it occurred on the days that the observations were carried out. The observation checklists were counted (by activity) and then a percentage was calculated by section. Teacher-led discussion (89% and 73%) and lecture (56% and 100%) were conducted frequently, while writing (22% and 36%) and reading aloud (33% and 27%) were at the lower end of the frequency count, with small-group work (67% and 73%) somewhere towards the high end. These results seem to indicate that instructor-dominated activities were prominent in the classrooms—this instructor preferred presentational-type activities for the learning of discourse elements. The figures also indicate that writing as an in-class activity was somewhat limited, but a great deal of editing and writing occurred during small group work, making it hard to tally the two activities individually.

It is important to remember that these figures represent classroom activities over the course of the quarter. However, the emphasis of classroom instruction changed over the ten-week period. As the students became more comfortable with the use of the discourse conventions for each mode presented in the beginning of the quarter the instructor shifted to more direct student involvement with writing and reading during the second half of the quarter. In the first half of the quarter, the instructor focused more on discourse structure rather than on how a reader might respond to a source text, or how students as
writers may analyze the content of the source readings while writing their own essays. Throughout the quarter, the instructor seemed to increasingly allow for discussion of issues, but mostly as a means of corroborating student comprehension, not as a means of challenging the students and enabling their own interpretations of content and the accompanying ways of presentation.

Balancing Declarative and Procedural Knowledge During Classroom Instruction and Tutorials

The instructor used a combination of classroom time and one-on-one interaction in the tutorials to discuss both declarative and procedural knowledge, and to help students put theory into practice by transforming "knowledge of what" into "knowledge of how." When the instructor dealt with declarative knowledge in the classroom she explored issues of discourse structure; that is, she concentrated on helping the students internalize the ideal structures she envisioned for each mode. It was, however, mostly during one-on-one interaction, that the instructor had opportunities to explore issues of content. The balancing of declarative and procedural knowledge across the classroom instruction and the tutorials becomes, then, closely linked to the coexistence of issues of content and issues of structure in the context of instruction.

In the classroom

Although the instructor spent a good deal of the classroom time on helping students understand declarative and procedural knowledge for discourse structure, on several occasions the instructor also tried to focus on issues of content. She tried for a balance by (a) discussing the sense of
audience. (b) mentioning the possibility of personal adaptations to the academic writing style. (c) trying to instill a sense of ownership in the students about their writing. and (d) constantly working on sharpening the students' analytical skills.

Whenever the students approached a reading, the instructor asked them to determine if it was indeed academic writing. They also discussed who was more likely to read the article considering a sense of audience. One such incident dealt with an article on the importance of cold remedies for Americans. an article entitled "Cold Remedies" (1990). adapted from "Cold Remedies: Which Ones Work Best?" that appeared in Consumer Reports (1989). The article examined the idea that over-the-counter cold remedies are meant to treat a multitude of symptoms, and that cold sufferers may be, on the one hand, spending money that does not need to be spent, and, on the other, exposing themselves to needless side effects. The instructor determined the thesis statement for the article was "Thus, it may be a good idea for cold sufferers to look for effective single-ingredient drugs."

After reading the article and discussing it. students had both positive and negative comments to make about its discourse structure. On the positive side, they said: "For every general statement there is an explanation." They also liked the fact that it "presented scientific evidence." On the negative side, they found that the many names of common drugs mentioned in the article made it hard to follow, and that "The last sentence in the conclusion [was] introducing a new idea." The sentence in question was "Finally, when in doubt, people with colds should always consult their physicians."
The instructor was quick to point out that most Americans would recognize, and possibly like the fact that they recognized, the names of the drugs mentioned in the article, and would probably find the information on the drugs helpful and interesting. She also said that, while it was true that she did not recommend introducing a new idea at the end of an essay in academic essays, it worked very well in this *Consumer Reports* article. She explained how the author might have purposefully introduced the new idea at the end to keep the readers thinking about related subjects, something that is not the goal of an academic essay, in which one wants the reader to focus on the clearly expressed ideas already presented.

From this example it is evident that the instructor wanted the students to know that there are many kinds of writing, and that academic writing—that they were learning in English 107—represented only one particular kind. Moreover, she reminded the students to think about the intended audience of this particular piece of writing, helping them internalize ways to read, and think about texts. Although she was—in this particular case—focusing on issues of content over issues of structure, and teaching the students "how to" approach different texts, discourse structure remained the central concern.

The concept of audience often brought on the subject of personal adaptations that can, and sometimes should, be made when writing. "I am choosing three examples because it is a convenient number, but you can choose as many as you like." or "For now you should follow these patterns [referring to the modes], but when you get out of here you can experiment." Once again, the instructor wanted the students to think about other possibilities.
while she presented a specific example, but she consistently held to a set format or discourse structure.

Experimentation is, however, unattainable without the students feeling a sense of ownership of and pride in their writing. The instructor tried to make the students feel comfortable about their writing. She said: "Towards the beginning of the quarter I will tell you more of what I want you to do, and then as time goes on I will expect you to tell me more of what I want you to know." As Langer and Applebee (1986, 1987), and Hillocks (1996) have pointed out, students need the scaffolding provided by the instructor. Scaffolding was also provided by small-group work and small-group presentations, and they seemed to support one another's efforts. For example, generally, the students would start discussions in small groups by talking about the main ideas and events in the readings, and then they would move into more specific questions. These small group discussions helped the students decode the source text at a semantic level, and also, most importantly, broadened the students' experiences with interpretation. Then, when the whole class discussion started, students were already familiar with ideas different from the ones they had held individually before the small group discussions started. Hence, they were better prepared to hear other small group's and the instructor's interpretations, both semantic and contextual, of the events being discussed. In this particular example, scaffolding provided increased manipulation of procedural knowledge that made the students feel a sense of pride and ownership of their interpretations.

Also, the instructor always stressed the individuality of writing, even in an academic setting: "I don't want you to repeat the story to me. I need your
opinion, and the reasons for having that opinion." or "For you that may be very important, but not for someone else, so you need to make your case." One time a student had a question about his thesis statement. After reading it, the following discussion took place

Instructor - Are you sure this is your opinion? or is it something that is evident from the story?

Student - It is my opinion.

Instructor - Well, it might be your opinion, but everyone will agree with you, so you better add something more personal. It looks to me that you are just telling me what happened in the story. make sure you tell me what you think. For that you probably need to go beyond what is in the story (Classroom observations, 3/95).

The instructor could have used this opportunity to enable the student in exploring his or her personal interpretation of the source text. Instead, the instructor limited her role to pointing out to the student that he or she needed to add personal interpretation, hence missing an optimal educational opportunity to guide the student through the processes of exploration of personal ideas.

The mini essays were also designed to make students feel comfortable about their writing. (For a sample mini essay, see Appendix I.) The case study students said they liked the mini essays because "it [gave] me an opportunity to practice all in a small paragraph." The instructor liked the mini essay for several reasons. Most importantly, she thought the mini essay allowed her to maximize the use of class time, because they could be written, read, and discussed fairly quickly. Also, they allowed her flexibility in choosing a particular problem area.
in the students' writing on which to focus. Specifically, she used the mini essays as (a) a model for formal essay genre (showing the structure and transitions used,) (b) an editing tool (making students' mini essays a focus for classroom discussions,) (c) a peer review tool (having students discuss them in pairs,) and (d) a matching tool (having students match instructor's comments to specific essays) (Peterson, 1996). The fact that students were not only encouraged to contribute new ideas to their analysis of readings and to their writing in general, but that they actively created and modeled classroom discussions allowed them to feel responsible for and proud of their written work.

In general, during most classroom discussions the instructor tried to focus on the students' analytical skills. For example, the instructor started class one day by distributing a handout that had two examples of introductions taken from essays written by ESL students. She had the students read them silently while keeping in mind three things: (a) What made them good introductions?, (b) What general techniques were used?, and (c) What things could be improved upon?

"Knowledge is Power," most people would agree with it. As we know, there are many ways to acquire knowledge. However, school is the most direct and systematic entrance to contact with knowledge. So, for several sake, everyone who can should try to get a college degree.

My father has lived a successful and wistful life--everybody sees him everywhere, and knows him. People envy his ability which can support five sons and one daughter until they stand alone on each field. He has suffered from Japanese colony, the restoration of independence and Korean war in his life. Even he has succeeded in everything, there is one thing he regrets. That is education at university. If you miss this time, you never catch it up again. Anyone who can should try to get a college degree.
In examining the first example, the students commented that they thought it was a good introduction, it succeeded at "grabbing" their attention and making them want to read more, and they liked the topic: "Knowledge is Power." For revisions, they concentrated on grammar and semantics. They suggested that "several" should be changed to either "everybody's" or "anybody's," and that "everyone" could become "anyone."

Regarding the introduction in the second example, the students said they had trouble following the ideas from one sentence to the next. The instructor rephrased this as "The relationship between the sentences is not clear." As techniques, they saw "the funnel" (a type of introduction discussed in class that begins specific and concludes general) used to go from a personal example--my father--to the fact that education is important. The instructor mentioned how this funnel was not gradual enough to be effective. In her opinion, this introduction contained "a lot of very specific information that would be better to save for the body of the essay." Regarding possible improvements, one student commented how the phrase "Everybody sees him everywhere, and knows him" was vague and did not contribute much to the sense of the introduction. But he did not know how to make it better. The instructor suggested "In town, people recognize my father and like him." Then she asked them if they saw any grammar problems with the paragraphs. This is the area where students were more eager to make comments. One of them said the auxiliary "will" was missing in the next-to-last sentence, they found missing articles ("the" university), and suggested "Even" be changed to "Even though."
The instructor took two important, albeit conflicting steps in this classroom example. On the one hand, she presented a rather tight formula for the writing of an essay: an introduction ending with the thesis statement, several paragraphs starting with a topic sentence, containing various examples organized the same way, and a summary sentence at the end. On the other hand, she also sought to discuss the content presented in these essays. For example, in "My Father," she tried to explore the students' response to the father as a character to try to create a rapport between reader and writer. She asked them what their feelings were regarding the father as a person. No student responded, so she then told them that

the writer is very effective in letting us know his father, by saying he was kind and that everyone liked him we get to know his father as a person, and a more personal relationship is established between you, as a reader, and the author, as a writer (Classroom observations, 1/95).

The instructor was not, however, able to tap into the students' reactions to the character of the father. She asked them how they felt after reading about the father in the second example. She pointed out that the writer on this piece was effective in describing the popularity of the father, by pointing out that he has been successful, that people are envious of his abilities, and that everybody knows him. Accordingly, the writer seems to want to establish a more personal relationship between the reader and the writer. The students, however, made no comments about the way this writing sample affected what they thought about "the father" as a person. In this particular case, the instructor tried to establish a meaningful discussion related to the content of the students' writing, but the discussion never materialized. Classroom observations suggest,
however, that discussions relating to issues of declarative knowledge about discourse structure occurred frequently in this classroom and that the students found those to be far more compelling.

Many times, attempts by either the instructor or the students to examine issues of content did not result in meaningful classroom discussion. However, students seemed willing to discuss issues of structure. Why was this the case? Previous studies have pointed to the fact that students learn what counts as interesting and appropriate, what can be said and how to say it (Applebee, 1997). If teachers stress content and ideas their students will too; if teachers stress ideal discourse structure, so will their students. Also, perhaps the ESL students believed that they needed a framework that guaranteed success in their writing, and were not very interested in experimenting since the discourse structures provided by the instructor offered a good formula to insure successful completion of the course. Furthermore, they seemed to see little purpose in discussing their own ideas and experiences as they pertained to the content of the sample essays.

In the tutorials

Because classroom instruction occurs in large groups, many writing theorists (Atwell, 1987; Belcher, 1995b; Graves, 1983; Harris, 1986) have argued for one-on-one tutorials or conferences. As one-on-one interactions between the instructor and the ESL students, the tutorials presented an opportunity for exploring both issues of content and issues of structure. However, even in this venue the instructor was more concerned with structure than with reinforcing her concern for the students' own ways of presenting their
ideas. For example, in the last tutorial, the instructor let the students choose the
direction of the interaction: they were to come prepared with questions, and they
were supposed to initiate the discussions. In Kamran's tutorial, he asked a
general question about organization, and the instructor said: "Good question.
First let's look at the thesis statement and topic sentences: because they should
make sense all by themselves." Although, after reviewing Kamran's essay, she
concluded they did make sense all by themselves, she failed to question him
about the content of these sentences.

During the same tutorial, Kamran wanted to make sure his thesis
statement "matched" his whole essay, an indication that he had internalized the
instructor's notion of the ideal text structure. The instructor had stressed
repeatedly that the thesis statement should be representative of the entire
essay. that is, the thesis statement was a microcosm of the entire essay's main
points. Interestingly, Kamran's thesis statement only partially "matched" the
essay. He claimed in his essay that he found Susan's--the central character in
"To Room Nineteen"--thoughts and decisions to be "abnormal:" "Confusion
about herself playing a major role in life, she displayed abnormal thoughts."
The instructor read and commented that Kamran had two ideas in his thesis
statement--confusion and abnormal thoughts--and that each of these ideas
should be represented in each topic sentence. Reading aloud with Kamran,
she found that each topic sentence did indeed discuss one example of
"abnormal thoughts" on the character's part.

Then the instructor focused on the idea of confusion: "Let's now look for
the idea of confusion. Since that was in your thesis statement we expect to find
that also. Is it in there?" The student answered "I don't think so." Kamran knew that his thesis statement was supposed to "match" his whole essay, but that a portion of his thesis statement did not; for he had not mentioned the idea of "confusion" in his topic sentences. He was able to recognize this problem immediately, indicating that he transformed his declarative knowledge about "a thesis should match the essay" into procedural knowledge. He realized that his ideas about the character's confusion should not appear in his thesis statement because he did not talk about the idea of confusion in his essay.

Although Kamran was able to recognize the "mismatch" between his thesis statement and the content of his essay, he would have not been able, without the instructor's help, to continue following the "rules" for presenting ideas in a model academic essay. When the instructor pointed to the fact that he mentioned "confusion" in his thesis statement but failed to mention it in any other place in the essay, the resulting exchange was interesting.

Instructor - Is the idea of confusion in there?
Kamran - I don't think so
Instructor - Then, you could put this idea somewhere else, the problem is that you don't want to put it in your thesis statement unless you are really going to talk about it
Kamran - Can I maybe put it in the conclusion? (Tutorial. 2/95).

So Kamran was about to break one of the ground rules for structure taught in class, namely that no new ideas are to be introduced in the conclusion. Kamran typifies a conflict between following the modes the way they were presented in class and finding a way to say what the he wanted to
say. This conflict was evident more in Kamran than in the other two case study students. This particular tutorial shows that, although the instructor was able to direct Kamran into following the "rules" for structure presented in class, she made no attempt to direct Kamran into discovering a better way to express his ideas. In other words, she focused on helping the student deal with procedural knowledge about issues of structure but did not attempt to work on procedural knowledge about issues of content.

A second example of the way the tutorial functioned as a connector between declarative and procedural knowledge can be illustrated by considering how Kamran learned the conventions of paragraphing. That topic sentences should control paragraphing was also explained and emphasized numerous times in class, and yet Kamran in particular tended to stray away from the guidance of the topic sentences in his paragraphs. In one paragraph in particular, the topic sentence asserted that "Susan's thoughts were always baseless." During the tutorial the instructor looked at this paragraph, but could not find the clear examples of "baseless thoughts" she was expecting to find. "What is an example in here of her thoughts that were baseless?" The instructor then started reading each sentence in the paragraph, asking Kamran if each one was an example of a baseless thought. Prompted this way, Kamran was able to recognize which of his examples were related to "baseless thoughts" and which ones were not. When asked: "So, how many examples are you giving us of thoughts of hers that were baseless?" the student replied, "only one." Now Kamran was able to delete extraneous information from his paragraph and further develop the relevant example. The tutorial was
instrumental, then, in enabling Kamran to examine one of his own paragraphs in light of the "rule" about topic sentences controlling and guiding the content of paragraphs, and to turn declarative knowledge about genre conventions into procedural knowledge about genre conventions.

Yucuanto also came prepared for his final tutorial, but his questions concerned quite minor points. For instance, his first question was about which of two words he needed to use in a particular sentence: "one of the questions I have is how to use the words 'that' and 'this.' When do I use them?" The instructor answered his question, but expected the student to ask more questions about discourse level issues. His next two questions also focused on discrete points, and the instructor answered them. But then she decided to change the direction of the tutorial, and began to point out some concerns of a more global nature, such as the logic of the argument ("Here you contradict your next statement") and paragraph level issues ("I don't think your topic sentence reflects [your reaction] very well"). By employing this advice, Yucuanto was able to produce a coherent essay.

The instructor, however, also included the issues of the students' own thinking about and response to the literary texts. Yucuanto generally seemed to understand the instructor's concerns, and at one point during the tutorial put this understanding into words: "So I need to include my opinion?" and "So every time I say something [from the story] I need to give my opinion?" He began to understand that after he describes an event from the story, he ought to discuss it--to give his opinion or to explain the event's relevance to his essay. This was
a point that had been discussed in class several times. The instructor had said not to present an example and just leave it there; it must be commented on.

You don't want to be just summarizing the story. you need to tell us what you think about it. ... At any rate, whenever you mention an event from the story, you need to give us your reaction: so you need to do that for the affair and for being alone, and for not having freedom [the three main ideas in his essay] (Tutorial, 3/95).

This was sometimes difficult for students to understand. In Yucuanto's tutorial, he began to understand that the instructor expected him to elaborate and discuss his examples. However, in general, very little time was given to exploring students' ideas about the content during classroom instruction and in the tutorials. For example, while Yucuanto was able to understand that the instructor wanted him to elaborate and include his opinion when discussing ideas from the readings, he was not presented with the possibility of elaborating his ideas with the help of the instructor.

These tutorials capture both the strengths and the shortcomings of the instructor's support. These sample tutorials exemplify the teaching of the transformation of declarative knowledge about discourse structure into procedural knowledge for writing a top-down essay with thesis and support. Tutorials offered an opportunity for knowledge transforming to occur, for this strategy requires the students to use ideas and concepts the instructor developed in class, especially as related to issues of structure. Although the tutorials addressed organizational issues in Kamran's and Yucuanto's essays, they also exemplified the instructor's lack of concern over issues of content. Nonetheless, when the instructor had the opportunity in the tutorials to individually challenge the students' thinking, she chose not to do so. An in-
depth look at the case study students' profiles will deepen an understanding of this important issue, and how the students followed the instructor's approach to analytic writing. The analysis of the profiles of the case study students will be presented in chapter 5, along with the analysis of the students' essays.

Discussion

The results presented in this chapter provide a detailed view of how the course's--and the program's--expectations and structures shaped the way these particular ESL students encountered the complexities of analytic writing. It also outlined the way in which the case study students dealt with these complexities. The students' interpretations were first affected by the written instructions they received for the three major writing assignments. Daily classroom instruction provided specific instructional activities and routines designed to familiarize the students with declarative knowledge about structural knowledge for analytic writing; but, as will be discussed, this approach often neglected ways of enabling the students in developing their own ideas or interpretations.

Classroom activities and the presentation of discourse knowledge and related terminology allowed the students first, to become familiar with, and then to internalize, general conventions for writing essays in each of the four modes. This detailed view of classroom interactions also pictured the way the students acquired procedural knowledge. Although the most clear examples of the application of procedural knowledge occurred during the tutorials, there is also
some evidence that "how to" knowledge for discourse structure was developed in the classroom.

Three patterns emerge from the results: (a) The beliefs of the ESL instructor seemed to be shaped more by her own experiences than by recent theories of academic writing that argue for the integration of topic knowledge and discourse structure; (b) the students seemed to prefer short cuts to academic writing that lead to only superficial knowledge of how to think analytically, that is, they preferred displays of analysis rather than critical thinking; and (c) it seems that the teaching of analytic writing should perhaps best begin with issues of content and students' responses to and ideas about the reading passages and then only later turn to issues of discourse structure.

The Instructor's Beliefs About Knowledge for Academic Writing

The way theoretical beliefs affected classroom pedagogy was most evident in the way the expectations for English 107 were operationalized in the classroom. In this sense, the present study is an examination of how a neophyte instructor interpreted and enacted her understanding of the expectations for English 107, in particular, and her general understanding of what teaching analytic--and by her definition, academic--writing entailed.

For instance, she seemed to view the skills she wanted to teach--clarity and organization--very much as survival strategies, not only for English composition classes, but for academic writing in general. In addition, she expressed very clearly her belief that, at least in this particular case, learning a set organizational structure should take precedence over the development of content. It was her understanding that once the students mastered the
discourse conventions of academic writing, they would be able to develop better ideas. She also believed that other educational opportunities would provide for content development but that she, as an ESL composition instructor, only had ten weeks (a quarter) to help the students internalize the specific organizational structure (thesis and support) that she considered indispensable to academic writing.

It is evident that the administrators of the ESL composition program had somewhat different expectations in mind. Their interviews suggest that they wanted the students to discover how literary texts were connected to their own lives and to the way they developed as writers. They saw writing both as a way to make sense of and to demonstrate understanding of content. Although they believed students could benefit from learning some patterned ways of organizing essays, these patterns by no means constitute a universal formula, applicable to all academic writing. Also, and most importantly, they believed that learning to write analytically takes a lot of time and practice, and ten weeks of instruction do not even begin to address the complexities of the processes involved in learning to write analytically.

The main discrepancy in the interpretation of the expectations was between the relative importance of issues of content and issues of structure. In particular the instructor gave priority to issues of structure over issues of content, while the program administrators did not intend for this to be the case. Accordingly, it is clear that when there is a discrepancy in the expectations for the classroom, it is the instructor's views that prevail. The expectations of rhetorical reading and issues of content exemplify this particular issue; since the
former--shared by the program administrators and the instructor--prevailed, while the latter--important mostly to the program administrators did not.

On the one hand, in this particular study, rhetorical reading was a shared expectation between the instructor and the program administrators. The study documented that rhetorical reading was very much a part of classroom instruction, that it became an expectation for the students as well, and that the students did make progress in this area. It is very possible that the reason why the expectation of rhetorical reading was so well implemented was that it was well conceptualized, shared, and interpreted by the administrators, the instructor, and the students.

On the other hand, the expectations dealing with issues of content in response to literary texts belonged more to the administrators than to the instructor. The instructor, at least on the days of classroom observations, was not able to direct an effective classroom discussion to relate to issues of content. It is very possible that this was so, at least in part, because issues of content were never part of the instructor's set expectations for the classroom. However, not every session was observed, leaving open the possibility that other sessions were more focused on content. In any case, interviews with the instructor and students suggest that issues of essay structure were central and issues of literary understanding peripheral.

It seems that, in the absence of a strong theoretical orientation for what it means to teach and learn analytic writing, the instructor relied on beliefs shaped by the instruction she had received as a student regarding academic writing. For example, the instructor did not seem to have a deep knowledge of ESL.
composition theory, nor of process-oriented approaches to writing. She did not believe, as did the administrators, that writing develops out of what is personally meaningful to other sources of knowledge and experience—for example, in literary texts. Accordingly, as Lortie (1975) has described, the instructor had a difficult time overcoming images from her own schooling, leading her to replicate teaching methods she experienced, or, in this particular case, did not experience as a student. The problem here is that her experiences were probably quite different from those of her ESL students and that she had interpreted ''good'' teaching to be what aided her in learning to write for the academy.

In the absence of a strong theoretical base for teaching English 107, the instructor interpreted the expectations of 107 as based upon (a) her own experiences as a student, (b) her understanding of what was ''missing'' from the students' writing, and (c) to a lesser degree, the training she received for teaching English 107. Perhaps if the instructor had been more familiar with theory that argues for the importance of both structure and content (Hillocks, 1986; Lindemann, 1995), she would have, first, believed more strongly in the need to explore issues of content in the classroom, and second, she would have been able to communicate this need more strongly to the students. She was certainly able to personally understand, and to communicate to the students the advantages of using rhetorical reading when they approached a text. The instructor acknowledged the fact that the training received for teaching English 107 focused more on responses to students' writing, that is, to their ideas, than on issues of structure, but she somehow did not internalize these
concepts. Her own beliefs were more powerful than the training she received in preparation to teach English 107.

No Short-Cuts to Teaching and Learning Academic Writing

The results from the analysis of the instructional content seem to indicate that expectations that are driven by sound theory should take precedence over “what the students wants.” Spack (1997) documented an ESL student who changed her perceptions of the elements she was missing that were responsible for her “failure” in her university courses. In the first year of Spack’s longitudinal study, the student strongly believed--and had convinced Spack to believe--that her failure to adapt to content courses was due to a lack of historical background knowledge; that is, she did not share in the general culture of the United States. After the second year of the study, this same student thought her failure, in the first year, had been due to lack of practice in “certain academic ways of reading and writing” (Spack, 1997, p. 44). By the third year of the study, she realized that she had failed in her first year because the acquisition of academic literacy “involves being engaged in a process of constructing knowledge” (Spack, 1997, p. 44). It was, then, her lack of knowledge on “how” to construct knowledge that had led to failure in her first year of studying in the United States.

The results of this study build upon those obtained by Spack to suggest that ESL composition instructors, and ESL composition programs for that matter, should not let their expectations be guided by “what the student wants.” Although an awareness of what ESL composition students need and want out of writing instruction is certainly recommended, even encouraged, these
students might not be in a position to decide what is best for them, at least as far as the development of analytic writing goes.

**Balancing Concerns for Content and Structure**

As explained earlier, declarative knowledge is defined as "knowledge of the what," while procedural knowledge is defined as "knowledge of the how" (Hillocks, 1995). The results of this analysis of the observations and interviews suggest that the instructor valued thoughtfulness in her students' writing but did not offer instruction to foster the students' interpretations of the literary texts. Figure 9 presents the instructional context as an interaction of, on the one hand, declarative and procedural knowledge, and, on the other, of issues of content and issues of structure.

The horizontal axis would document instances when the instructor focused on using either declarative or procedural knowledge in the classroom discussions. The vertical axis exemplifies classroom discussions focusing on either issues of content or issues of structure. The different types of classroom activities described in this study can, then, be placed in the corresponding quadrants.

For example, the first quadrant, procedural knowledge for content (activities in which the instructor showed the students how to develop their ideas,) remains empty after the analysis of the results of the classroom interactions. The second quadrant, procedural knowledge of structure, includes times when the instructor showed the students how to deal more effectively with the rhetorical conventions and the modes. As stated earlier, these instances occurred mainly in the tutorials, but also during classroom discussions and one-
on-one interactions in the classroom. Specific activities included, among others, correcting the students' outlines, and all activities that focused on sharpening the students' analytical skills.

The third quadrant represents instances when instruction was geared towards the acquisition of declarative knowledge about issues of structure. This includes mainly classroom presentations about rhetorical conventions and the modes, and when the instructor clearly reminded them of the "rules" to be followed in academic writing. The fourth quadrant represents activities in which the instructor told the students what they need to do in order to develop the content of their writing: Discussing the importance of a sense of audience, suggesting personal adaptations that can be made when writing, and developing a sense of pride and ownership in the students' written work.

The majority of students were—to a lesser or greater degree—able to comply with most of the specific requirements, like length, and the combining of the modes, for example. While they, for the most part, also included their personal reaction to the source text, they were not able to effectively respond to the content, development, and/or organizational arrangement chosen by the author of the source text. This occurred despite the fact that the instructor did take class time to discuss issues of content in task interpretation, for example, she suggested more specific, personal reactions to essay two. It is evident that the students knew they had to deal with their personal reaction to the source text, but they did not know "how to" relate their personal reactions to the content of the text.
On the other hand, descriptions of the discourse conventions for the analytic essay and the modes seemed to provide the students with a suitable outline around which to organize their ideas, but classroom instruction did little, if anything, to work on the quality of these ideas. The instructor efficiently taught the discourse conventions of academic writing, but did little instruction on how to think analytically about content; that is, about the literary experiences in the texts.

**Wanted: Procedural Approach to Issues of Content**

In summary, then, it appears that although the instructor talked about ways to focus on issues of content during classroom instruction (i.e., personal adaptations, variations in writing,) she did not take a “how to,” or procedural approach to understanding literary texts. That is, her manipulation of issues of content was limited to dealing with declarative knowledge. Naming the content to be included in the essays without enabling the student in considering how to present their own interpretations of it. Put another way, she repeatedly told the students what they should do (“You need to tell me what you think.”) but she did not show them how to do it. This may be why discussions of the content of literary source texts were not as successful in this classroom as were discussions on issues of structure. She never effectively guided them through a classroom discussion involving issues of content, that is, literary interpretation of the texts they were to respond to. Also, the instructor’s attempts to help the students focus on issues of content do not seem to be rigorous, or specific enough, to be of any help to the students. For instance, she encouraged them with “give your opinion,” or “write clearly.” But the students clearly needed to be
pushed beyond spoken directions to specific ways of interpreting and writing about texts (Herrington, 1988; Scholes, 1985).

It follows, then, from the discussion of the two previous issues, that the instructor needed to focus more closely on the quality of the students' ideas. As will be seen in chapter five, many students were able to comply with the structural "rules" taught in the classroom, but few were able to produce engaging content. The question remains as to whether the instructor could have made the students express more engaging ideas than the ones they chose to present in their written products. It is evident to the researcher, as an observer in the classroom, that this instructor cared--somewhat--about issues of content. She repeatedly tried to include them in the classroom discussions, but she was never able to do so effectively. It is also evident that she cared much more deeply about issues of structure, a concern strongly held by the ESL students also.

The instructor seemed to be more concerned about the quality of a student's ideas during one-on-one interactions with individual students. At least then she focused on making sure they had something innovative to say, even if "innovative" did not necessarily result in "engaging." In a follow up interview after the conclusion of this study, the researcher asked the instructor why she did not care about the quality of the students' ideas. She responded that her goal had been to help the students write clearly, and that they would probably learn to develop their ideas "at some point in their academic careers."
Summary

This chapter examined how the course expectations, as articulated by program administrators, but enacted by the instructor and the students, affected the writing development of the students. As program expectations transformed into pedagogical interactions, specific problems arose. It appears that the educational well being of the English 107 students was best served when all the players involved in the educational experience shared certain beliefs and targeted common expectations, as was the case for rhetorical reading, for example. The chapter also examined the way classroom instruction attempted to provide a context for the ESL students to develop as analytic writers. More specifically, the chapter described how the instructor, through lectures, small group activities, a variety of reading and writing activities, classroom discussions, and presentations provided the students with both declarative and procedural knowledge about the structural component of analytic writing, but largely excluded issues of content. Accordingly, the chapter discussed the importance of procedural knowledge, both of structural and content issues, for the development of ESL writers. Namely, that an instructor should not limit his or herself to discourse structure. For as other writing theorists and teachers (e.g., Hillocks, 1985, 1996; Langer & Applebee, 1987) have pointed out, content and structure are inherently interrelated, a point made by both the program director and the course coordinator.

Ignoring content and emphasizing an ideal structure to express the students' ideas seemed to short-circuit the ESL students' presentation of their ideas in an engaging and stimulating way. The consequences of the emphasis
on discourse structure in the students' writing will be a central theme in the next chapter. In chapter 5 the researcher will explore issues related to the students' performance in the three main writing assignments, as evidenced by an examination of their composing processes and by employing different kinds of text analyses. Chapter 6 presents the conclusions, and implications arising from this study of how ESL students learn to write analytically.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarity</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conformity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freshman composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhetorical reading</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macro-structure</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Declarative and Procedural Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Various stakeholders' expectations for English 107
### Mean Percentages of Time on Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Section A (n=9)</th>
<th>Section B (n=11)</th>
<th>Total (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Aloud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led Discussion</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Presentations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (quizzes, setting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups up, handing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back work, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Mean percentages of time on task by classroom activities.
### Percentages Across Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Section A (n=9)</th>
<th>Section B (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Reading</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Aloud</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led Discussion</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Presentations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (quizzes, setting up, handing back work, etc.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Frequency count by classroom activities
Figure 9: The intersection of declarative and procedural knowledge as a function of content and structure in the instructional context.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

WRITING PROCESSES AND WRITTEN PRODUCTS

ANALYSES OF ESSAYS WRITTEN IN RESPONSE TO THE THREE MAJOR WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

Introduction

The central question for this chapter is to what extent, if at all, the instructional context shaped the students' development as analytic writers over the course of the ten-week period. To answer this question the researcher examined the students' responses to the three major writing assignments for evidence of their development as analytic writers. Appendix J consists of three essays for each of the three main writing assignments--a total of nine representative essays--written by three case study students. Specifically, the 36 essays were subjected to four types of analyses--syntactic, content, structural,
and level of abstractness—that sought to document the ESL students' development as analytic writers. The analyses consist of a combination of quantitative techniques, some of which appear to produce definite results, and some for which the results are more ambiguous. The relative value of these numerical analyses is complemented by the profiles of the case study students as ESL writers.

The four analyses, each with its own focus, consider sentence and text level issues (syntactic complexity and structural sophistication) as well as issues of how students responded to the source texts (literary response statements) and the level of analytic sophistication in those responses. Put another way, this chapter concerns itself with the ESL students' written performances, looking not just at structural issues, but also at their ability to think analytically about information and experiences gleaned from literary and informational texts. Profiles of individual students help us understand what specific experiences and knowledge contribute to the students' development as agents shaping their learning of English as a Second Language. The profiles were developed descriptively using the questionnaires, interviews, classroom observations, and analysis of the students' written work.

**Case Study Student Profiles**

The personal and educational backgrounds of the students were discussed in chapter three. Also discussed were their command of declarative knowledge of the terms used to describe discourse structure and their graded
performance in the classroom. This section of chapter five examines the case study students’ perceptions of writing instruction in general, and this ESL composition course in particular. In addition, the researcher examined the writing processes they employed for each of the writing assignments. Unedited versions of the three main writing assignments for each of these three case study students are presented in Appendix J. The information profiled for this section was obtained mainly through the interviews conducted with the case study students, and from field notes from classroom observations. The purpose of this in-depth analysis was to tap into the students’ perceptions of the course and of their development as writers. A more detailed look at the writing processes employed by the case study students will help contextualize the analysis of the written products which follows.

Kamran: Going Against the Grain

Thoughts About Writing and the ESL Composition Classroom

Kamran did not doubt that he would be able to become a good writer. He knew both ideas and organization are needed to produce a good essay. "Well, the main thing is organization, but your opinion is there at the beginning, but organization is more important." Although this is what he said, he did something different in his writing. The instructor had stressed repeatedly in class that his thesis statement should be at the beginning, but on several occasions he decided to include it in the conclusion. Also, Kamran seemed to write better for in-class tasks than for take-home assignments. Unlike the other ESL students, when he wrote in class, he worked at a fast, fluent pace, and he asked many questions of the instructor. Perhaps he was able to concentrate...
more fully in his written work when he had the instructor as a continuous source of prompting, and this allowed him to write more thoroughly. He was also a very passionate writer when he cared about the subject of his written work, especially for his midterm assignment.

Kamran’s Writing Processes

To gain insight into Kamran’s writing processes, the following section describes how he composed the three main writing assignments, as well as his midterm, the piece of writing of which he was especially proud.

Essay one: Disagreeing with Wendell Berry

Kamran said he did not like writing essay one because he did not find it easy to agree with Wendell Berry’s ideas. Personally, Kamran found computers to be indispensable, and could not understand why anyone, like Berry, would not think so. He said, however, that he credited essay one with teaching him how to use the outline as “a source of development for the whole essay, making it easier to take points and adding a few more sentences to complete the paragraphs.” In his first draft, Kamran rewrote the outline adding a couple of words, and he ignored all but one—a word choice—of the instructor’s comments written on the outline. The instructor had suggested he add transitions in between the ideas in different paragraphs, and that he express his ideas more clearly. During the first interview Kamran said he realized he had not made the changes the instructor had suggested, but he could not explain why. He said it took him “about an hour” to write the outline.

The instructor’s response to the outline included a series of questions: “What did the letter say? / How? / Then what?” at various points in the outline.
She also asked for further elaboration: "Develop more," and "Explain the meaning or significance." She also commented on how the essay was not long enough to meet the assignment requirements. From the first draft to the second draft Kamran added some quotations, but did not explain their relationship to what he had written in the essay. For example, in the second paragraph his topic sentence read: "Taking help and working with your wife is not a bad idea." In the second draft he added: "Referring to his essay in which he says that 'technological innovation always requires discarding the older one with a new model' showed how sensitive he was for his wife, and didn't want to work without her involvement." The quotation does not, however, serve to support either his particular point in the sentence, or the topic sentence, or the thesis statement. The instructor commented on the final draft that he needed to show some kind of relationship between the quotes and the rest of his essay.

As for the development of the topic sentences for this essay, Kamran's original outline idea for one of the supporting paragraphs was "Working with computers is still a different thing." On the first draft the idea became "Comparing the clarity of a computer print out with that of a typewriter makes the computer printout somewhat more striking." He is making the topic sentence an example of the idea he is supposed to be presenting in this paragraph. The sentence changes further to: "Another important perspective about working with computers is the quality, cleanliness, and efficiency which is more striking than a typewriter." By generating a new topic sentence in the first draft Kamran jeopardizes the structure of the entire essay--as taught in class--because he failed to make adjustments to accommodate the new topic sentence.
In the first interview the researcher asked Kamran if the four paragraphs in the essay had to be related to the thesis statement. He said: "Yes, well, these are not really connected, but they are supposed to be." Similar situations were repeated throughout the study. Kamran knew what he was supposed to be doing, and he was also able to say if he was actually doing it or not. Most of the time, especially at the beginning of the quarter, he was not.

Kamran's process of drafting and revising essay one helps shape his profile as a writer. He thinks that writing is a technique to be mastered, but he forgets to keep the goal in mind, trying to fit pieces together without worrying if his arguments make sense or if they relate to one another. Also, Kamran ignores the opportunity to present his ideas in opposition to Wendell Berry's, and to turn his essay into a representation of what he believes in. Kamran received a "C" for this particular essay.

**Essay two: Scratching the surface**

Kamran said his essay two "had been organized properly by me and in proper sequence." He also thought writing a comparison and contrast essay made it easy for him. His outline was approved by the instructor with no comments. His first draft also met the instructor's approval. She asked for more information on the introduction, a couple of transition sentences, and concluding thoughts on two paragraphs. The instructor's main comment read: "The second developmental paragraph needs to support the thesis statement more directly." Kamran did add the concluding thoughts on two paragraphs, but he did not change the second developmental paragraph. The instructor made the same comment about support at the end of the second draft.
It is true that Kamran’s essay two was well organized, and that Kamran managed to stay within the boundaries of his essay topic, but he did not act on the instructor’s most important comment. It was hard for Kamran to write when he was not in absolute command of what he was writing; he could not see beyond what was on his mind as he wrote, a strategy sometimes referred to as “What’s next?” or knowledge telling (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1983). Yet, in essay one he chose to ignore his personal reaction to the source text as he wrote. Before writing essay two he knew he needed to work on organization, and he did, but he could not change his focus once he had put words on paper, causing the second essay to lack the structure the instructor preferred.

**Essay three: Making a judgment call?**

Kamran’s outline for essay three was also well organized. He said it took him "like two hours" to write it. The instructor saw one problem with it:

Your plan looks mainly like you are going to re-tell the story. You can’t simply re-tell the story; you need to do some other kind of analysis. You can use many of your ideas as examples, but each paragraph needs to have a more general principle behind it (Tutorial, 3/95).

His first thesis statement stated: "Susan had been suffering from mental disorders, and needed sympathy to resist against her tortured state." In the first draft the instructor suggested he work on developing relevant topic sentences that related to "why" he made the assumptions presented in the thesis statement; or that he change his thesis statement to something that was actually related to what he was writing in his essay.

In the final draft, the thesis statement changed to "In my opinion, whatever attitudes Susan had towards her life and family all represented
abnormal thoughts." Such a change came after the instructor suggested, in a
tutorial, that he modify the thesis statement to include his opinion of the story.
The term "abnormal thoughts" was too general, so the instructor suggested he
look for topic sentences that "mention, and give examples of, her abnormality."
For the most part, Kamran succeeded at this job; the instructor thought the
following topic sentence was "good": "Other evidence for Susan's abnormal
thoughts can be identified by the fact that her ideas for overcoming her terrifying
thoughts were simply senseless." In essay three Kamran managed to present a
well-organized essay and to include relevant information. He was able to do so
when he worked diligently on the outline and honestly attempted to listen to the
instructor's comments. But perhaps most importantly, he was able to express
his reactions to the source text clearly. Also, for this essay Kamran was able to
work with the instructor more effectively; he could accept her comments and
make small changes in his essay.

Kamran's midterm exam: Enjoying writing

Kamran was particularly proud of his midterm exam. "It was the easiest
of the essays as my ability to write on a free topic is far better than writing on a
prescribed text." He also used comparison and contrast, the mode he felt more
comfortable with. Although the midterm essay was not analyzed for this
particular study, it is relevant to understanding Kamran's approach to writing.
He does not like to write when he is not free to choose the subject of the essay.
This corresponds to his profile because he did not like to include in his writing
anything that was not in his mind to begin with.
Overview

It was not always clear if Kamran followed his own directions. For example, he said repeatedly in the interviews that the outline was so important to him because "it is the full structure of the essay from which we get useful points to add in as we write," yet he did not always follow his outline. He either followed it completely (as in essay one,) barely adding new words, or ignored it completely (as in the first draft of essay three). He did not seem to realize that discourse structure can function in ways other than prescription, as an organizational tool for example. Yet he seemed, at least at times, to get "mixed signals" from the instructor. On the one hand, she nudged him toward developing his own ideas. On the other, her written comments suggest that doing so would lead inevitably to disorganization. What the instructor was unable to communicate to Kamran, and to other students as well, was "how" to develop original ideas while using discourse structure as an organizational tool.

Thoughts About Writing and the ESL Composition Classroom

Sung-Ho was often very frustrated about his problems with writing.

I found problems which were a lot of sentence awkward language and unclear phrases after I wrote essay one. In fact, I did not understand the exact way to use grammar and academic writing skills. I tried to write a lot of essays such as diary in order to solve the grammar problem. I thought that I needed to read a text book so as to understand the writing structure like introduction, body, and conclusion. As time went by, when I took the midterm, I tried to focus on grammar and writing structure. However, I still found problems with more specific writing skills like rhetorical modes. It is very difficult for me to understand rhetorical modes. Especially, cause and effect is the most difficult for me to
understand among rhetorical modes, so I thought that I needed to take reading notes. I think that reading the text book several times helped me use rhetorical modes effectively (Interview, 4/95).

Sung-Ho attempted to find ways to solve his problems with writing, but he always felt beaten by his deficiencies with grammar. If given the choice, he would have liked a class that focused more on grammar.

The Writing Process

Essay one: Backing Berry

Sung-Ho's outline for essay one was not very detailed. In it he stated what he intended to do instead of including his ideas from the beginning. For example, his outline for the introduction read:

"1. Thesis statement
   A. Compare to two letters and Berry's reply
   B. Using computers is very general."

From reading this outline it is not clear what his essay will be about or what idea will control it. Sung-Ho's main problem was twofold: (a) deciding what his ideas were, and (b) putting them in writing. He did try to follow the instructor's comments while working on revisions, but he had so many grammar problems that his writing was, at times, barely comprehensible. As for content, he stated that the two response letter writers had not clearly comprehended Berry's message.

Essay two: Comparison as safe territory

Sung-Ho's outline for essay two was somewhat more detailed than the one for essay one. He was able to include ideas in the configuration of the essay, for example in part of the body:
2. Sylvia Plath
   A. What are the most important things for her at 17
      1. freedom
      2. to devote her energies
   B. What are the most fearful things for her at 17
      1. getting older
      2. spare her from routine and rote

The more clear outline allowed Sung-Ho to write his ideas on paper more clearly; probably because organization and clarity facilitated his thought processes. He was able, it seems, to use comparison as an organizational tool for his idea, although in a rather primitive manner.

Essay three: Hesitant judgment call

In essay three Sung-Ho was able to organize his thoughts before he started writing. The instructor said: "Basically good organization and support: although there is still room for improving how the first developmental paragraph is controlled by the topic sentence. Good thesis statement and topic sentences." Content-wise, he attempted to explain why Susan, the main character, felt loneliness. Sung-Ho seemed to be making progress throughout the quarter. Grammar remained, however, the main obstacle to his development as a writer. This third essay also required very careful reading for successful interpretation of his ideas.

Yucuanto: Becoming a Good Writer

Thoughts About Writing and the ESL Composition Classroom

Yucuanto did not have any problems comprehending what the instructor wanted him to learn. He thought the instructor emphasized rhetorical conventions the most in the classroom. "The thesis statement thing. I think she
always emphasizes this thing." He believed writing the outline was probably the most important aspect of writing an essay.

Yucuanto did not consider himself a good writer. "As long as I can't compete with the native speakers in writing papers, I don't consider myself a good writer." But he did feel confident that he had "clear enough" in his mind what he needed to do to become a good writer.

He often complained about his grammatical knowledge. "I have been studying grammar for many years," he says, "yet I always make many mistakes." Yucuanto was also very much of a perfectionist, not happy with his performance in the writing projects assigned in class, even after spending five hours or more working on each essay. Not surprisingly, he thought the most important part of doing academic writing was "having a good outline."

The Writing Process

Yucuanto's thought processes while writing the three major writing assignments could be titled "paraphrasing," "form over substance," and "working on form and substance," respectively. Yucuanto's outline for essay one did not include all the details needed to write his essay. His thesis statement ("In his essay, Berry acts as if he takes advantage of his wife") did not leave a lot of room for elaboration. He ended with a generally well-organized essay that the researcher found not very engaging. The ideas presented were neither well-developed, original, nor controversial.

His thesis statement on the outline for essay two was: "My 17-year-old period was better than that of Sylvia." Once again, his essay had adequate
support, but the ideas were not engaging. He was, however, able to follow the instructor's recommendations and produce a clear, well-organized essay.

For essay three Yucuanto wrote an outline that did not satisfy him, so he asked the instructor for help. His first outline was:

Thesis Statement: Susan's lives were different before and after married cause my reactions to her different.
I. Introduction
II. Susan was happy before married
   I thought Susan would not get any troubles in her life
III. Susan was depressed after married
   I believed she could handle it because she was intelligent
IV. Susan committed suicide
   My perception of Susan that she was smart was wrong.
V. Conclusion

The instructor made the following comments: "I can't understand the thesis because of the grammar. Try to rephrase it. Remember that a topic sentence should describe the whole paragraph, so notice how I changed yours." [The instructor added "so," "but," and "and then." after I, II, and III respectively.] "Also, what other details will you include in your paragraphs?"

Yucuanto revised his outline and produced the following:

Thesis Statement: The fact that Susan's life changes cause my reactions to her to change also.
I. Introduction: Susan was happy before the affair, so I thought she would not get any troubles in her life. However,
II. Susan was depressed after Matthew cheated with other woman, but she looked like she could handle it, so I believed she could.
   1. Susan was ruined by her feelings; she was irritated and felt alone.
   2. She asked her husband whether there was something wrong with her.
III. Susan wanted to be alone, so I thought Susan had found the solution
   1. She got her room
   2. She rented a hotel room
   3. She had a holiday in a remote place
IV. Susan committed suicide, and then my perception of Susan that she was smart, was wrong.
   1. Susan commits suicide by breathing gas
   2. Smart Susan did something stupid

V. Conclusion

Yucuanto was able to produce an outline that would allow him good organization and he had clear, interesting, and engaging ideas. More than the other students, Yucuanto asked the instructor meaningful questions, even jotting down questions on specific parts of his first drafts for her to answer and return. He actively sought help to become a better writer.

Summary of Case Study Students' Analyses

This analysis of the case study students' thoughts and feelings about writing in general, about the specific writing assignments, and about their development as analytic writers begins to clarify some of the complexities of teaching and learning academic writing. Numerous times the instructor did not hesitate to "judge" the students' manipulation of structure. She appeared to feel confident telling students how to organize their essays in order to make them more clear. She never did, however, express an opinion on the quality of the ideas the students were presenting in their written work. For instance, Kamran's essay one would have provided an excellent opportunity for the instructor to help Kamran develop his ideas more deeply. Recall that Kamran "did not like" writing essay one because he found it hard to agree with Wendell Berry's refusal to use computers. While the instructor felt confident guiding Kamran's manipulation of structural issues, she did not, but might have helped Kamran explore the reasons for his "not liking" the source text. The case study students' detailed profiles helped us understand the way they dealt in developing the skill
of writing analytically. The results and discussion of the more quantitative numerical analyses will provide more information on the students’ development as analytic writers.

**Syntactic Analysis**

The purpose of the syntactic analysis was to trace the development of T-units across the three major writing assignments. Specifically, the researcher was interested in the number of T-units (T), the number of words per T-unit (W/T), and the number of error-free T-units (EF). Generally, T-unit length is regarded as an indication of syntactic sophistication, as is more error-free T-units (Hunt, 1977; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Tabulated results are presented in Appendix K. Figure 10 presents the means (M) and standard deviations (SD) resulting from these data. All things being equal, one would assume that students who are developing as writers would become more syntactically sophisticated across the quarter. However, the effects of the task demands, and the fact that ESL writers face difficult challenges when learning English syntax are clearly two major factors that must influence syntactic development.

As Figure 10 indicates, the number of words in each essay averaged 611. Given that the written instructions always required the students to write an essay of “about 500-600 words” in length, the students, in general, wrote slightly longer essays than what was required. In addition, they wrote considerably longer essays for the first assignment, but about the same length essay for the second and third essays. Counts of the average number of T-units across the
essays indicated little, if any, variation, from 44 to 43 to 42; when examined as number of words per T-unit, the students wrote longer T-units for essay one (an average of 16 words), than for essay three (an average of 15 words), and then for essay two (an average of 13 words). The number of error-free T-units remained fairly constant for essays one and two (22 each), and dropped for essay three (19).

In order to examine the effects of time of essay on various T-unit measures, results were subjected to a one-way, fixed effects, repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA). Figure 11 presents ANOVA results for the syntactic analysis. The dependent variables are expressed as proportions so that comparisons across essays be valid, since essay one is longer than the others. The dependent variables are: (a) words/T-unit, and (b) error-free T-units/T-units. For the first dependent variable, words/T-unit, $F(2,22)=5.52$, $p<0.01$, indicating significant differences between essays one, two, and three regarding number of words per T-unit. However, the number of words per T-unit decreases first, and then increases. For the second dependent variable, error-free T-units/T-units, $F(2,22)=1.02$, $p>0.38$, indicating that the differences in the proportion of error-free T-units to total T-units are not significant across essays. However, the number of error-free T-units in essay three (19.0) is lower than the numbers for essays one, and two (22.3 and 22.5, respectively).

The results of the syntactic analysis of the essays underline several issues. First, it is hard for the students to keep to the length specified in the written instructions. A length requirement is important because it provides boundaries within which the students can experiment with their control of ideas.
It is curious to notice that the longer essay, on average, was essay one, and the shorter was essay two. After essay one, the instructor stressed repeatedly the importance of staying within the word length limit, and even lowered the grades of the students that exceeded the word limit. It is apparent, then, that the students were cautious to follow the word requirements for essay two.

Second, the number of T-units decreased across the three essays. For essays two and three, this change represents an increase in the length of the T-unit, something that could be interpreted as an improvement in the quality of writing. However, from essay one to essay two results are mixed. Because the average essay two is shorter than the average essay one, one cannot assume that fewer T-units mean longer T-units.

Third, and rather surprising, is the fact that the number of error-free T-units decreases, but not significantly, from essay two to essay three. Normally, one might expect the students to write more error-free T-units as they develop as analytic writers, but other factors may be at issue. For example, it is possible that the students felt more confident to discuss more complicated issues in essay three than in essay two, in which case they may have increased their chances of making mistakes. In other words, as their confidence as writers grew, it is possible that increased experimentation resulted in more error-free T-units. This speculation could be supported by the results of the content analysis: specifically, the significant increase in interpretive T-units across the three essays, as well as the decrease in general T-units across the three essays. It seems, then, that the results of the syntactic analysis of the essays.
when examined independently, offer no support to the hypothesis that the students were developing as analytic writers.
Content Analysis: Students' Responses to Source Texts

The purpose of including a content analysis of the students' essays was to document the students' responses to ideas and experiences in the source texts. Specifically, the analysis examines the effects of time of essay and the students' use of descriptive (D), personal (P), general (G), associative (A), interpretive (I), and evaluative (E) response statements. Complete results of this analysis are presented as Appendix L. A look at Figure 12 will give us some insight into the development of the essays' content by giving means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of the proportions of type of statement to total number of T-units.

As Figure 12 indicates, the students seemed to use more personal response T-units from essay one to essay two to essay three (M=10.00, M=14.60, and M=16.30, respectively). Conversely, they used fewer T-units related to general content from essay one to essay two to essay three (M=16.20, M=12.90, and M=6.00, respectively). Their use of T-units of an interpretive nature also increased through the ten week period (M=23.00, M=32.20, and M=35.50 for essays one, two, and three respectively). The students use of descriptive-, associative-, and evaluative-type T-units seemed to fluctuate from essay one to essay two to essay three. Summarizing these results one can say that descriptive trends regarding the means are seen in P, G, and I. In P and I there is an increasing trend, and in G a decreasing one. Also, the highest dispersion of the data across essays is obtained in descriptive T-units (15.4), and the most homogeneous one is observed in the evaluative ones (5.8). However, these results represent a qualitative interpretation of the
The students' responses to the source texts, reported as percentage of the total number of response statements in the students' three essays were subjected to a one-way, repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of these analyses are presented in Figure 13. As can be seen, the results for variables G (general) and A (associative), \( F(2,33)=2.92, p<0.07 \), and \( F(2,33)=3.11, p<0.06 \), respectively, are approaching the significance level set at .05. As for variable I (interpretive), there is significant difference for time of essay, \( F(2,33)=4.99, p<0.01 \). There is no significance in the results for variables D, P, or E.

The results of the response statements the students employed over the 10-week quarter indicate that despite the instructor's overriding concern for genre structure, the students' ways of responding did change from essay to essay, but not necessarily in the direction that would be predicted. The one pattern that held true to the prediction of increased use over time is in the percentage of T-units classified as "interpretive." This pattern may be a good indicator of writing development, because it also indicates increased involvement with both the source text and the students' own writing. Results for the associative type of response statements were not significant, but they approached significance. However, they fluctuated between essays, making it impossible to account for A's significance as an indicator of writing development over time. Although results from the "general" type of response also approached significance, conversely, the students' use of T-units of a "general"
nature decreased over the ten-week period. This decrease may be an
indication that the students were becoming more focused in their discussions of
the ideas they presented in their essays. Using the discourse structure as an
organizational tool, they were perhaps better able to focus on the ideas they
wanted to express. While the means presented for the variables labeled
"descriptive," "associative," and "evaluative" do not seem to follow a set pattern
of either increase or decrease, the differences might be explained by the type of
essay written.

For example, the fact that essay three was based on a more literary
source text (short story as opposed to opinion essay) than either essay one or
essay two may have prompted the students to use less associative T-units and
to depend more on restating events from the story before analyzing them using
either interpretation or evaluation. It is also possible that Wendell Berry's
opinions regarding computer technology made the students react so strongly
that they produced more evaluative T-units for essay one than for either essay
two or essay three. A more powerful indicator of the students' increasing
command of content-level issues would have been a significant decrease in
descriptive-type statements, and/or a significant increase in evaluative-type
statements across the 10 weeks of the course. The lack of statistical
significance in these two areas may be explained in either of two ways: (a) The
instructor provided few opportunities for the students to consider the content of
the readings, or (b) the idiosyncratic nature of the three reading-to-write
assignments made it hard for patterns of change to emerge. Overall, however,
the results of the content analysis seem to indicate the students were
developing their interpretive skills. Also, it is important to notice that, although not significantly, the students increased their percentages of T-units classified as "personal reactions." This may very well be an indication of the students' increased personal involvement with the literary text. These patterns suggest that ESL students with instructional support can learn literary interpretation, that is, a sophisticated way of understanding reading passages.

Structural Analysis: Looking for Genre Conventions

The purpose of including an analysis of the structure in the students' essays was to understand how well the students as a group had internalized the genre conventions for analytic writing presented in the classroom. Specifically, the analysis looked at (a) the total number of paragraphs included in the essay, (b) a quantitative rating—from one to three—on the thesis statement, measuring how well the thesis statement represented the main ideas in the essay, (c) the placement of the thesis statement in the paragraph, (d) the placement of a topic sentence for each of the developmental paragraphs, (e) the presence of a summary sentence at the end of each of the developmental paragraphs, and (f) the presence or absence of a conclusion as the last paragraph of the essay. Tabulated results are presented as Appendix M. Figure 14 presents the results as either means (M) or percentages computed for the 12 students' three essays written at three different times across the 10-week quarter.

Figure 14 suggests that, for essay one the mean number of paragraphs written was 4.83, 67% of the students wrote a five paragraph essay, 25% a four paragraph essay, and 8% a six paragraph one. The thesis statement in essay
one received an average rating of 2.33, with 42% rated as three, 50% as two, and 8% as one. All of the twelve students included a summary sentence at the end of their paragraphs (starting with the second paragraph) in essay one. As for the second paragraph, 58% made the topic sentence the first one in the paragraph, 8% made it in the first and second sentences of the paragraph, 17% placed it as the third or more sentence, and 17% included no topic sentence at all. Of the twelve students, 42% used a summary sentence at the end of the paragraph, and 58% used no summary sentence at all. For the third developmental paragraph, 92% of the students made the topic sentence the first one of the paragraph, while 8% made it in a combination of the first and second sentences. Only 58% of the students included a summary sentence at the end of the paragraph; of these, 71% made it the last sentence of the paragraph, while 29% made it the next-to-last sentence of the paragraph. Forty-two percent of the students did not include a summary sentence at all. When writing the fourth developmental paragraph, 100% of the students made the topic sentence the first sentence of the paragraph, and 78% of the students who had a fourth developmental paragraph included a summary sentence as the last sentence of the paragraph. Overall, 67% of the students included a conclusion as the last paragraph of their essay while 33% did not.

As for essay two, the average paragraph length was 4.42, with 42% of the students writing a five paragraph essay, and 58% writing a four paragraph essay. The average rating for the thesis statement was 2.08, with 25% rated 3, 58% rated 2, and 17% rated 1. Of the 12 students, 92% placed the thesis statement at the end of the first paragraph, and 8% made it the next-to-last
sentence in the first paragraph. In the second developmental paragraph, 100% of the students placed the topic sentence on the first sentence, and 83% included a summary sentence at the end of the paragraph. In the third developmental paragraph, 92% made the topic sentence the first sentence in the paragraph, while 8% made it in both the first and the second sentence in the paragraph. While 83% of the students included a summary sentence of the paragraph (17% did not,) 90% of those who did made it the last sentence of the paragraph, and 10% put it in another position. As for the students who had a fourth developmental paragraph, 100% of them made the topic sentence the first one in the paragraph, and 60% of them included a summary sentence as the last one in their fourth paragraph. Overall, 83% of the students had a conclusion for their last paragraph.

For essay three, the average paragraph length was 4.75, with 33% having five paragraphs, 50% having four, and 17% having either six or seven. In the first paragraph, the average rating for the thesis statement was 2.75, with 83% rated 3, 8% rated 2, and 8% rated 1. Of the 12 students, 92% placed the thesis statement at the end of the first paragraph, and 8% made it the next-to-last sentence in the first paragraph. In the second paragraph, 75% of the students made the topic sentence the first one in the paragraph, 8% made it a combination of the first and second sentences, and 8% made it the third sentence. Of the twelve students, 75% included a summary sentence as the last one in the paragraph. For the third paragraph, 92% included the topic sentence as the first one in the paragraph, while 8% made it the third one in the paragraph. Only 58% of the students included a summary sentence as the last
one in the paragraph. Every student (100%) who had a fourth developmental paragraph made the topic sentence the first one of the paragraph for each of the three essays, while the majority (67%) included a summary sentence at the end. Only 58% of the students included a conclusion as their last paragraph.

An evaluation of the results of the structural analysis of the three essays suggests the extent to which the students had internalized the concepts presented in the classroom that were used to describe declarative knowledge about analytic writing. On average, most students chose to write five-paragraph essays. The instructor never required that the essays follow the five-paragraph format, but the examples used in the classroom did fit into the five paragraph format. It seems that, for essay one, most of the students chose to remain with that format (67%), but changes occurred on essays two and three (42% and 33% of the students chose the five paragraph format respectively). The fact that more students chose to deviate from the five paragraph format as the quarter progressed is a positive sign for their general development as analytic writers, since it may be interpreted as increased experimentation with their academic writing. It is possible that the students felt more secure in their writing as they gained more control of discourse structure knowledge.

Another possible indication of their development as analytic writers is the fact that it was in essay three that the highest percentage of students (83%) received a rating of three—the highest possible—on their thesis statement. This increased rating would indicate that, with time, students became more adept at presenting their thoughts clearly and in an organized manner in the thesis statement. Clarity and organization in the thesis statement had been strongly
emphasized in the classroom, as was the fact that the thesis statement should be the last sentence of the first paragraph. A fact most students (100%, 92%, and 92% for essays one, two, and three respectively) seemed to have internalized.

Moreover, the students appeared to have internalized most of the rhetorical conventions they had been taught in the classroom. For example, most students (with the lowest number—58% in the first paragraph of essay one) made the topic sentence the first sentence in their developmental paragraphs. The instructor had repeatedly stressed during classroom discussions that a clear and organized essay would have the topic sentence at the beginning of the developmental paragraphs. Quite differently, the instructor had only suggested that the students include a summary sentence at the end of each developmental paragraph. and the students did not follow this suggestion as closely as they followed the “rule” about the topic sentences. On the contrary, one “rule” that was not followed so closely concerned conclusions. Although the majority of the students made the last paragraph of their essays a conclusion (67%, 83%, and 58% for essays one, two, and three respectively) the researcher expected the percentages to be higher, since maybe the students would have internalized this “rule” more thoroughly.

The appearance of topic sentences as the first ones in any particular paragraph seems to be related to the number of paragraphs used. There is a tendency in essays one and three to have an increase in the percentage of students who use this condition in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, respectively. In fact, in all three essays all students wrote the topic sentence as the first one in the
fourth paragraph. Nevertheless, the use of the summary sentence as the last sentence of the paragraph does not follow this rule. It is not affected by the number of paragraphs written. The fact that the instructor repeatedly stressed that the topic sentence should be the first one in any given paragraph, and that this was in fact so, may be an indication of the effectiveness of classroom instruction relating to knowledge of discourse structure.

Overall, results from the structural analysis of the students three main writing assignments appear to indicate that, for the most part, the students internalized the “rules” that had been presented in the classroom, and that they succeeded, to a greater or lesser degree, in applying them in their essays.

Level of Abstractness Analysis: Looking for Focus

The analysis of the essays by level of abstractness classified essays as being either “thesis and summary restatement,” “unfocused,” or “focused.” The purpose of this analysis was to judge how well the students were able to articulate their ideas, by moving beyond the ideas presented in the source text to an interpretive stance. In an essay classified as “thesis and summary restatement,” the student began with a thesis statement but reverted to a summary of the reading passage without either arguing or presenting evidence for the thesis. Those classified as “unfocused” were essays in which the students included a thesis statement, but did not succeed at supporting, elaborating, or connecting the claims they made in the body of the essay. An essay classified as “focused” is one in which the students went beyond restating the plot from the source text, and used claims to support the thesis statement. Tabulated results are presented in Appendix N. Figure 15 presents the
frequencies and percentages of each of the three ratings in the analysis by level of abstractness.

As Figure 15 indicates, for essay 1, five of the twelve essays were classified as “thesis” (42%), four of them as “unfocused” (33%), and three of them as “focused” (25%). For essay 2, one of the twelve essays was classified as “thesis” (8%), six of them as “unfocused,” (50%) and five of them as “focused” (42%). Finally, for essay 3, none of the twelve were classified as “thesis,” five of them as “unfocused” (42%), and seven of them as “focused” (58%). It seems, then, based on this particular analysis, that students produced more “focused” essays as the quarter progressed. A Pearson Chi-Square test was performed on this data to test the descriptive results obtained. Results were not significant at the preset .05 level \[\chi^2=9\ (4, 36), \ p<0.06\] but results do approach significance, which leads to the assumption that the percentages of the type of essay written (thesis, unfocused, focused) is related to the essays written across time. On doing a residual analysis the differences lie in the values for focused increasing significantly through the ten-week period.

The most conclusive findings from all the structural and content analyses performed seem to come from the analysis of the essays by level of abstractness. Recall that the purpose of this analysis was to evaluate students’ ability to move beyond summarization of the source text to interpretations of the source text. The fact that the values of the “focused” types of essays increase from essay one, to essay two, to essay three probably indicates that the students were developing as analytic writers, in that they were able to frame their understanding of the texts within an interpretation.
Also interesting is the fact that the grades the students received for their essays in English 107 seem to support this finding. As indicated in Appendix H, the average grade for essays one, two, and three for all 29 students increased from 3.16 to 3.27, to 3.35 (on a scale of 1-4, for essays one, two, and three respectively). This would mean that the students were gradually becoming more adept at doing the kind of work the instructor required of them. Results from the analysis of classroom instruction indicated that the instructor was concerned, above all, with issues of structure, and that, while somewhat concerned with issues of content, this concern was limited to teacher presentations rather than student-based activities and discussions. A joint interpretation of the results from the analysis of level of abstractness and of classroom instruction could possibly indicate that the students were capable of carrying out literary discussions and analysis.

Summary

Results from the four types of quantitative analyses performed on the 36 essays are summarized presently. First, the results for variable I (interpretive) of the content analysis, and the overall results of the level of abstractness analysis offer support for the fact that the students were, at least in part, developing as analytic writers. Second, the results for all the measures of syntactic complexity were quite mixed, yielding no consistent patterns. Third, the results for variables A and G (associative and general, respectively) of the content analysis, or the literary responses to the source texts, offer non-significant
support for the overall assumption that the students were developing as analytic writers. Finally, the analyses of variables D, P, and E (descriptive, personal, and evaluative, respectively) of the content analysis do not offer any statistically significant results.

Overall, it seems, then, that the combination of analyses performed on the students' three main writing assignments suggests that the students were actively developing as analytic writers but that this development occurred in fits and starts rather than linearly across the quarter. It appears that this development was prompted by various agents, namely (a) classroom instruction, (b) the students' personal background, and (c) the students' educational background. Moreover, the socio-educational context that was molded during the ten-week period by the interaction of the first three agents was the force driving their development as analytic writers.

Apparently, classroom instruction was effective in helping the students overcome gaps in their declarative, and--to some extent--procedural knowledge for issues of structure that were indispensable in learning the type of analytic writing the instructor emphasized. Although classroom instruction did not effectively "push" the ESL students into a deep exploration of issues of content, it seems that the combination of readings and the structuring of the written task were indeed conducive to such exploration. The students' personal and education backgrounds were important agents in the shaping of the socio-educational context because most students expressed a lack of, and a desire for, instruction in the genre conventions for analytic writing. Moreover, the students were "actors" in classroom interaction, and maybe partly responsible
for the fact that classroom discussions relating to issues of content did not materialize. In other words, the students' limited backgrounds for the kinds of analytic thinking about texts provided little upon which the instructor could build. Yet there is some evidence from both the content analysis and the analysis of level of abstraction that the students were certainly capable of such thinking and reasoning.

This chapter has focused on how different kinds of analyses of the students' three main writing assignments portray the students' development as analytic writers. The next chapter examines the conclusions and implications of the results of this study as a whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essay One</th>
<th>Essay Two</th>
<th>Essay Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>675.2</td>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>567.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/T</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) for measures of syntax across the three essays. W stands for total number of words, T stands for total number of T-units; W/T stands for mean length of T-units; and EF stands for error-free T-units.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF/T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.033899</td>
<td>0.016949</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.001420</td>
<td>0.000065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Analyses of variance for measures of syntax for the three essays.
## Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essay One</th>
<th>Essay Two</th>
<th>Essay Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) for proportions of response statements (type over total) across the three essays. D stands for descriptive-, P for personal-, G for general-, A for associative-, I for interpretive-, and E for evaluative-type statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>638.00</td>
<td>319.10</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>232.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 35</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>255.00</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 33</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>145.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 35</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>651.00</td>
<td>325.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>111.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 35</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>736.00</td>
<td>367.80</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 33</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>118.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 35</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>502.90</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 33</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>100.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 35</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Between 2</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>72.10</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 33</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 35</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Analyses of variance for response statements across the three essays.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essay One</th>
<th>Essay Two</th>
<th>Essay Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=12</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Paragraphs</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Thesis St. Rating</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Statement as #1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Sentence as #1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Sentence as Last</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Sentence as #1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Sentence as Last</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Sentence as #1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Sentence as Last</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Results of structural analysis of the three essays. Unless otherwise indicated, all values are expressed as percentages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essay One</th>
<th>Essay Two</th>
<th>Essay Three</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfocused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Results of analysis by level of abstractness across the three essays.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The present chapter begins with a summary of the goals of the study, and then focuses on tentative responses to the research questions. The main conclusions arising from the study are presented, and the implications of these conclusions for students, instructors, and ESL programs are discussed. Finally, recommendations for further research are considered.

Summary of the Goals

The need for ESL composition courses as part of a general ESL Program is generally not contested. Analytic writing, one of the chief purposes of such courses, seems to be a very necessary skill for the academic success of ESL students in the United States. As a relatively new field of study, ESL composition may benefit from exploratory-type studies of ESL writers; that is, of classroom research on the teaching and learning of ESL composition. The
present study used in-depth case study methodology, and it included an 
examination of both classroom interaction and analysis of the written products.

The main objective of this study was to describe and understand the 
teaching and learning of analytic writing in an intermediate, ESL composition 
classroom in an attempt to document the students' possible development as 
analytic writers. More specifically, the study sought to examine how instruction 
might foster the uses of declarative and procedural knowledge of genre 
conventions for analytic writing and how students' writing processes and 
products might suggest the success of such an effort. The purpose of the 
instructional component of the study was to examine how instructional support 
fosters the development of these ESL students as analytic writers. On the other 
hand, the four specific, detailed analyses of a sample of twelve students' three 
main writing assignments were included as a measure of change over time in 
the students' writing. The analyses included a look at the syntax, discourse 
structure, content, and level of abstractness in the thirty-six essays.

The present study is, then, innovative because it examines both the 
instructional context and the kinds of writing strategies and the products 
(analysis of the three main writing assignments) that suggest how context may 
contribute to the development of these ESL students as analytic writers. The 
results may also provide valuable information for instructional and 
administrative decisions about ESL programs in the United States, especially in 
regard to the preparation of ESL writing instructors.
A Look at the Research Questions

This section restates the research questions from chapter one and briefly answers them.

1. How does daily classroom instruction provide a context for learning to write analytically?

The present study's look at daily classroom instruction was substantiated by about 20 hours of classroom observation over a ten-week quarter in two different classrooms. Daily classroom instruction provides the instructional support that students receive when learning to write analytically. Also, it is during daily interaction in the classroom that both the instructor and the students shape their interpretations of what it means to write analytically. For example, classroom discussions focused mostly on issues of discourse structure for the academic essay, while discussions about issues of content were less evident. Put another way, the instructional context provided access to declarative knowledge about issues of discourse structure, and, to some extent, to declarative knowledge about issues of content, but not to procedural knowledge about issues of content. Accordingly, although the students did at one level develop as analytic writers, text analytic results suggest that students did not consider the content of the source texts as much as they did issues of discourse structure.

(a) What specific instructional activities and routines does the instructor use on a daily basis?

The instructor used teacher-led discussions, small group work, lecture, silent reading, writing, student presentations, and reading aloud to create the
instructional context. Time on task for these activities seemed to change throughout the ten-week period, going from mostly teacher-led interaction to more student involvement, including student presentations. The combination of these classroom activities allowed the students to gain both declarative and procedural knowledge about discourse conventions and the role they play in learning to write analytically. For example, the teacher-led discussions on discourse structure—how to draw an outline onto a text, for instance—served as a model for the activities the students did both while working individually and in groups.

(b) How do these activities and routines help the students gain declarative knowledge for analytic writing?

It was mainly through the teacher-led discussions and lectures that the instructor presented declarative knowledge about discourse conventions. These classroom activities allowed the students to become familiar with the terminology for such conventions, as well as guided practice—through editing, for example—in its practical applications. Also, activities in small group work and student presentations provided the opportunity for the instructor to focus on declarative knowledge about both issues of structure and to a less extent issues of content. Specifically, it was the classroom discussions that allowed the students to internalize the fact that the topic sentence should be the first one in any given paragraph—a rule followed fairly consistently in the three essays.

(c) How do these activities and routines help the students gain procedural knowledge for analytic writing?
The students' participation in small group work, the writing of mini essays, and the coordination of student presentations allowed the students a “hands-on” approach to the learning of discourse conventions in several modes. Through scaffolding, the instructor allowed the students to experiment with analytic writing. It was, however, noted in the results, that the instructor focused almost exclusively on procedural knowledge about issues of structure, practically ignoring procedural knowledge about issues of content. It would seem, then, that the specific classroom activities and routines, as enacted in this particular classroom, limited the students’ opportunity to explore procedural knowledge for the analysis of ideas and experiences gleaned from source texts. The almost exclusive focus on genre knowledge may explain why the students were not able to perform deeper analysis of ideas in their writing as measured by how they responded to the source texts.

2 How are the courses' broader curricular expectations and structures operationalized in this particular classroom?

Extensive interviews with the students, the instructor, the course coordinator, and the program director provide the knowledge of the courses' broader curricular expectations and structures. Daily classroom activities, and one-on-one interaction between the instructor and the students appeared to be the main agents shaping the students' interpretation of the courses broader expectations and structures. The interviews revealed that, while the instructor, the course coordinator, and the program director had clearly stated expectations prior to the beginning of the course, the students started the ten-week period with few notions of what to expect from the course. Moreover, it
seems that the students' interpretations were shaped by the instructor's personal expectations through both classroom and one-on-one interaction. In this particular classroom, then, it is the instructor's expectations that shape the students' interpretations of what English 107 is supposed to deliver.

(a) How does the enactment of the curricular expectations and structures affect the way the students learn to write analytically?

It appears, based on the results of this study, that for an expectation to be successfully implemented in the classroom, it needs to be shared by all the agents involved in the teaching and learning; namely, the program director, the course coordinator, the instructor, and the students. The students' development as analytic writers is shaped only by those expectations that are actively enacted in the classroom, as was the case for rhetorical reading. Accordingly, curricular expectations and structures need to be clearly stated, and successfully internalized by all in order for writing instruction to effectively implement these expectations. This point has implications for the preparation of ESL writing instructors. For example, although the program director's personal expectations for English 107 were clearly based on current theoretical trends in ESL composition pedagogy—particularly when dealing with balancing structure and content—this specific expectation was not successfully implemented in the classroom. The instructor, who had little background in ESL composition theory, tended to follow her own idiosyncratic beliefs about teaching and learning analytic writing. The students' conception of analytic writing, accordingly, mirrored the instructor's personal interpretation.
How, if at all, do the students' experiences with, and perceptions of, the readings get transformed into analytic writing?

The reading component in this particular course was designed to challenge ESL students in many ways. Writing in response to reading, and especially in response to literary readings, was used to enable students learn to interpret complex ideas, while exposing them to the cultural values and systems of thought (Scholes, 1985). Also, practice in writing about source texts may help the students develop skills necessary to survive in the academic written exchange of ideas. The students' personal interpretations and reactions to the source texts became, in this course, the catalyst for ideas presented in dealing with issues of content. For instance, in essay one the students reacted strongly to Wendell Berry's ideas about computers, as evidenced by results of the content analysis, since the results of the interpretive response statements were statistically significant. The students' experiences with procedural--or "how to"--knowledge about analytic writing, and their dealings with the source text are exemplified both in the classroom and in the tutorials. More specifically, in the classroom, discussions about "To room nineteen" provided the vocabulary and literary interpretations necessary for an individual exploration of the topic, while in the tutorials, one-on-one discussions between the instructor and the student helped shape content manipulation, as in Yucuanto's essay three.

(a) How is procedural knowledge implemented in the classroom?

The instructor designed several techniques to put procedural knowledge to work in the classroom. Making students aware of a sense of audience, discussing personal adaptations to the academic writing style, motivating a
sense of ownership in the students’ writing, and focusing on different activities to sharpen the students’ analytical skills were concrete activities that the instructor used to focus on “how to” knowledge in the classroom. It seems, however, that she mostly succeeded in tackling procedural knowledge about issues of structure, and did not focus on issues of content.

(b) How is procedural knowledge put to work in the tutorials?

The tutorials, designed to bridge the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge, had limited success in exploring procedural knowledge about issues of content. They were, however, very successful in helping the students apply procedural knowledge to issues of structure. More specifically, they helped the students learn to apply their theoretical knowledge about rhetorical structures when revising their written work, as evidence by Kamran’s experimentation with self-editing issues of structure.

4 How do the students’ previous experiences affect the way they learn to write analytically?

A student’s previous experiences, whether personal or educational, shape his or her interpretation of what they “need” from their ESL composition course. This, in turn, affects the operationalization of the courses’ curricular expectations in the classroom since results will always be influenced by individual differences. In this particular study, the students felt a need to know and internalize the elements of analytic writing as presented by this instructor.

(a) How do the students’ personal backgrounds affect their ability to write analytically?
The population for this study consisted mostly of students majoring in engineering (34%) and business (19%) who were highly motivated to succeed in the American university system. A good percentage of them (34%) even planned to continue graduate studies in the United States. These students wanted very much to learn American writing; they thought it would guarantee success in their academic endeavors. This quest for dominance of the discourse structure may have shaped the students' interpretations of the expectations for the program, especially as enacted by this particular instructor in this particular course.

(b) How do the students' writing instruction backgrounds and experiences shape the way they participate in the instructional context?

Most of the students in this study (57%) stated that their previous writing instruction was limited to "free topic" writing, in which they were able to choose the subject of their essays. They believed that, because of their prior writing instruction, their "logical thinking skills" were not developed enough, making it hard for them to compete in the American university system. Also, 40% of them claimed not to have been exposed to writing in response to reading, 30% were not familiar with the multiple-draft system, and 30% had not used structure in their writing. Accordingly, 95% of the students thought the most important advice the instructor could give them was instruction in the discourse conventions. These beliefs actively shaped the students' interpretations of the expectations for English 107.

(c) How does the students' declarative knowledge about discourse for analytic writing shape the way they develop as analytic writers?
Most students stated never having being exposed to structural knowledge or rhetorical conventions in their prior schooling. It is evident that other writing the students are required to do in content courses at the university level assumes these students have been exposed to such declarative knowledge for written discourse conventions. It was, accordingly, necessary for this ESL composition course to present declarative knowledge about rhetorical conventions to the ESL students. Ideally, declarative knowledge about structural knowledge for analytic writing provides the students with the organizational tools around which they can build the content of their writing assignments. In this particular classroom discourse knowledge became the focus of analytic writing. Although the students were able to develop their knowledge of discourse structure, and even to effectively use this knowledge as an organizational tool, discourse structure obscured the content component of the development of analytic writers.

5 How does the students' written work evidence their progress and ability to write analytically about literary and informational readings over the ten-week period of the course?

The four types of text analyses of the 12 students three main writing assignments suggest that the students were, to some extent, actively developing as analytic writers throughout the ten-week period. Below is a consideration of the results of each analysis.

(a) How do measures of syntactic complexity account for student progress throughout the ten-week period?
Keeping in mind that, in general, students wrote slightly longer essays than required, the number of T-units decreased slightly, but not statistically significantly, from essay one, to essay two, to essay three. Longer T-units throughout the essays might be interpreted as writing development at the sentence level, and results indicated significant differences between essays one, two, and three regarding number of words per T-unit. However, the number of words per T-unit decreases first, and then increases, suggesting the effects of specific essay assignments rather than general development. The variation in the number of error-free T-units may be indicative of increased content manipulation. Perhaps the students attempted to discuss more complicated issues in essay three, decreasing the number of error free T-units produced in that essay.

(b) How do measures of level of abstractness suggest the students' ability to write analytically about readings?

Results from the analysis of level of abstractness appear to indicate that the students wrote more focused essays as the quarter progressed. In some way this went together with a diminishing use of the "thesis and summary" as a strategy for representing their understandings of the source texts. The use of thesis and summary restatement in essay one and the absence of this strategy in essay three suggests that the students were better able to express their ideas clearly and in an organized fashion in essay three than either in essay two or in essay one. Being able to succinctly and clearly express an idea is indispensable to effectively representing one's interpretation in an analytic framework.
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(c) How, if at all, does an analysis of the structural framework of the essays suggest the students’ development as analytic writers?

The analysis of the structural framework the students developed for their essays seems to indicate that the students were effectively internalizing the discourse conventions taught in the classroom. The near-to-perfect mean rating obtained in essay three and the absolute presence of the topic sentence as the first one in the fourth paragraph of all essays are evidence of this claim. However, this knowledge does not necessarily represent a deepening understanding of analytic writing.

(d) How does a content analysis of the essays reveal the development of ideas and critical thinking skills in the students’ essays?

Results from the content analysis of the essay suggest that the students were developing their interpretive skills throughout the ten-week period. The students relied on personal statements about the source texts more often from essay one, to essay two, to essay three. Their use of interpretive statements also increased through the ten-week period. Conversely, they used fewer statements related to general content from essay one, to essay two, to essay three. The students use of descriptive-, associative-, and evaluative-statements seemed to fluctuate for the three writing assignments. Although varying interpretations of these data are possible, results in general indicate an increase in the students’ ability to manipulate source texts, a skill of prime importance in the development of analytic writers. However, the fact that results are uneven and inconsistent suggests that the instructional context did not
provide as much support for analytic thinking as it did for structural knowledge for the forms of analytic writing.

Conclusions and Implications

The results from this study consistently suggest two main ideas. First, it seems that instructional scaffolding is necessary for students to learn all aspects of learning to write analytically. That is, given the demands of such writing, the students need guidance in their exploration of declarative and procedural knowledge about both discourse structure and content interpretation. Second, learning to write analytically is a complicated process that necessitates attention in all aspects of its development. At the same time the students in this study were learning how to become analytic writers in the classroom, the instructor was also learning how to become effective at her job. The ESL composition program thus needs effective institutional support in order to foster the development of both teachers and students. Presently, these two implications are presented and discussed, and minor themes relating to these ideas are evaluated.

Instructional Scaffolding: Balancing Procedural and Declarative Knowledge for Form and Content

Within the instructional context there was a clear unbalance between the declarative and procedural knowledge that influenced results. The procedural knowledge for content might not have been the instructor's focus, because of her specific background as a writer and preparation as an instructor. Therefore,
the balancing of declarative and procedural knowledge failed in part because
the instructor chose not to concern herself with the students' developing ideas
about the source texts. Although mastering the elements of discourse structure
is basic to the learning of analytic writing, the instructor also needs to guide the
students' thinking processes and their development of ideas.

In this particular study, classroom and tutorial discussions related to
procedural knowledge about issues of content did not effectively materialize for
a variety of reasons. First, it is possible that the students thought the instructor
was not interested in the quality of their ideas, and therefore chose to not
develop them, or not to seek the instructor's help in developing them. Second,
it is also possible that the students themselves were not highly interested in
developing their own ideas, rather wanted to concentrate on learning the
organizational structures of analytic writing. The students' interest in issues of
structure could be an effect of (a) their previous instructional experiences with
writing, (b) their culture, and (c) their interpretation of the expectations for
English 107. Moreover, 78% of the students considered themselves to be "low
intermediate" when it comes to proficiency in English. Perhaps that is the
reason they thought they should not concentrate on developing their own ideas.
After all, it was the students who stated they would have wanted more help with
grammar, as opposed to more help with the development of their ideas. Third,
the instructor's expectations for English 107 were limited to issues of structure,
and thus the instructor did not think it her duty to help the students develop their
ideas. Fourth, it is also possible that, consciously or unconsciously, the
instructor limited the students' interest in developing their own ideas. It is clear
that the students viewed the instructor's role as one limited to helping them improve their command of genre conventions, as opposed to helping them develop their ideas. Perhaps some training in reader response theory or on the elements of literary interpretation would have helped both the instructor and the students focus on the development of ideas. This seems to have been a key concern to the course coordinator. Fifth, it is possible that the instructor believed that the development of the students' interest in issues of content would come later in their development as analytic writers, but this study was limited to the ten weeks described previously. In these ten weeks, and based on an interpretation of classroom activities, there seemed to be limited student involvement with issues of content—and only for declarative knowledge.

It is true that results from the tabulation of instructional activities (see Figure 7) indicate that the amount of time spent dealing with declarative and procedural knowledge was roughly similar, at least on the days the observations were carried out. But the imbalance comes from the fact that there were no classroom activities relating to procedural knowledge for content. With a few exceptions, most opportunities for meaningful modeling of issues of content and discussion of how to integrate form and content came during the tutorials, making the tutorials indispensable to the development of ESL students as analytic writers. However, this is something to be pursued in future studies as the current study did not. Although a majority of the students (66%) said the tutorials helped them write organized essays, about a third of the students (33%) thought the tutorials helped them with topic development. So, even in an instructional context that limited students' exploration of procedural knowledge
of issues of content, the tutorials provided somewhat of a context for the development of issues of content.

Also related to the prevalence of issues of structure over issues of content in this classroom is the idea that often students will only express what they think exemplifies the instructor's interests. Based upon the interview with the case study students, the researcher would say they clearly understood what was important for their instructor, and what they needed to do in order to get a good grade. As an observer, the researcher thought the students were at least somewhat interested in developing their ideas, and would have benefited from thoughtful modeling in this area.

Another possible interpretation of the relationship between issues of structure and issues of content is that instruction in genre conventions may have to precede instruction in issues of content, at least for this group of ESL students. It is clear to the researcher that these students knew they were expected to include their personal interpretation of and response to the source readings, but failed to do so many times. It is possible that the students wanted to exercise control over the issues of structure before attempting to control issues of content, after all, it seems simpler to control the former as opposed to the latter. Also, it becomes impossible for the students to use genre conventions heuristically if they do not feel comfortable using genre conventions in their writing. For example, the students found comparison and contrast the hardest mode to use, and they were also less able to define it. In other words, command of declarative knowledge about issues of structure seemed to need to precede command of procedural knowledge about issues of content.
Moreover, the students' inability to properly express their ideas was a continued source of frustration for them. It would seem possible, then, that ESL students might benefit from an instructional approach that includes the exploration of both issues of structure and issues of content at all levels of proficiency in English. Future studies ought to explore this issue by comparing the effects of various approaches to the balancing of discourse structure and content knowledge.

**Oversimplification: The Need for Institutional Support**

The results of this study seem to indicate that the conceptualization of an ESL composition program has a great effect in the daily shaping of both the instructional context, and the implementation of program expectations, among other things. It would have been difficult to understand the instructor's motivations and the patterns of classroom activities without understanding the way the entire ESL composition program was conceptualized. A program's expectations need to be shared and explained to the instructor and the students, because the students seem to eventually adopt the instructor's expectations as their own. If the instructor has not internalized a strong explanation and theoretical foundation for the expectations the program represents, the instructor will likely fall back on personal experiences and his or her own beliefs about what works best in the classroom. The expectations for an ESL composition course should be clearly stated to the instructor and the students at the beginning of the course.

Institutional support would ideally also play a part in the program for preparing instructors. An ESL program would need to design a teacher
preparation model that includes frequent meetings between the administrators and the instructor, the examination of writing samples that the students produce during the duration of the course, and the instructor's response comments to it. A mentor that would inquire as to the instructor's beliefs and expectations for the course he or she is teaching, and an instructor's journal to record classroom experiences, among others. The training of ESL composition instructors needs to include more theory and discussion of research results, the same way that the written instructions the students received before each essay included a theoretical component on the idea of writing in response to a source text. Also, instructors need specific and detailed feedback so that they can understand the effect institutional policies (and their own policies and practices) have in the students' learning.

English as a Second Language programs may also choose to be more rigorous in the selection of the instructors. Studying relevant personality variables and personal interests that might influence his or her teaching methodology. The students participating in the program also need strong institutional support. It is difficult for an average ESL student whose deficiencies in grammar overwhelm him or her to concentrate on other aspects of his or her writing. Perhaps it would be possible to offer students some type of grammar-based support that they could access as part of their enrollment in English 107. Then the students might feel that they are getting "what they want"—grammar instruction—as well as "what they need"—guidance in the development of issues of content.
The oversimplification of the processes involved in the teaching and learning of analytic writing is especially dangerous considering the many ways in which writing development in a SL differs from writing development in an L1. Also, and especially for ESL students, the instructor does not know the processes of reading and response to the text that happen before the students enter the classroom and begin classroom interaction. Put another way, how well can we access and understand ESL students' thought processes?

**Overview: Practice and Theory**

In a practical way, the results of this study improve the understanding of the characteristics involved in the teaching and learning of analytic writing in the ESL classroom. For example, the importance of tutorials and the importance of a research-based theoretical explanation for decisions on program expectations and curriculum design. Moreover, the results provided detailed explanation of the ways in which the instructional context shapes the development of the ESL writer, by providing an arena--through classroom activities--for the operationalization of course, and program, expectations and objectives. The analysis of the case study students' writing processes provides information that could help instructors find workable solutions to the problems faced by some ESL writers. For instance, when faced with a student like Kamran who consistently neglects to follow the instructor's recommendations, the instructor may try to allow the student to write during class, when easier access to the instructor is provided.

Theoretically, the data resulting from the analysis of the instructional context could be used to develop and test emerging theoretical designs about
the processes involved in the teaching and learning of analytic writing in ESL composition classrooms. In other words, educational activities that fall into the quadrant related to procedural knowledge about issues of content could be incorporated in the classroom. This revised instructional context could then be tested for improved balance of declarative and procedural knowledge about issues of structure and issues of content. This manipulation of the instructional context and classroom activities could be compared to results obtained by Hillocks (1986, 1995) dealing with the same issues in L1 situations. Similarly, results of the essay analyses for this study could possibly lay a foundation for the development of a unit of analysis to gauge the evolution of ESL students as analytic writers. It seems that any viable unit of analysis would need to relate to both declarative and procedural knowledge about both issues of structure and issues of content. Seeing that the analysis by level of abstractness produced the most conclusive findings as it relates to issues of content, and that the structural analysis produced the most conclusive findings for issues of structure, it would seem wise to include both these analyses in any further attempts to create a unit of analysis.

Finally, the improved understanding of any facet of the processes of the teaching and learning of analytic writing will aid instructors, researchers, and textbook writers to increase the efficacy of the teaching of ESL composition.
Recommendations for Future Research

Before discussing interesting research agendas, it is important to remember that findings emanating from this study are not meant to be generalizable to other student populations. Rich description is provided so that researchers can decide on applicability of findings to their own situations. Also, it is important to remember that the different agents involved in shaping the findings for this particular study probably have different capacities for articulating their thoughts, both written—as answers to questionnaires—and oral, in response to interviews. Accordingly, results are not meant to be accepted, but should be carefully interpreted and questioned.

The most important recommendation for future research is that all studies of ESL writers be nested in the overall ESL instructional program to which the student belongs. Studies of ESL writers need to be nested for several reasons. First, results from this study indicate that only those expectations that are shared by all agents in the development of ESL writers are the expectations implemented in the classroom. Second, if researchers, students, instructors, and administrators understand the rationale behind the curriculum that plays a part in the students' development as writers, the teaching and learning processes, as well as the research agenda, are facilitated.

Researchers interested in the development of procedural knowledge of content should focus on the one-on-one interactions between the instructor and the student, where these types of discussions seemed more likely to materialize in this particular study. Also, one-on-one interactions between the instructor...
and the students should become indispensable to ESL courses. Moreover, researchers interested in the development of procedural knowledge for issues of content on ESL composition students need to design longer studies and follow the students through several courses in English composition. It is possible that the case study students observed for this particular study acquired procedural knowledge for issues of content in other college-level courses, and it would be interesting to try to document such development. It seems that the development of ESL students as analytic writers is a complicated, time-consuming process, and that qualitative research methods might be best suited for this particular area of SLA. Future studies should plan accordingly.

Longitudinal studies about ESL writers need to be conceptualized to explore the transition writers make from declarative to procedural knowledge--both for issues of structure and issues of content. Must declarative knowledge always precede procedural knowledge, or can a truly balanced approach exist in an ESL classroom? It would be interesting to observe ESL composition classrooms in which different emphases are placed on declarative and procedural knowledge, or ones in which the development of issues of content takes precedence over the development of issues of structure. Would the students’ progress as analytic writers be accelerated by different pedagogical approaches? Can ESL composition instructors “push” their students into the exploration of issues of content, or is it a developmental issue over which the instructional context has little--or no--control?

Of special interest would be to investigate if other ESL composition programs, or other instructors at this particular ESL composition program.
exemplify the same imbalance between declarative and procedural knowledge as it relates to issues of content. For what type of instructor is this imbalance more evident? Do different ethnic groups react differently to the presentation of both declarative and procedural knowledge in the classroom? What about students with different levels of proficiency? Are more proficient students more willing to experiment with content manipulation?

The type of studies suggested for future research agendas--nested, longitudinal, focusing on both process and product--could focus on different types of source texts. For example, the texts could be more clearly divided into informational or literary. These clear divisions would make it easier to account for development of issues of content in the students' writing. Is there a certain type of source text that facilitates the students' involvement with relevant ideas? It would also be interesting to investigate the ways in which informational or literary readings shape the ESL students' cultural and learning experiences.

Furthermore, there might be a need to study how past educational experiences of ESL students relate to the balancing of issues of structure and issues of content as it relates to declarative and procedural knowledge. Since most of these ESL students claimed no previous instructional experience with genre conventions, is it true, as the students in this study feel, that their problems with writing in English come from lack of knowledge of genre conventions? Will ESL students naturally "make the leap" into effectively manipulating issues of content during their academic careers once they master genre conventions? A study designed to follow ESL students through the entire
ESL composition course sequence, and on to content courses requiring writing, might help answer this question.

Perhaps a look into the balancing of declarative and procedural knowledge as it relates to issues of structure and issues of content in an English composition classroom—Freshman composition, for example—or in content courses for that matter, would help understand the instructional processes in ESL composition classrooms. What are the NSs' attitudes toward genre conventions and the role they play in helping them to learn how to write analytically? Also interesting would be to investigate the demands placed on American students learning to write in a FL. Would they feel the need to master issues of structure before engaging in activities designed to develop issues of content? If not, what types of issues would be of importance for the students learning to compose in a FL?

From a teacher education perspective, it would be interesting to follow an instructor such as the one presented in this study through in-service training sessions designed to stress the importance of issues of content in all levels of ESL composition instruction. Results from extensive interviews with this instructor could help develop ways to tie theory and research results with educational practice. Is it possible to convince an instructor that what he or she believes in might not be the most sound approach to a certain task, or are most efforts at retraining fruitless? The training for ESL composition instructors should focus on helping both the instructor and the students realize the importance of focusing on issues of content, even in beginning ESL courses.
All these possible research agendas need to be guided by the two main conclusions drawn from this study. Most importantly, researchers should be aware of the importance of nesting ESL studies within the broader concept of institutional support at all levels, for the administrators, for the instructors, and for the students. Moreover, descriptive studies of the development of ESL students as analytic readers and writers can help researchers better understand this complicated process. It seems, then, that although this study explored one particular context for the teaching and learning of analytic reading and writing, and began to explore the complexities of ESL students' development as analytic readers and writers, there are many unanswered questions about the nature of the instructional context and its role in these developmental processes.
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APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF READINGS REQUIRED FOR ESSAYS 1, 2, AND 3

Essay #1

The readings for essay #1 included an essay written by Wendell Berry, *Against PCs: Why I'm not going to buy a computer* (which appeared in Harper's magazine), two letters from readers of Harper's (Inkeles and Koosman), and Berry's rejoinder.

Berry states he, both as a farmer and as a writer, does not like to depend on energy corporations. He does not need, or want, a computer since his wife corrects, critiques, and gives ideas to his work. Computers not only cost money, but may cost him the closeness he shares with his wife. He also mentions some standards for technological innovation to be useful to people. New machines should be cheaper, smaller, use less energy, be easily repairable at a small, privately-owned store, and not replace or disturb anything good.

Inkeles says that if we follow that rationale, we should also get rid of vacuum cleaners and washing machines, since 'Wife' can do a better job. Koosman says Berry misses the point of computers, which is to help edit, not help with idea development, and that it frees spouses for other work. Berry
replies that maybe his wife likes to, and wants to, help him write, and that the most innovative idea when it comes to computers is not using them at all.
Essay #2

"Reflections of a Seventeen-Year-Old" contains one selection from the diary of Sylvia Plath. She feels passion and contentment about her life as it is at age 17; but she looks gloomily towards the future and describes her fears of getting older, getting married, and making difficult decisions.

"Child of the Dark" contains selections from the diary of Carolina María de Jesús, a woman who lives in the slums of Brazil. She writes about her distrust of politicians, and about the deplorable conditions in which she and her children live. Amidst the fears of abuse and starvation, de Jesús finds some peace through her imagination.
Essay #3

"To Room Nineteen" is a long short story about the mental breakdown of Susan Rawlings. This formerly happy housewife, for reasons that can be debated, begins to feel isolated from her family and begins seeking opportunities to be alone. Over time, being alone becomes an obsession and she eventually spends all day, every day, in a hotel room by herself doing absolutely nothing. After becoming convinced of her utter separation from her family and her former self, she commits suicide.
APPENDIX B

WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS FOR ESSAYS 1, 2, AND 3

Essay #1
Description: This is a combined reading-writing assignment based upon the following related texts in Changes: Wendell Berry's essay, "Against PCs: Why I'm not Going to Buy a Computer" (pp. 179-181), two letters in response to his essay (pp. 182-183), and his reply to those letters (p. 184). You are expected to read each of these texts at least twice and then write an essay (about 500 words in length) in which you discuss your reaction(s) to this entire set of texts. This means that your essay should give your audience a clear, organized discussion of how you responded to the content (ideas), development (support of the ideas), and organization (arrangement of the texts) of Berry's essay and the letters and reply to them. This will involve (in your reading and your writing) considering such questions as:
- Did Berry present his ideas clearly? Did he present them effectively in terms of support? Which areas of his essay were convincing? Which were not? Which did you agree and/or disagree with? How could this essay be improved?

- Were the two letters in response to his essay effective responses? If so, why? If not, why not? To what extent did you agree and/or disagree with the writers of the letters? How could the letters have been written more effectively?

- Did Berry write a convincing reply to those letters? If so, what made it convincing? If not, why was it unconvincing? How could he have improved his reply?

You are not expected to answer or discuss all of these questions; they are intended simply to give you guidance in determining your reactions to the texts and in organizing your essay.

To write an effective response essay, you must read the assigned texts carefully so as to fully understand what they say and how they express their ideas. You must also have a very clear sense of which aspects of the texts you want to respond to, and what your responses are. In other words, good reading will help your writing; also, you can use writing to increase your understanding of the assigned texts. This is the essence of academic reading and writing: good, careful reading ('reading-to-write', where we read according to the requirements of our writing) makes writing easier and more effective, and writing serves as a tool through which to break down and analyze texts we are reading or have read.
In your essay, you should:

A) Include a thesis statement which clearly indicates a general or overall reaction to the assigned texts;

B) Include topic sentences which identify specific areas to be discussed and responses to be made in your essay;

C) Cite specific examples from the texts in support of points you have made, i.e., particular responses.
Essay #2

Description: This is a combined reading-writing assignment in which you will discuss your observations, as a reader and writer, of one of the following texts in Changes:

-- "Reflections of a Seventeen-Year-Old" (pp. 123-125)

OR

-- "Child of the Dark: The Diary of Carolina María de Jesús" (pp. 132-135)

In this essay, then, you will share with your readers what you found interesting, significant, surprising, confusing, and so forth in your readings of the text you have chosen. Hence, when your readers finish reading your essay, they should have a clear idea as to some of your observations of the text.

As the questions above suggest, you can discuss your observations by using such rhetorical devices or modes as cause and effect, comparison-contrast, classification, and/or contrasts, your cause and effect analyses, your classifications, and your use of examples. Readers should gain a clear understanding of what you observed and experienced while reading and writing about the text you have selected.

Before writing your essay, then, you should:

A) Read the text you have chosen at least three times.

B) Write notes describing each of your readings: what you observed during your readings, how your approach to reading the text changed (or remained the same) from one reading to another, what you looked for during each reading, etc.
C) Make a list of specific thoughts, feelings, and experiences you see in the text.

D) Look for ways in which cause and effect, comparison-contrast, classification, and exemplification can help you in your reading of the text. i.e. use these rhetorical modes as reading devices so as to provide focus in your reading and to help you in preparing to write your essay.

Your essay should be about 500-600 words in length and should use at least two of the four rhetorical modes mentioned earlier. Use those rhetorical modes which best help you share your observations with your readers.
Essay #3

Part A - Instructions given out when the students began reading the story

Description: This is an extended reading-writing assignment based upon the short story "To Room Nineteen." This is a rather long story that you will be reading in segments of approximately 5-6 pages throughout most of the quarter. You will complete various small-scale writing tasks connected to each segment of the story. These tasks will provide material you will need to write Essay #3. The essay itself will be due near the end of the quarter, and at some point in the second half of the quarter you will be given a detailed description of what the essay requires. In the meantime, you need to concentrate on each segment of the story and on the tasks assigned for each segment. Again, completion of these tasks will better enable you to write a strong, effective Essay #3.

Here are some suggestions for approaching Essay #3 and all of its components effectively

A) Create a section or category in your portfolio in which to collect all of your writing related to "To Room Nineteen."

B) Note that the first sentence of the story, "This is a story, I suppose, about a failure in intelligence: the Rawling's marriage was grounded in intelligence," is in fact a thesis statement. Because that sentence functions as a thesis, refer back to it frequently as you read each segment of the story, and as you begin to compare segments once you've read more than one. Here you need to understand that your main task in reading and writing about this story is
to solve this problem: what does that sentence mean, and how does the story illustrate or support what it says?

C) Pay particular attention to the two main characters of the story, Susan and Matthew Rawlings, especially Susan, as you read through the segments. Note how they are characterized, i.e. described, by the author, and use these descriptive details to build your own portrait of these characters. Also, as you learn more about them, particularly Susan, try to understand why they act and think as they do.

D) Don't emphasize finding the meaning or message of the story as you read the various segments. Instead, pay careful attention to the development of the story - to what we are told about the main characters and to what happens as the story unfolds - in relationship to the story's thesis statement.

E) Keep a written record of your thoughts, impressions, reactions to, and questions about the story as you read the segments. That is, compile a 'reading log' of notes concerning your reading of the story. Here you might also want to write notes about how (if at all) your reading process change as you moved from one segment to another.

F) As you read later segments of the story, look back at earlier segments to find connections between events or descriptions in the various segments. Here you must bear in mind that in this story, as in any text, there is an ongoing building process taking place. That is, the author uses various events and descriptions in the story to create the foundation for later events and descriptions. One of our jobs as readers is to trace or identify these connections.
G) Make notes of what you believe are key sentences or passages in the story.

H) As you begin to form ideas about the meaning and significance of the thesis statement of the story, look for evidence in support of your ideas within the text.

I) Be prepared to discuss the story from time to time in class.

J) Ask your teacher to explain words, phrases, or events in the story which are difficult to understand.

K) As you complete various small-scale writing tasks assigned for each segment of the story, remember that, among other functions, we use writing as a problem-solving device. Texts set problems for us to solve as readers. That is, quite often the meaning of a text isn’t clear, and so we have to find ways of unlocking the text. We do this by analyzing how a text is organized, and how its various parts are connected. This is where writing can play an important role. In other words, we don’t use writing only to express fully-formed ideas or conclusions or information; we also use it as a tool to analyze what we read and to sort through our reactions to a text so as to (a) discover, and (b) clarify ideas and thoughts about what we are reading or have read. Hence, writing about a text can enhance our reading of the text. This is one of the key ideas we are teaching in English 107.

L) In addition to paying careful attention to the content and the organization of the story, look closely at the language of the story. Try to learn from the vocabulary, word combinations, and sentence structures used in the
story. In other words, use the story as a language and grammar building exercise as well as a reading-writing experience.

M) Don’t create unrealistic expectations for yourself as you read through the story. This is not an easy story to understand, and there will likely be times when you are unclear as to the meaning of individual sentences or passages as well as to events which take place in the story. Whenever this occurs, stay calm and be patient. We are going to be working systematically through the story, and you will find that as you move from one segment to another, events and descriptions earlier in the story will become clearer as you encounter later events and descriptions. Likewise, later events and descriptions will be easier to understand if you look back at earlier segments. Reading is a process of going back and forth through a text, and you will need to follow this 'recursive' process as we make our way through this story. Also, we will have occasional group and class discussions about the story, and so you will have opportunities to ask questions about the story and to compare ideas and interpretations with your classmates.

Part B - Given to the students when it was time to start writing

Description: Essay #3 is the major reading-writing assignment in English 107. Over the past several weeks, you have been asked to read several segments of the short story, "To Room Nineteen," and to complete a wide variety of reading and writing tasks connected to the story. These tasks included writing and compiling (in your portfolio) "reading notes" about the story itself, about how you read the story (i.e. your reading process), about your reactions to the story, and so forth. Using these reading notes and the rhetorical knowledge (about
rhetorical modes, thesis statement, topic sentences, etc.) you have obtained in this course, write an essay on one of the following topics. The essay should be 500-600 words in length. The rhetorical modes you must select from are: exemplification, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and classification.

Topics:

A) Using at least two of the rhetorical modes mentioned above, write an essay in which you discuss your reactions to Susan Rawlings, especially as you proceeded from one segment of the story to another.

B) Using at least two of the rhetorical modes mentioned above, write an essay in which you discuss how you read the story, i.e. your reading process/techniques, as you moved from one segment of the story to another.

C) Using at least two of the rhetorical modes mentioned above, write an essay in which you discuss your interpretation(s) of the thesis statement of the story (i.e. the first sentence of the story) and how your interpretation(s) change and/or remained the same as you moved from one segment of the story to another.

D) Using at least two of the rhetorical modes mentioned above, write an essay in which you discuss your reactions to the story itself (i.e. its content, its possible message(s) or theme(s), its appeal to you, etc.), especially as you proceeded from one segment of the story to another.

E) Based upon what you now know about reading and writing and how they are related, as well as about the rhetorical modes taught in this course, write an essay in which you advise future English 107 students on how to read
"To Room Nineteen" effectively. You must either use or discuss at least two of the rhetorical modes mentioned above in your essay.
APPENDIX C

NEEDS SURVEY

Personal
Name ____________________________
Age ______
Sex ______
Nationality _______________________
Local address ______________________
Marital status ______________________
If, and when, you get married, would you like your spouse to speak English? How important would it be for you? (1 = very important, 2 = it would be nice, 3 = would not bring it up) ____________________________
If, and when, you have children, would you like them to speak English? How important would it be for you? (1 = very important, 2 = it would be nice, 3 = would not bring it up) ____________________________
Do you speak and/or read any other foreign languages? If so, which one(s)? ____________________________________________
Do you work? If so, where?, and how many hours a week on average?

Educational
When did you arrive in the United States? __________________________
How long have you been studying at Ohio State? __________________________
When do you expect to graduate? __________________________
What is your major? __________________________
What is your minor, if any? __________________________
Do you plan to study at another institution or in another country?

What do you think is your current level of proficiency in English? (circle one)
elementary  low intermediate  high intermediate  advanced

What is your main purpose in studying English?

Do you plan to pursue any kind of graduate studies after getting your degree at Ohio State? Explain

General
What are your general interests?
_____ entertainment at home (radio, TV)
_____ entertainment at the movies
_____ social activities (parties, gatherings)
_____ talking to friends
_____ community activities (specify)
_____ cultural interests (specify)

_____ reading books (what kind?)

_____ other activities

Which of the above activities you perform in English?

What time of the day do you use English the most?

For how many hours per day would you say you use English?

With whom do you use English most frequently?

Rank the following by frequency in your daily activities (1 = the most, 4 = the least).

_____ listen to English

_____ speak English

_____ read English

_____ write English

Assign a percentage (make sure the total is 100) to the following activities as you perform them on a weekly basis.

_____ listening to English
reading English
speaking English
writing English

Where do you expect to work on your future career?
business
government
industry
academic environment
other

What do you expect your duties to be in such a field? Be specific?

Are you willing to be interviewed regarding your experiences with writing and the type of writing instruction you have received in your country?
APPENDIX D

WRITING QUESTIONNAIRE

Name __________________________
Nationality ______________________
Gender __________
Age __________
Year in college ______________________
Major __________________________

What kinds of writing do you do for your other college courses here at OSU? Check as many as apply.

_______ short answers
_______ essays
_______ research papers
_______ essay tests
_______ other: ____________________________

Do you ever do any writing that is not assigned by your teachers? What kind? In what language?
What kind of writing that teachers assign is most difficult for you? Why is it difficult?

What kind of writing that teachers assign is easiest for you? Why is it easy?

Do you think 107 has helped you write for other courses at OSU? Why or why not?

What is the role of the tutorials in helping you with your writing?

What would you like to have more help with?

How do the readings that you do in 107 help you with your writing?

What kind of writing instruction does your 107 instructor give? What seems to be the most important advice she gives?

What kind of help does the instructor give after you start an essay?
Does the outline help you write essays? How?

Do you consider yourself a good writer? Why or why not?

What do you have to do to get a good grade in 107?

What do you think of the writing instruction you have received so far at OSU?
Do you think you can become a good writer?

What kind of writing did you do in high school? (Look at the first and second questions to get some ideas, then explain.)

What kind of things were important to your high school teachers? How were you graded? How were you taught? Was there structure? Did you read before writing? Did you do more than one draft?
January 2, 1995

Dear 107 student:

I am a graduate student working on my Ph. D. in Foreign Language Education at The Ohio State University, and I am interested in the acquisition of writing in a second language. This letter is meant to request your permission to do research in your classroom on how ESL students learn to write academic essays.

I intend to study the teaching/learning of rhetorical structures by ESL students. My research project involves no experimentation, only observation, audio recording of some classes, and some interviews.

I guarantee that any data I collect regarding your class will only be seen by me, my adviser, and your teacher. I also promise that in any report of the project I will keep all information confidential through the use of pseudonyms. Please be reassured that, if you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. If you have any questions feel free to call me at 292-2332.

Thank you for your help. I look forward to getting to know you better through the course of the quarter.

Sincerely,

Maria C. Garriga

____ Check here if you would like to volunteer for interviews.

________________________________________ Please sign here if you would not mind participating in the study.
APPENDIX F

LETTER TO THE ESL COMPOSITION DIRECTOR

1592 Saint Anthony Drive
Fort Wright KY 41011
(606)341-4865

Dr. Diane Belcher
Director, ESL Composition Program
118-C Stadium East 1961
Tuttle Park P1
The Ohio State University
Columbus OH 43210

December 31, 1994

Dear Dr. Belcher:

I am writing this letter to officially request access to Susan Peterson's Winter Quarter sections of 107 for the purpose of doing research on the teaching (and learning) of the academic essay. The research team includes Susan, Dr. Newell (from English Education within Educational Studies), and myself.

We would like to examine the teaching and learning of rhetorical structures and modes of writing within the class. Susan has assured me that this is part of the 107 syllabus, and, because this research does not involve experimental manipulation of any kind - only a desire to describe and understand - there will be no changes made to the content of the course.
As part of this study we anticipate 5-10 hours of classroom observation, 5-10 hours of audio taping of the class and/or tutorials, and selected interviews with students, Susan, and the program coordinator. We would also like, if possible, access to the students’ portfolios.

We will have the students sign a consent letter in which we guarantee their anonymity and confidentiality, and in which we will inform them of the general purpose of the research. They will know all three members of the research team will have access to all data. They will also be asked who would like to volunteer for the follow-up interviews.

We also intend to distribute a needs analysis questionnaire in the hopes of better knowing the student population. The distribution of these two forms will be the only two activities that will require student time not accounted for in the syllabus, and they could both be scheduled for the first day of classes.

I have drafted a proposal that describes this research project more thoroughly, and would be willing to send you a copy if you see it fit. Please let us know what you think.

I would also like to thank you for considering this request; and will, if you so desire, inform you of conclusions we draw from our observations.

Sincerely,

María C. Garriga
APPENDIX G

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Date ________________  Section __________

Activities  Time on Task  Sequencing

Lecture

Small Groups

Silent Reading

Reading Aloud

Writing

Teacher-led Discussion
Student Presentation

Use of Audio-Visual Equipment

Non-Instructional Activities
APPENDIX H

COURSE GRADES FOR ALL THE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN ENGLISH 107
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>DBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 4* | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 4 | 0* | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0* | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4* | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0* | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | 0* | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 0* | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | ex* | 4 | ex* | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0* | 3 | 4 |
| 10 | 0* | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 11 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 |

(continued)

Figure 16: Quiz grades of all the students enrolled in English 107. T stands for type of test, W for the percentage weight of the final grade, and M for the maximum allowable value. A represents the average, DBL represents a doubled value, ex stands for excused. * is the lowest value, which is dropped.
Figure 16 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ex*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ex*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ex*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>Pres</th>
<th>Fin</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Gra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

Figure 17: Supplemental grades of all the students enrolled in English 107. T stands for type of test, W for the percentage weight of a particular type of test, M for the maximum allowable value, and A for the average.
Figure 17 (continued)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This mini essay was written in response to "Stopping by woods on a snowy evening." The specific question was "How does the author convey that the atmosphere is quiet?"

The unedited mini essay was

In the poem "Stopping by woods on a snowy evening," the author uses different descriptions to convey that the atmosphere is quiet. First, he describes his location to emphasize that he is the only one in the forest. He says that he is far away from any village, and no one will see him there. Therefore, it should be a very quiet forest without any people. Second, he uses the time and the climate to describe the quietness. He mentions that it is the darkness evening in the year, and it is a cold snowy night too. Thus, we suppose that no one or no animal will be active in this bad condition. Moreover, he uses the sound to describe how quiet the forest is. He says that the ringing bell, the easy wind and the downy flake are the only sound in the forest. So we can feel it should be a quiet forest without any other noise. Because of the special descriptions from the author, we know that he locates in a very quiet night in the poem.
APPENDIX J

NINE REPRESENTATIVE ESSAYS FROM THREE CASE STUDY STUDENTS
ESSAY ONE

Sung-Ho

It is not surprised that even children can use a computer well. Because using a computer is very general and easy; in addition, it is one of the most convenient things in the world. It is certain that using a computer is not always satisfied everyone. Wendell Barry who wrote "Against PCs". On the other hand, Inkeles and Koosman who wrote against Barry's essay. When writers try to edit a essay, both of them who wrote letters think that it is right to use a computer. That's the big problem why do not understand the Barry's essay. But the purpose of Barry's essay is not forced a person not to use a computer but he and his wife only express their life style, therefore, both of them who wrote letters misunderstand the true idea of Wendell Barry's essay. Both of them who wrote against Barry's essay were only talking about the advantages of using a computer, they wrote, about writers who usually try to use a computer for editing and correcting words. By the way they may be not understand why did Barry's wife do that instead of using a computer, so Inkeles wrote that "Barry's wife is cheap, repairable near home", and Koosman has also a similar opinion that "a computer is cheaper than a secretary (or a wife)". Two writers' letters did not mention the disadvantages of using a computer, for example, if Barry were only concentrated on using a computer, he and wife's relationship may be destroyed, because his wife likes working for him; also, only if human-being depend on using a computer, he has trouble in relationship of human-being.

Wendell Barry's essay has two true ideas against PCs. First, Barry never ignores the wife's role. Because according to Barry's essay, he never ignores the wife's role. Because according to Barry's essay, he never forced got her to type and correct a word. Also he has believed in his wife's skill about editing the essay! however, two writers wrote that she has only been doing such a job without her will. Second, it is natural idea that she likes to help him by editing the essay, because she is not a secretary but a wife, however, two writers have a severe opinion about wife's role even though he and his wife like to work each other.

I agree with Wendell Barry's essay, because Barry's essay is more clear and logical statement than two letters; in addition, two writers have a narrow-minded view of woman's role, and only wrote their opinion without others opinion. Although two writers have a heated argument against Barry's essay. According to the Barry's replies, Barry insisted, "if the use of a computer is new idea", then a newer idea is not to use one. As matter of fact, Barry and his wife can live happily without using a computer, thus two writer have to reconsider about their letters.
Writing is not an easy job, but it is always interesting, especially for people who like it. Some people even make it as their occupations. Wendell Berry is one of them. He often writes about preserving our land and resources. One of his essay, "Against PCs," tells us that he does not agree that computers will benefit our life. He still believes that his conventional typewriter is better than a computer, and he even says that his wife works better than a computer because she can check and criticize his works. Berry looks very satisfied with his wife's work. In his essay "Against PCs," Berry acts as if he takes advantage of his wife.

There are many letters provoked by his essay. Two of those letters came from Inkeles and Koosman. Inkeles, in his letter, wrote that Berry uses his wife as an alternative instead of using a computer. He also makes comparisons between a wife and a computer. He did that as a criticism toward what Berry has done to his wife. In Koosman's letter, he wrote his letter more moderately than Inkeles did. But, he has the same opinion as Inkeles. That is, he agrees that Berry uses his wife. He also gave a suggestion that it would be better if wives do their jobs and allow the existence of computers. These two letters have very similar main points: they both agree that Berry has treated his wife inappropriately.

Berry made a defensive reply as the answer toward the provoked letters. In his reply, he tried to convince the readers by using his choice words that he is not exploiting his wife. He also said that none of the correspondents provoked by his essay recognizes the innovativeness of his essay. He did that because he wants to avoid shame that happens because in fact he has exploited his wife. He also want to avoid other women's anger. He is aware that he has written an essay that hurts other women's feelings. His reply is just a piece of writing to make the readers believe he is not acting like that.

Berry seems that he is exploiting his wife according to his essay, "Against PCs." He tells the reader that he is very satisfied with his wife. He compared the more advantages of using his wife rather than using a computer. She can do the job better than what a computer can do. Computers cost more money; however, he does not need to spend more money by using his wife. He also mentions that he does not wish to fool himself by owning a computer, and with any reasons, he still will not buy one. It seems that he really treats his wife as a slave.

Many letters provoked by his essay prove that the readers believe Berry uses his wife for purpose. His defensive reply is just to deflect the readers' comments: the comments that give him a bad mark. Although his wife is his closest friend, Berry should not write as if his wife is his slave in this essay.
In this modern world, where technology is moving so fast, having some ability to work with computers is of great significance. Every one of us should try how to use a computer which is very effective. Now in Wendell Berry's case, the writer who does'nt agree on taking help from computers and seems, as if he is trying to tell people to say no to computers, which would be of least importance to most of us. Wendell Berry's comparing his wife to a computer may be correct in his own mind, but but would'nt look appropriate to a majority of people.

Taking help and working with your wife is not a bad idea, as she understands your needs, worries more completly and may also appreciate your ideas. She cannot be compared with a secretary who only takes the work as a job. Although a secretary can do all the required work as assigned to her, but after reading Berry's opinion it looks as if getting the work done by your own wife is more astonishing and shows how much confidence he had in his wife. Referring to his essay in which he says that "technological innovation always requires discarding the older one with a new modle" showed how sensitive he was for his wife, and did'nt wanted to work without her involvement.

Another important perspective about working with computers is the quality, cleanliness and efficiency which is more striking than a typewriter. In his letter to Berry about what he thought of his views, Toby Koosman, the reader implicated his views in the most correct sense. He made it clear "that to a writer a computer is required only for typing and editing words, not for generating new ideas and thoughts". In this way what he meant was that computers were only a source for putting the finished or completed information into a whole set of papers, and not getting the required matter from it. His words didn't seem to hurt his wife at all. As compared to the other reader Gordon Inkeles, who really criticised Berry's wife in the greatest sense by using words like "a low tech energy saving device", which really showed his disapproval for berry's essay.

Going against PCs today would rather look oldfashioned. Apart from Berry's views which show adverse feelings for using computers, Computers these days are popular among kids too who love playing games comprising of beautifully coloured graphics. Saying no to computers would be like ignoring modern technology and going into the past. Today we just can't deny the facts that in every other house there is a PC from which elders and youngsters all get the required help. We cannot think of a single government institution, office or bank which would be working without any computer aided machinery of PCs. It is very amazing the way Wendell Berry comments his views against computers. Wendell Berry should try to be considerate and should'nt try to take people in the olden days. The ability to think about computers as device which helps us in making advancements and innovations is not clear to Wendell Berry to a great extent.
Wendell Berry really looked defensive in his reply. As far as the two letters are concerned both the readers clearly disapproved Berry's opinions. In fact Wendell Berry didn't like the way his wife was criticised. In the letter from Gordon Inkeles the reader used words like "she is cheap, repairable, near home, good for the family", which I presume are quite annoying for a man to hear for his wife. By calling them "audacious" he meant that he was hurt. In Berry's reply he finally agreed and pointed out that "I have lost against my readers" he had properly understood his views were being looked at.

Getting your work done by either using a typewriter or by getting some help from your wife, is not a disgrace, but, in today's world having some acquaintance with computers, and to rely on them would be more significant. Computers should mean a lot to us as ignoring them like Wendell Berry and getting your work done on a typewriter would rather make us oldfashioned. Regarding the views of the two readers I would say that they showed their least admiration for Berry's ideas, and his precious views were of no importance to them.
ESSAY TWO

Sung-Ho

Everyone has different thoughts about the most important and fearful things, because it has something to do with the times and the way of living. The major differences between Sylvia Plath and I are the times and the way of living. She was 17 years old in 1950's but I was 17 years old in 1980's. In addition, according to her diary, her way of living is diametrically opposed to mine. She does not want to change her own situation but I always look at the bright side of life. For these reasons, she and I have dissimilar opinions at 17 years old.

What are the most important and fearful things at 17 years old for Sylvia Plath? She seems to love freedom, because she wants to be home by herself in order to draw a lot of pictures and think about a sense of values. She loves the age of 17 years old. At that time, she "long for a cause to devote her energies" what she wants to do. It is the most fearful thing for her to be getting older. If she will get older, she seems too afraid of losing freedom. She does not want to get married, because she does not like to spend time cooking three meals a day and "in the relentless cage of routine and rote". She want to be freedom; on the other hand, she is much in fear of changing her way of living.

What are the most important and fearful things at 17 years old for me? When I was 17 years old, I was attending high school. I hope to enter a good college: therefore, my daily life was focused on preparing for the entrance exam for college. another important thing for me to maintain relationships with my friends. Although we were preparing to get busy for the exam, we tried to keep up relationships. We used to play basketball every Saturday so that we could improve our relationship each other. There were two fearful things for me. One thing was losing confidence in myself. I tried to practice exercise and enjoy the outdoor sports more than to stay at home in order not to lose confidence. Another thing was worrying about the uncertain future. I did not know exactly what I really wanted to become and what I should prepare for the future. After all, I thought that is the best way to overcome worries was to cultivate my mind. Unlike Sylvia Plath. I tried to mix with others and gain confidence in myself.

People have different opinions about the most important and fearful things due to the way of living and the times. Although Sylvia Plath and I are same age at 17 years old, she and I have dissimilar thoughts about most the important and fearful things owing to the way of living. She has egotism, but I have optimistic personality. When I compare the times between her 17 years old in 1950's and my 17 years old in 1980's I found big differences of the times between she and I. Thus, she and I have not the same opinion about the sense of value. In fact, everyone has a different way of life, because it is impossible for people to have same experiences.
Yucuanto

Seventeen years old is the most important moment for most people. But, not everybody experiences a great moment at that time. Some unlucky people had bad experiences at that time. This happened with Sylvia Plath, a writer who died by suicide in England in 1963. In her earliest diary entries, "Reflections of a Seventeen Year Old," Sylvia expressed that she got a different experience from what she expected. She got confused in looking for her identity. She had unhappy feelings, and she also experienced bad feelings. She was such an unfortunate girl at that time. Fortunately, these bad moments did not happen to me when I was seventeen years old. It was a great year, and my feeling was happy. Compared with Sylvia, my seventeen-year-old moment was better than that of Sylvia.

Sylvia and I had contrasting perceptions about our identities when we were seventeen years old. Sylvia was still looking for her identity. In her diary, she wrote that she still did not know herself and perhaps she never would. She was still confused about her identity, about who actually she was. In contrast to Sylvia, I had already found my identity. I knew who I was. I was a young boy who was growing up to be a man, a decent man. I was also intelligent. Once, I was elected to be the leader of the class. Everybody looked up to me, not only my friends but also my teachers. I was very proud of myself.

The other thing that differs between me and Sylvia was about our feelings. Sylvia felt sad. She was unhappy. In her diary, she told us that she was happy at the present moment. She wanted to be what she wanted to be. Then, she was afraid; she was afraid of getting older and getting married. She also cried about her destiny. In contrast, when I was that age, I was feeling happy. Honestly, I felt a little bit scared at the beginning. I had that feeling because it was a transition from being a child to being a man. But I could overcome my anxiety. I spent my seventeenth year with a great feeling. The feeling would not be forgotten as long as I live, and of course it was better than Sylvia's.

Then, we also imagined different things. Sylvia wrote that sometimes she tried to put herself in another's place and how awful to be anyone but her. She often imagined herself being successful but she never had it. On the other hand, I did not have the same fantasies as Sylvia's. I imagined how proud of being myself, but I did not feel that it was awful to be somebody else. The other thing I imagined was that I would be a successful person. My imaginations were great and different from Sylvia's.

Overall, my teenage moment was a lot more impressive than Sylvia's. My perceptions, my feelings, and my imaginations were positive. In contrast, Sylvia experienced a hard time. She had negative perceptions, her feelings were terrible; and she had poor imaginations. Although the seventeen-year-old period is the most important, not all people have a nice experience.
There are many stages in an individual's lifetime through which one has to pass, consisting of happiness, sorrow, goodluck or misery. In her diary, Sylvia Plath gives a very unique and artistic view of life. She took life in a light manner. While Dona Carolina, mentions her miseries and hardships. These problems also caused her mental distress. Regarding the lives of both ladies, Sylvia Plath, as compared to Dona Carolina, had a splendid and enjoyable life. Both of them had different living backgrounds. Sylvia Plath was quite well off economically as compared to Dona Carolina. She had a room of her own, which she really admired. Sylvia disliked getting older, and preferred a carefree life without any responsibilities. Appreciated Nature to a great extent. Sylvia was living in a dreamland of her own, giving opinions about life. As she puts it "I'm afraid of getting married." displays her denial on facing reality. Sylvia Plath had a certain amount of self esteem in her, gives an idea of how pleased she was with her identity. Since problems being the main source of their diaries, Sylvia was less fedup of life then Dona Carolina, who was in a miserable state. Food being her main problem, had to work all through the day picking paper from different streets. Since her children were too small to work. the entire burden of earnings was on Carolina. Regarding the problem of food she says, "How horrible it is to see a child eat and ask is there more." Actually shows how depressed she was. Her attitude towards working people was very kind. Calling herself a "favelado" while living in a slums called "favela" longed for a happy and hunger free life. Sylvia's problems were less and could be changed, but Carolina supporting a family too, had numerous worries. Dissatisfaction was a common problem among them. Sylvia, looked considerably confused about her identity as mentioned in the diary. "How awful to be anyone but i" defines the perplexing problems concerning her identity. She expressed her unsatisfaction in the writings. that indicate her uncertainty about accomplishments. But finally, agrees to the reality in life as she says "I long for a cause to devote my energies." Shows interest in a field of her liking. But these were just her wishes, not negative views on her life. Her problems were not so bad as Dona Carolina's. Being displeased with the system, especially politicians, whom she considered as unjust and unsympathetic. Moreover, her recommendations for the government were to make them understand the point, hunger. She was of the opinion that only those who have gone through hardships know what they have been through, rest just laugh. Regarding the increasing problems, she sometimes looked sick of her life. The only way to overcome these depressions was switching the mind to thoughts of living in fantasy. Never getting discouraged was her only resistance and hope for a life without worries. Although discouragement was shared by both of them, but Dona looked more affected from it.
Faced by different living standards, which varied accordingly to the surroundings they lived in. As compared to Dona Carolina, Sylvia Plath looked idol with no work, making judgements on useless issues. In contrast Dona Carolina had a hectic schedule of untiring labor and knew how to survive in the actual world. Apart from the few illogical views Sylvia Plath had about life, she was still free from worldly worries and pains.
ESSAY THREE

Sung-Ho

This story tells us about typical middle aged and married women in most of our society. Like this main character Susan, many young couple fall in love while they have their own career. When they get married and have a child, women usually sacrifice their career over family. Many intelligent women follow this step and they believe it is the right choice. This story made me rethink about this choice. She started feel alone because she does not know what she wants or how to enjoy her life.

Susan, the main character started to feel alone, because she did not know what she wanted anymore. When her kids started to go to school, she had a lot of free time. However, she did not know what to do with her free time. She kept herself busy working for no reason. She kept doing the housework, because that is what she used to do. Throughout this event, she started to realize that she feels lonely. After all, she did not know how to make herself useful except for doing housework. At this time, she gave up her job. Subconsciously she regrets leaving work, but she does not know this consciously. The choice she had made over her career was bringing her loneliness and emptiness. In addition, Matthew hired a detective agent to follow Susan. Susan could not enjoy this pleasure ever since she got exposed by her husband. At the same time, she found out Matthew was having an affair with woman. For this reason, she feels alone, because she confused what she really wants.

Another reason Susan feels alone is that she did not how to enjoy her life. She believed that staying away from her family and having her own time was going to make her feel better, so she decided to have her own space which was a Mother's room. Her children was not allow to go in there and she stayed alone. this made her more lonely. She has been doing only set in the chair. She was not enjoying her life. Later, she was going to Hotel room 19 when she wanted to stay away from the house. But she thought she would enjoy this. this only made the situation worst. Instead of figuring out how to enjoy her life, she more lonely. Both Mother's room and Room 19 made her lonely. I believed Susan's way of enjoying her life was to stay away from her family. In my point of view, Susan's way of enjoying life caused her to be alone all the time.

I think that she stayed alone, because she did not know what she wants and how to enjoy her life. She had to face crisis of her life. In the middle her marriage, she began to think about her choice over career and family. Her loneliness has caused by her husband's affair and kid's growing up. She did not know how to enjoy life after her marriage. She thought being alone in Room 19 and Mother's room was going to solve the problem. However, it only make
worst and she got more lonely. After all, she decide to kill herself. If she found out how to enjoy and what she wants, this should not have happened.

Yucuanto

The story "To Room Nineteen" is about "a failure in intelligence." At the beginning, Matthew and Susan were the happiest couple in the world. They were smart; they planned everything. They also had a happy marriage, four nice children, a big house, and a large white garden. They could maintain their marriage because they believed to each other. However, after Matthew told Susan that he cheated with other woman, the great situation they had before was no longer maintained. Since that moment, Susan, the main character in the story, changed drastically; and it caused my reactions to her changed also.

At the beginning, Susan looked like that she could handle her uncomfortable feeling, so that I believed she could. She did not showed her disappointment to Matthew but her feeling to Matthew was not the same as before. She was irritated. I could feel how upset she was. She also felt as if she was not a good wife. It was why. then, she asked her husband whether there was something wrong with her or not, and his husband told her that there was nothing wrong with her. It seemed to me that she was trying to make a correction of herself by asking her husband. She was smart; she used her thinking instead of showing her angriness. She should be able to solve her problem by her intelligence.

Next, Susan was doing something to be alone, so I thought she was more intelligent this time. First, she got her own room, Mother’s room. But she still felt bad. Then, she rented a hotel room to get a peace. But she still did not find it there. Another thing she did was to tell her husband that she needed a holiday. He agreed and she had a holiday in a remorse place in Wales. But, she did not stop her effort until this time. She was still trying. Then, she went to Fred’s hotel on the regular bases. She found something she was looking for, a peace. But this feeling was no longer lasting until she knew that her husband hired a detective to spy her activities. So, she did not feel alone again. Although she already tried her best to be alone, she still could not feel it.

Finally, toward the end of the story, Susan did several things that surprised me. First, she lied to her husband by making up a story that she was having an affair with a publisher after Matthew told her that he had an affair with somebody she knew. This was really a big change for a smart person like Susan. A smart person seldom do this, so her action surprised me. Then, she was thinking of committing suicide because she could no longer resist her suffering. She was really loosing her intelligence. Finally, she killed herself by breathing gas from the gas fireplace in Fred’s hotel. It was a very tragic action done by an intelligent person like Susan. I really did not suppose that Susan did that.
This story shows that a perfect, smart person could make a mistake, and even a big mistake. Although I thought she could handle her bad feeling at the beginning, she finally gave up. Smart Susan did a very surprising action: she committed suicide. Why she did not use her intelligence and think more to solve her problem instead of doing something stupid.

Kamran

People do suffer from mental disorders and ailments, but in the case of Susan Rawlings, it was more self-created and seemed as if she was making mountains out of molehills. Feeling embarrassed on telling truth to her husband made the situation get more worse. She had craving for being alone and wanted most of the time for herself. In my opinion, whatever attitudes Susan had towards her life and family all represented abnormal thoughts.

Susan had a happy life in the beginning and loved her family and husband dearly. Matthew's going out with a girl did make her feel bad, but paid less attention to it. On such an act by Matthew she should have revolted and take some steps, so that he couldn't repeat these kind of shameful acts in future. By her displeasure Matthew would have taken her seriously and could have shown more interest for her. Susan didn't even feel his unfaithfulness regarding love for her. Matthew must be enjoying these lenient steps taken by Susan for he was free to enjoy his life outside his house and going out with different young girls. These ideas clearly prove Susan's lack of understanding serious circumstances.

Other evidence for Susan's abnormal thoughts can be identified by the fact that ideas for overcoming her terrifying thoughts were simply senseless. First of all, choosing an isolated hotel room to ease one's nervous problems couldn't be considered as an intelligent move, for it further worsened her condition. Thinking of your own house as haunted or considering it a demon's resting place shows lack of sensibility. She was so worried about her problem that on one occasion she cried to God, as she puts it "Dear God, keep it away from me." she mentions her tyranny and how depressed she had been all the time. Looked as if she had already considered herself dead during her lifetime. These were nothing but her own foolish mistakes for which she suffered to a great extent.

As far as the family was concerned, Susan had been selfish towards them. She did not realize how hard could it have been for small children to live without a mother. How much they are going to miss her and wont find her love in anyone else. Susan was just concerned about herself thinking all the time of opportunities for a time off at Fred's hotel. Sitting in a lonely room thought as if all worries had gone but were still there for as soon as she left the hotel felt the same situation. During her time in the hotel she just wasted her time thinking of it as relaxation. It shows as if her love for the children had just disappeared, for
what appeared in the beginning as such a caring mother would turn out to be so devoted towards her own self is unbelievable.

It is true Susan did suffer from mental disorders, and choosing death was not a normal remedy for the cause. Instead should have shared her depression with Matthew or applied his advice for an outcome. By living in her own depressing world she had already lost hope for a return to norm. I would say that due to Susan’s lacking of sufficient mental power, made her life miserable and caused her family to suffer with it.
APPENDIX K

DATA FROM THE SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay 1</th>
<th>Essay 2</th>
<th>Essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Std W</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>WT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Complete data from syntactic analysis for the three essays. W stands for total number of words; T stands for total number of T-units; WT stands for number of words per T-unit; EF stands for total number of error-free T-units; and Std stands for student.
APPENDIX L

CONTENT ORGANIZATION

265
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Essay 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Essay 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Complete results of content analysis for the three essays
APPENDIX M

RHETORICAL CONVENTIONS
Figure 20: Complete results of the analysis of rhetorical conventions for the three essays. 

# stands for number of paragraphs, TH stands for thesis statement, TO stands for topic sentence, P stands for placement, C stands for conclusion, X means existence, L means last one, L-1 means next-to-last one, and NA non-applicable.
Figure 20 (continued)

5 4 3 1 1 NA X 5 2 1 1 1 X 4 3 1 1 1 NA X
X 0 0 L X L L 0 X 0 0

6 5 2 L-1 1 1 X 4 2 1 1 1 NA X 4 3 1 1 1 NA X
X 0 0 0 L X L 0 X L 0

7 5 2 1 1 1 X 4 3 1 1 1 NA X 7 3 3 3/1 1/1 0
X 0 L 0 X L L L-1 L L/0 0/X

8 5 2 1 1 1 X 5 2 1 1 1 X 5 3 1 1 1 X
X L L L X L L L X 0 L L

9 5 3 1 1 1 0 4 2 1 1 1 NA X 4 1 1 1 NA 0
X 0 0 L X 0 0 L X 0 L 0

10 4 2 1 1 NA 0 4 1 1 1 NA X 4 2 1 1 1 NA X
X 0 0 0 X L 0 X L 0

11 6 2 1 1 1/1 0 4 1 1 1 NA X 4 3 0 1 NA 0
X 0 0 L/0 X L L X L 0

12 5 2 0 1 1 X 5 2 1 1 1 X 5 3 1 1 1 X
X L L L X L L L X 0 0 L
APPENDIX N

DATA FROM LEVEL OF ABSTRACTNESS ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Essay 1</th>
<th>Essay 2</th>
<th>Essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
<td>focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>thesis</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>unfocused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21. Complete data from the analysis by level of abstractness across the essays.