A STUDY OF THE WRITING PROCESSES OF ESL WRITERS AND THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION ON THOSE PROCESSES

By

PAULA S. ROBERTSON

Bachelor of Science

In Education

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico

1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
July, 1991

A STUDY OF THE WRITING PROCESSES
OF ESL WRITERS AND THE EFFECTS
OF INSTRUCTION ON
THOSE PROCESSES

Thesis Approved:

Carol Lynn Mader
Thesis Adviser

Guy Bailey

Richard P. Battiger

Norma N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express heartfelt thanks to Dr. Carol Moder for her continuing advice, encouragement and patience over the past two-and-a-half years, as well as for the inspiration she has provided. I am also grateful to Dr. Batteiger and Dr. Bailey for their well-timed words of encouragement and for their suggestions regarding the development and completion of this thesis.

To my fellow ESL composition teaching assistants and to Mary Ann Ward of the OSU English Language Institute I express thanks for allowing me to use their classes for questionnaire administrations - not once, but twice. Special thanks go to Becky North, who was always ready to do anything to help, from acting as a sounding board for my ideas to running an errand. I must also thank the ESL instructors at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock for their valuable input and encouragement as I was developing the ELI version of the questionnaire. To Jackie Johnson, who allowed me to use her computer for revisions, many thanks, as I could not have finished it without you.

I am particularly in debt to my parents, Bob and Pat Robertson, for their ongoing belief in me, and for the respect for education they instilled in me as a child. To Rose Rodman, my resident mom, for her many prayers and

long talks, thank you. To my closest friends who stood by me every day, and often reminded me what reason I had to go on, to Gladie, Joelle and Whitney, my deepest gratitude. Most of all I wish to express my thanks to God; he is really the only reason I have made it this far.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the finished product has been the focus of the English composition class, with the teacher seeing and responding only to the final draft of the essay (Taylor, 1981; Zamel, 1982). Students were often given a "procedure" for writing; they followed a certain sequence - write an outline, write an essay which strictly conforms to the outline, revise only grammar or language usage errors. Composition was seen as a completely linear process, an orderly progression of steps. As Zamel (1982) suggests, "the whole notion of how writers write - where ideas come from, how they are formulated and developed, what the various stages of composing entail - was ignored" (p. 195). Composing is now more frequently viewed as a process of discovery and invention - building, backtracking, side-stepping, leaping, rather than adhering to a predetermined path.

The basic assumption teachers and researchers are now working from that is we cannot hope to teach our students how to write without understanding the process that takes a writer from the formation of an idea to its successful, effective communication on the page (Zamel, 1982). For ESL composition teachers, the important questions are quite

similar to those of L1 composition teachers. We need to know more about what our students do as they write, and what composing strategies are employed by good vs. poor writers. Furthermore, it is important to understand what kinds of instruction produce significant changes toward the production of clear, effective, successful compositions.

A major catalyst for this study was the need for an effective assessment tool which would provide the classroom teacher with a means of understanding how his or her students were approaching the writing process, and what strategies they were using. Such an instrument would make it possible to tailor instruction to a particular class or individual. Considering the time constraints faced by a composition teacher, a self-reporting questionnaire was selected as the most practical approach for classroom use, and two versions were developed.

The questionnaire was used to investigate the characteristics of writers at two different levels of ESL and composition study. Existing research (discussed in Chapter Two) has indicated more experienced and less experienced ESL writers exhibit different behaviors during the writing process. As research on the composing processes of ESL writers to date has involved an average of ten subjects, this study seeks to add to the body of information on ESL writing processes by reporting data from a larger number of subjects through the use of a self-reporting questionnaire. To obtain comparative data, the

questionnaire was administered to a group of students enrolled in academic courses at the university level (university group), and to a group enrolled in intensive English language study (ELI group). These groups were selected because most of the previous research on ELI writing processes involves writers at this level, and the researcher wanted to add to the established base of information. It was posited the university group would possess higher language proficiency and more L2 composition experience, and would therefore exhibit facility with a greater number and variety of strategies used in developing and revising an essay.

In order to better understand what kinds of instruction affect composing processes, this study also addresses the effects of two different kinds of composition instruction (process vs. structural focuses) on these writers. To do so, it was necessary to administer the questionnaire twice, once near the beginning of the semester to find out which composing processes students were using, and once near the end of the semester to determine what changes occurred. While courses at both levels are described as "process courses," the ELI course focused upon structure and vocabulary, with little emphasis on invention or revision strategies. The university course, however, emphasized the concept that writing is an ongoing, recursive process, and presented a variety of strategies for invention, development, organization, revision and "blocked" writing.

Emphasis was also placed on shifting structural focus to the role of "clean-up" editing, where focus on grammar is postponed until the piece of writing is nearing completion. These instructional differences should be reflected in the changes reported between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire.

Two versions of the questionnaire, appropriate to each level, were administered near the beginning and end of the Fall 1990 semester to sixty-eight students enrolled in International Freshman Composition I at OSU, and to thirteen students enrolled in an advanced-level composition course at the OSU English Language Institute (ELI). The questionnaire included statements about writing activities in various stages of the writing process: prewriting, writing of the first draft, revision and "blocked" writing, which refers to what writers do when they get stuck. This arrangement is an attempt to simplify the presentation of the questionnaire; it is not meant to imply the writing process can be neatly divided into non-overlapping categories.

The following chapter demonstrates the complexity of the writing process, presenting previous research on native speaking (NS) and non-native speaking (NNS), more experienced and less experienced writers. Also included is a discussion of methods and approaches to instruction which are developing in response to what is being discovered about how writers write.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Writing Processes of NS and NNS Writers

Historically, a focus on the end product has characterized research in writing, as well as the principles which have guided the teaching of writing. More recently, however, this focus has shifted from what students write to what they do when they write (Zamel, 1982). A number of studies have attempted to address questions regarding what strategies writers employ to effectively (or not so effectively) communicate their ideas on paper. This chapter reviews research on the writing processes of both native English-speaking writers (NS) and non-native English-speaking writers (NNS), focusing particularly on NNS writers. According to Flower and Hayes (1977), however, the body of knowlege resulting from this research has yet to be effectively translated to classroom teaching on a widespread basis. Therefore, types of composition instruction and their effect on writing processes are addressed as well.

Research on NS Writers

As the subjects for this study, as well as the subjects for most NNS writing process research, include writers at the university level (or those engaged in English language study with a view to university study), research of a like

nature was selected for the discussion on NS writers. The first was conducted by Pianko (1979) to examine the composing processes of college freshman writers. Subjects included twenty-four students randomly selected from four hundred students enrolled in a community college freshman composition course in New Jersey. Of the seventeen who completed the study, eight were females and nine were males; seven were typical college age and ten were adults. Ten were categorized as remedial writers, while seven were traditional writers. No further information was given with regard to how the students were placed in the categories for age and writing skill.

Five writing episodes were scheduled, and each was designed to elicit descriptive, narrative, expositive and argumentative essays, with an alternative option given to write about anything they wanted. Each session was observed and videotaped, and all writing material was collected. An interview immediately followed each session, during which writers were questioned as to their behaviors. Furthermore, a separate interview was used to establish each writer's general attitude and feelings toward writing, perception of personal writing behaviors and past composing experiences.

Based on observations and interviews, a set of composing behaviors was established and used to analyze the data, including the amount of time spent on each behavior and how many times each occured. These behaviors included pre-writing, planning, composing, writing, pausing, re-

scanning, re-reading, stopping, contemplating the finished product and handing in of the product. Other variables examined included revising, attitude, concerns about grammar and word usage, etc.

Findings for the group as a whole indicated they spent little time pre-writing (mean = 1.26 minutes), and fourteen out of seventeen planned mentally, rather than on paper. Most wrote only one draft, and for those who did, no major reformulations were noted. The mean composing time was 38.85 minutes, which Pianko considered to be a lack of commitment a lack of commitment to the writing tasks, given the fact writers had all afternoon in which to compose. Differences between age and sex were not found to be remarkable, but the analysis of "traditional" vs. "remedial" writers revealed some interesting differences. The traditional writers spent more time pre-writing, and paused and re-scanned more frequently. Pianko considered this to be important because of how the traditional writers were using these strategies: they were "pausing to plan what to write next, re-scanning to see if their plans fit, and then pausing again to reformulate" (1979, p. 14). Remedial writers were, on the other hand, looking around the room or staring blankly, and did not re-scan much at all. Combined with the interview data on attitudes, feelings and concerns, these findings indicate the traditional group had a higher level of development with regard to their concept of the writing process (Pianko, 1979). A similar study by Perl

addresses the composing processes of "unskilled" college writers.

Another classical study on the composing processes of NS writers is Perl's (1979) examination of the composing processes of unskilled college writers. Subjects included five students selected according to two criteria: "writing samples that qualified them as "unskilled" writers and willingness to participate" (Perl, 1979, p. 318); no information was provided with regard to criteria used to determine skill. A researcher was present at each of four sessions, during which writers were asked to speak their thoughts aloud as they composed. Topics were derived from an introductory social science course; subjects were asked to approach the material in either an objective or subjective manner. During a fifth session, the researcher conducted an interview to obtain information on the subjects' perceptions and memories of writing.

A coding tool was devised for this study which charted composing behaviors against a time continuum on the draft, systematically revealing which behaviors were used, for how long and how often. The system went beyond basic categories to distinguish between such things as local vs. global planning, reading a sentence or a few words vs. reading a number of sentences together and editing by adding vs. editing by deleting.

Analysis of the data indicated these "unskilled" writers spent an average of four minutes pre-writing, and

involved such activities as rephrasing the topic until an idea prompted a connection with their personal experience, dividing a larger concept into two smaller parts and making associations to a word in the topic. More often, however, the students began writing without a sense of direction. They developed their ideas as they wrote. The actual writing was marked by a back and forth movement: they wrote, thought about what they wanted to say, checked to see if they were communicating their ideas and then moved forward again. Pianko indicated that less experienced writers, such as the ones in this study, do not exhibit this recursive behavior. It may be that the comprehensive, exhaustive nature of the tool used by Perl revealed activity not readily seen in Pianko's study. In any case, Perl states that since their written products were "inadequate or flawed" (p. 330), these strategies were probably not being effectively carried out. Her analysis of editing behaviors indicated these students edited as they wrote, and demonstrated concern with lexical items, syntax and discourse as a whole. Comparison of coded behaviors with the written products showed the students were confused about structural and register rules, were often unable to see that their mental ideas did not translate to the page, and often took it for granted their readers would understand their ideas.

These findings indicate that "beginning" or "unskilled" writers do bring a set of strategies, often deeply embedded,

to the classroom. Teachers would do well to use these strategies as a springboard, and help the students to improve what is already there and working to some degree, while moving the writers away from non-productive strategies. The next study on NS writers focuses on student and experienced adult writers with respect to revision strategies.

Sommers' (1980) study compared the revision of twenty freshman enrolled in their first semester of composition with twenty experienced adult writers (journalists, editors and academics). Each writer wrote an expressive, explanatory and persuasive essay, and revised each essay twice, resulting in a total of nine drafts. Drafts were coded for deletion, substitution, addition and re-ordering at four levels: word, phrase, sentence or the "extended statement of one idea" (Sommers, 1980, p. 380). Analyses for the student writers revealed they predominantly viewed revision as a "rewording activity" (p. 381). Their drafts showed they made very few conceptual changes. According to Sommers, they saw writing as translating. They merely wrote their thoughts on the page, and saw them as being complete and fully developed. As a result, only surface revisions were needed. In marked contrast to the student writers, the professional writers viewed revision as necessary to find the "form or shape of their argument" (p. 384). The experienced writers also demonstrated an understanding of their readers, and they reviewed their work from the

reader's perspective. This gave them a fresh perspective on their work, which often makes revision easier. Sommers states that the basic difference between the two groups is in their approach to communicating meaning: "Student writers constantly struggle to bring their essays into congruence with a predefined meaning. The experienced writers do the opposite: they seek to discover (or create) meaning in the engagement with their writing, in revision" (p. 386, 387).

These studies serve to demonstrate the writing processes which have been shown to characterize NS writers. Research on NNS writers shows that, basically, the two groups exhibit similar strategies for the composing process. However, when generalizing findings for NS writers, it is important to remember that NNS writers bring a whole set of extra problems and advantages to writing, such as language proficiency and L1 writing experience.

Research on NNS Writers

Raimes' (1985) study of the composing processes of "unskilled" ESL writers enrolled in "developmental" ESL writing courses utilized think-aloud protocols, in which students were asked to verbalize their thoughts as they wrote. Analysis of the protocol audiotapes revealed they spent less than 3 minutes on prewriting activities (except for one less proficient student who did not understand the assignment); engaged in little planning, such as making lists, outlines, or other formatting strategies; and

frequently re-read phrases or sentences just written. Rehearsing, or "voicing ideas on content and trying out possible ideas," was the most commonly occuring activity (Raimes, 1985, p. 243). Two possible purposes for rehearsing were suggested: to search for grammatically correct forms and to "[talk] out ideas, [try] things out, and [test] on an audience words and phrases that were never put on paper" (Raimes, 1985, p. 243). As far as writing is concerned, the more proficient students were able to move from sentence to sentence with little trouble, while the less proficient students often moved immediately from one sentence to another only to discover they did not have anything to say. Revision, on a large scale, was virtually nonexistent; only the most advanced student began a second draft, which was not very different from the first. Editing focused on surface revisions and generally took place during sentence writing, rather than after the essay was written.

A follow-up study by Raimes (1987) included eight ESL writers, four enrolled in an ESL composition course (classified as remedial) and four enrolled in the required Freshman Composition course or the Introduction to Literature course, all at Hunter College, City University of New York. Measures of assessment included the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (grammary, vocabulary and reading sections), a taped "think-aloud" protocol, and ranking of drafts. Results indicated that the remedial students did less "planning, rehearsing, rescanning,

revising and editing" than the non-remedial students (Raimes, 1987, p. 459); these results reflect previous findings. Scores on the Michigan, which tests English language proficiency based on norms of entering college students, did not indicate much correspondence with ranking of drafts, which shows that other factors, such as instruction in or exposure to writing, are more significant than proficiency as gauged by a multiple-choice test. Raimes (1987) suggests that length and type of experience with English, along with experience and instruction in writing (both in L1 and L2), play a greater role than proficiency as reflected on a multiple-choice test such as the Mighigan.

Zamel's findings, in her case study of six advanced ESL writers (1983), supported the idea that writing is non-linear. She observed the subjects as they wrote, recording their writing behaviors. Post-composition interviews were conducted to obtain information on the writer's feelings and attitudes about writing, and about why they did what they did. According to Zamel, a major finding of her study "was the extent to which ESL advanced writers understood that composing involves the constant interplay of thinking, writing, and rewriting" (1983, p. 172). All of her subjects devoted a large amount of time to thinking about the essay before they began actually writing it. This would seem to differ significantly from Raimes' "unskilled" writers. They also repeatedly re-read what they had just

written; the significant difference here seems to be that the most advanced writers would go beyond just a few sentences, and explore paragraphs or ideas. Early revision was focused on achieving meaning rather than on surface errors, which tended to occur later in the writing process; this was not true for the least skilled writer, as she focused excessively on surface errors (as did Raimes' unskilled writers). Zamel's writers also wrote numerous drafts, but they were given as much time as they needed, whereas Raimes' were given limited time.

In comparing skilled with unskilled writers, two major differences were apparent. First, planning strategies were virtually absent at the unskilled level and rather extensive at the skilled level. Second, revision and editing differences were significant in that unskilled writers tended to be overly distracted by immediate surface problems, while the advanced writers postponed attention to surface errors in favor of more global content/organization oriented changes.

A somewhat fresh approach was used by Cumming (1989) to explore the writing processes of ESL writers: writing expertise was rated based on L1 writing experience as reported by the participants. Subjects included twenty-three French-speaking students who were judged to be at three levels of L1 writing expertise and two levels of English proficiency. Three writing tasks were assessed: students were asked to 1) write an informal letter

describing their English class, 2) write an expository argument in which they took one side of an argument responding to a statement about the place of women and 3) write a summary of a booklet on popular science. Think-aloud protocols were taped for each session, and analyses were carried out using the written products and taped protocols.

Three aspects of writing performance were assessed, including text quality, attention devoted to aspects of writing during decision making and problem-solving behaviors used to control writing processes. Ratings for quality were done by two raters (.72 reliability) using "a slightly modified version of Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel and Hughey's (1981) ESL Composition Profile" (p. 92). Attention to aspects of writing during decision making was coded by the researcher using five categories to reflect different facets of composing (language use, discourse organization, gist, intentions and procedures for writing). For analysis of problem-solving behaviors, the researcher coded writer response using six heuristic search strategies: engaging in a search routine, directed translation or code-switching, generating and assessing alternatives, assessing in relation to a criterion, standard, explanation or rule, relating parts to the whole and setting or adhering to a goal.

The most interesting findings involved attention to aspects of writing during decision making, which indicated

that high ESL proficiency or greater L1 writing expertise yielded higher scores for discourse organization and content while writing in L2 when compared to lower levels of L1 writing expertise or ESL proficiency. This gives credence to the idea that ESL proficiency is not the only factor involved in higher order writing skills such as discourse organization and content; the implication here is that instruction should attempt to maximize the skills the writer brings with her to the classroom, whether it be L1 writing expertise, ESL proficiency or extensive exposure to English (as suggested by Raimes, 1987). Another interesting finding was that the least experienced L1 writers, regardless of ESL proficiency, were unable to address more than one aspect of writing at a time, and essentially wrote whatever came to mind, "without reflections or modifications (Cumming, 1989, p. 113). On the other hand, expert writers addressed multiple aspects at one time and planned carefully, with a sense of direction. Cumming (1989), in response to the findings, proposes three characteristics of writing expertise in L2 performance: "extensive use of heuristic search strategies for evaluating and resolving problems, attention to complex aspects of writing while making decisions and the production of effective content and discourse in compositions" (pp. 118, 119).

Implications for Teaching

Research on the writing processes of NS and NNS writers shows that many characteristics are shared by both, which

means that the body of research on NS writers can be applied to NNS writers. Researchers and teachers should keep in mind, however, that NNS writers have special needs and problems based on the challenges of communicating in a second language. In addition to similarities in the writing processes of NS and NNS writers, the findings for experienced and inexperienced writers suggest that the writing process is very rich and varied at both levels, although inexperienced writers tend to be limited in their use of strategies. It has also been suggested that inexperienced writers possess an underdeveloped sense of what writing is all about (Raimes, 1987; Zamel, 1983; Sommers, 1980).

This "sense of what writing is all about" seems to be the point of departure for process writing. Widdowson straightforwardly states that, "writing is a communicative activity" (1983, p. 34). Traditional instruction has tended to present writing as an excercise in demonstrating knowlege of certain rules rather than with communicating ideas. Raimes (1983) suggests we have had it backwards, stressing construction of the perfect draft, thereby hindering our students from communicating on a higher level. As Shaughnessy puts it, "Instruction in writing must begin with the more fundamental processes whereby writers get their thoughts in the first place" (1977, p. 245). ESL writers need to learn how to tap into ideas they already possess,

how to develop those ideas and how to express them in a manner which will enable their readers to understand them.

There are many suggestions for how to teach them these things. Suggestions include teaching problem-solving strategies (Flower & Hayes, 1977), maximizing feedback by teachers, peers and writers themselves (Goldstein and Conrad, 1990; Zamel, 1985; Key, 1990; Hyland, 1990), using journals (Blanton, 1987; Spack and Sadow, 1983) and teaching them how to critically revise their own work (Taylor, 1981; Wallace and Hayes, 1991; Raimes, 1985, 1987; Key, 1990). The most pervasive perception throughout the literature is that composition teachers should help writers to break down aspects of the writing process into manageable chunks. For example, a particular lesson might require the class to predict how an essay might be developed, based on a thesis statement. Raimes (1987) suggests course design "should include instruction and practice with strategies: how to deal with the text of the question and with their own emerging text, how to generate ideas on a topic, how to rehearse ideas, and how to consider the options prior to devising a plan for organizing their ideas" (p. 460).

According to writing process research, revision is one area where the differences between experienced and inexperienced writers are marked. One of the major differences reported is that experienced writers see their revision as necessary to find and develop meaning. Revision strategies should therefore be given greater attention, as

most inexpert writers consider their work to be complete as soon as it is written down (Raimes, 1987, Cumming, 1989). Furthermore, when inexperienced writers do revise, they do it in an unsystematic, "hit and miss" manner which seriously impairs their ability to revise effectively. Raimes states:

> "what students really need, more than anything else, is to develop the ability to read their own writing and examine it critically, to learn how to improve it, to learn how to express their meaning fluently, logically and accurately (1983, p. 149).

Wallace and Hayes (1991), in a study which examines the effect of instruction on revision, report they obtained revisions significantly greater in number and complexity based on only eight minutes of instruction which underscored the differences in the types and extent of revisions made on the same text by an expert and inexpert writer. For example, the inexpert writer only eliminated spelling, wordiness and grammar errors, while the the expert also paid attention to global concerns, audience, and reorganized if necessary. This indicates skills necessary for various types of revision (surface and global) may already be present to some extent and could be readily tapped, and that instruction which shows students what revision looks like and how it can be approached can result in rapid changes. Part of the problem is that the teacher's concept of revision and the students' concept of revision are separated by a wide chasm.

Another often ignored aspect of teaching composition involves feedback. If writing is communication, then it makes sense that good feedback is necessary for students to understand what communicates and what does not. The value of interaction with both teachers and peers has been underscored by many (Keh, 1990; Hyland, 1990; Charles, 1990; Zamel, 1985).

Charles (1990) suggests teachers frequently respond inappropriately to student drafts when the students are unable to clearly and accurately present their ideas. Based only on the draft, with no clues as to the process followed to create it, comments may be confusing and frustrating, if not incomprehensible to students. She suggests a self-monitoring technique wherein students number perceived problems, and write a brief comment, with a corresponding number, for the teacher to address. While this would not help with problems the students are unable to identify, it would help to understand how they are approaching the drafts and various writing problems. Feedback should occur at all stages in the development of a writing task, and should not be limited to only the teacher. Keh (1990) suggests feedback should come from peers and conferences, as well as from written comments or corrections. Hyland proposes using audiotaped teacher responses instead of handwritten comments. Such a system avoids often cryptic or illegible handwritten responses, and allows the teacher to provide more feedback in less time.

There is a wealth of information available on process writing and how to apply that information to classroom practices. In our enthusiasm to help our students become competent, independent writers, it is possible to confine them with a prescriptive formula for the "process," which is no better than ensnaring them in prescriptive rules for form and style. Selzer suggests that "if teachers will acknowlege a number of effective overall composing styles - as well as options for performing each composing activity - they will be more likely to produce flexible and resourceful writers" (1984, p. 277).

While a great deal has been written with regard to teaching the writing process, little actual research has been carried out to determine what specific instructional approaches and techniques are most effective. Without doubt, the possibilities are as varied as our students, but as teachers it is our responsibility to come to the classroom equipped to respond to our students' needs with as many approach and technique combinations as we can. This study seeks to add to what is already known about how ESL writers write, as well as to develop a practical classroom tool which will enable teachers to quickly target and respond to their student writers' strengths and weaknesses. While the taped-protocol, observation and interview methods of obtaining data do allow a researcher to gain a relatively clear picture of writing proccesses, these methods are very time-consuming. Time is not something a composition teacher

has much of, so the questionnaire developed for this study enables classroom teachers to obtain data on the writing processes of their students with a minimum of time and effort. The development of the questionnaire and the experimental design are discussed in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER III

THE PILOT STUDY

Because previous ESL writing process research has involved only a relatively small number of subjects (fewer than twenty-five), it was decided to obtain data from a greater number of ESL writers. A questionnaire format was deemed to be the most practical way to do this, despite the disadvantages of a self-reporting format. Although this format is problematic in that it is impossible to gauge whether or not responses reflect actual writing activities, the questionnaire does facilitate the gathering of a significantly larger body of data than is available using other methods, such as personal interviews or taped protocols. Furthermore, the questionnaire format provides classroom teachers with an efficient and manageable means of obtaining information about their students' writing processes.

In order to develop a questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted using students enrolled in international freshman composition courses at OSU, which use a process approach to writing. Students and instructors, as well as other professionals in the field were consulted with regard to the type and wording of statements included in the question-

naire. As mentioned earlier, statements were divided into four categories which reflect stages of writing: pre-writing, construction of the initial draft, revision and blocked writing. The recursive, complex nature of the writing process makes it impossible to set up neat categories, but for the questionnaire format used it was considered necessary in order to present the statements as simply and directly as possible. The questionnaire attempts to address this complexity by including similar statements across categories; for example, revision statements are included in the section for initial draft construction, as well as the section for revision. On a Likert scale, subjects were asked to indicate how often (from "always" to "never") they engaged in a specific writing-related activity (see Appendix A).

The questionnaire was administered to forty-four students near the end of the semester. Subjects were placed in rank order according to course grade, and the middle fourteen were dropped out, leaving two groups of fifteen, which were designated "high" and "low." The mean grade for the high group was 86.4 (a "B" grade), while the mean for the low group was 75.1 (a "C" grade). T-test analyses were run for each question, comparing the high and low groups; only two questions were statistically significant, Question seventeen, "I write the introduction first" (first draft construction category) and Question thirty-four, "I spend the greatest amount of time on the third draft" (revision

category). The low group was more likely to write the introduction first, and was also more likely to spend the most time on the third draft. While these responses are not especially remarkable by themselves, it is interesting that the low group spent the most time on the third draft, considering the fact that it is only possible to earn up to six points on the third draft (the major portion of the grade is assigned with the second draft). This is representative of previous findings that less skilled writers tend to misplace their energies: it would have been more effective to spend extra time on the second draft.

In evaluating the results, it was determined that the subjects were probably too similar in skill-level to yield useful comparative data. It was decided therefore, for the purpose of the larger study, to give the questionnaire to students at the university level and to those at the level of intensive English language (ELI) study, rather than comparing only students at the university level. While no formal assessment of writing experience or language proficiency was made, the ELI group, as a whole, was assumed to be less experienced and less proficient. Furthermore, the late-semester administration raised questions as to the effect of instruction on the responses of the students. To measure these effects, it was also decided to administer the questionnaire twice, at the beginning and the end of the semester. As the questions themselves did not seem to be problematic for the students, the only changes to the

university version of the questionnaire involved the addition of questions about writing first in L1, then translating to L2, using English or L1/L2 dictionaries and seeking assistance from their instructor or the Writing Center. These additions were made as the result of further consultation with ESL instructors.

In order to assess writers involved in intensive English language study, who, with a TOEFL score of less than 500, are judged unready for full-time academic study at an English-speaking university, it was necessary to modify the questionnaire with regard to vocabulary, sentence complexity and level of skills assessed. The modified version was developed with the help of experienced ESL writing instructors at the Universtity of Arkansas at Little Rock, and following numerous administrations to students enrolled in the Intensive English Language Program at that University.

The resulting questionnaire, included in Appendix B, utilizes simplified vocabulary and sentence structure, and deletes those questions which are considered to exceed the level of writing required at most intensive English programs. These changes caused the ELI version to be three questions shorter and to be arranged differently than the university version. As a result it is necessary to refer to the exchange table, provided in Appendix C, when comparing questions across versions. Examples of the changes made between the university version and the ELI version are as

follows: Question Twenty-three of the university version (Appendix B) reads, "I make major changes in content and/or organization," while its equivalent on the ELI version (Appendix A), Question Twenty-two, reads, "I make major changes in ideas or put things in different places." Question Thirty-four on the university version (Appendix B), "I spend the most time on the third draft," is representative of questions deleted on the ELI version due to irrelevancy (third drafts are not required of the ELI class).

As a result of the pilot study reported above, two versions of the questionnaire were developed, one suitable for the university level, and one for the ELI level. Their presentation was the same, except for the differences previously discussed. Having completed the pilot study, preparations were made to begin the larger study. This study is discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER IV

THE STUDY

As research in the area of ESL writing processes has involved only a limited number of subjects to date, this study seeks to further investigate the writing processes of a large number of ESL writers by looking at and comparing subjects already engaged in general academic study at the university level with subjects engaged in intensive English language study. Specifically, the purpose of the study is to determine what differences exist between these two groups of ESL writers, and also to explore the effects of composition instruction on these two groups of writers. Based on research (Raimes, 1985, 1987; Zamel, 1983; Cumming, 1989), it is predicted there will be significant differences between the writing processes of the university group and the ELI group, even before instruction. The university group should demonstrate tendencies to use a large variety of strategies, and to revise on a global level; the ELI group, on the other hand, should exhibit a focus on structure at all stages of the writing process, with fewer strategies in their repertoire. Furthermore, it is expected the impact of instruction will be observable in two ways: first, in comparing the changes reported for each group

between the first and second administrations and secondly, in comparing the two groups with each other.

The Subjects

Subjects for this study included 68 students enrolled in the first level of Freshman Composition for International Students (ENGL 1013) during the Fall 1990 semester at OSU, and 13 students enrolled in an advanced composition class at the OSU English Language Institute (ELI) during the Fall 1990 term; this number represents all students present on both days the questionnaire was administered. The freshman composition group (n=68) will be subsequently referred to as the "university group" and the ELI group (n=13) will be referred to as the "ELI group" An advanced group was chosen at the ELI, rather than a beginning group, because in order to use the questionnaire format, a minimum level of language and writing proficiency was necessary. Also, to facilitate comparison, it was necessary to choose a group capable of producing writing similar to that produced by the university level group.

The university group included 46 males and 22 females and the ELI group included twelve males and one female. Table 1 presents the mean number of years of English study, English composition study and length of stay in the U.S. for the subjects in each group. The means for years of English study were 7.9 years for the university group and 5.9 years for the ELI group. The university group had studied English composition for an average of 2.00 years,

while the ELI group had .736 years of study (Table 1).

TABLE 1

YEARS OF ENGLISH & ENGLISH COMPOSITION INSTRUCTION

	English Mean years	Engl. Comp Mean years	U.S. Stay Mean Years
University	7.9	2.000	1.198
ELI	5.9	0.736	0.594

Length of stay in the U.S. was reported at 1.198 mean years for the university group and 0.594 for the ELI group (Table 1). Thus, the university group had more years of English language and English composition study than the ELI group, which supports the assumption that the university

TABLE 2

NATIVE LANGUAGE

Language	University	ELI	Language	University	ELI
Malay	2	1	Setswana	2	0
Arabic	3	1	Kikuyu	1	0
Korean	6	2	Sindhi	1	0
Japanese	0	2	Icelandic	3	0
Thai	0	1	Vietnamese	1	0
Turkish	0	1	Bengali	1	0
Indonesian	16	3	French	1	0
Chinese	18	1	Kuwaiti	1	0
Spanish	3	1	Swedish	1	0

group will demonstrate greater facility with the writing

process. The subjects in each group reported a wide variety of language backgrounds, reported in Table 2. Further analyses of these findings, with respect to their impact on writing processes, were not pursued.

The English Language Institute Course

The OSU English Language Institute composition course requires students to complete a minimum of two drafts, with the option to do more. Assignments result in somewhat shorter and less detailed essays than in the university group, and involve only one level of response: describe or explain, as opposed to describe and explain. The first draft is marked, but does not receive a grade; the second draft is assigned a holistic grade. Emphasis is placed on improving sentence structure and vocabulary, and on introducing students to the concepts of thesis statement and basic essay organization (introduction, body, conclusion). Minimal instruction is provided with regard to invention, development and revision strategies.

The International Freshman Composition Course

The International Freshman Composition Course is a process-oriented writing class. Assignments require students to generate fairly complex essays, with several facets to each assignment. For example, students might be asked to explain a custom of their home country and demonstrate how this custom highlights differences between their country and the U.S. Students are required to submit three drafts for each of five essays. The first essay is

marked for content/organization problems, with structural surface errors de-emphasized, while the second draft is marked and assigned points based on a weighted grading system; content and organization are worth more points than grammar, vocabulary and spelling. Revision of the second draft can earn the students up to six points. Extensive instruction and practice are provided in invention, development and revision strategies. Students are encouraged to view their writing as a continually changing and developing work, rather than as being complete once the initial draft is rendered in "pen and ink." They are taught to focus first on content and organization, and to ignore surface concerns until late in the development of the essay.

The Materials

The researcher drew from the literature and personal experience, as well as input from professionals and ESL students, to develop the two versions of the questionnaire, and modifications were made based on the pilot study; this development was discussed more extensively in Chapter III. In order to simplify questionnaire organization, the questions were grouped according to four categories: prewriting, writing, revision and blocked writing. The statements focused on specific types of activities which students might engage in across all stages in the writing process. A Likert scale of one to five was used, with the opposite ends of the scale labeled "always" (one) and

"never" (five). Data was also obtained with reference to sex, language background, duration of English study, composition study and length of stay in the U.S., and is reported earlier in this chapter. A copy of the university version of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A; the ELI version can be found in Appendix B. When comparing the two versions, refer to Appendix C for the exchange table.

Procedures

Subjects responded to the questionnaire during regular class sessions, after receiving written and spoken instructions. The questionnaire was administered to each group twice, once near the beginning and once near the end of the semester. Students were told by the administrator that the questionnaire was part of a research project conducted by someone, and it was emphasized that it would in no way affect their grade. They were also instructed to think carefully about the statements and respond as honestly as possible. They were given as much time as they needed.

The results of this study are discussed in the following chapters. Chapters Five and Six discuss the first and second administrations for the ELI group and university group, respectively. Chapter Seven compares the findings for each administration between groups.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

ELI Group

This chapter discusses the data obtained from the ELI group for the first and second administrations of the questionnaire. The means and standard deviations for each question are reported by category, and are discussed below with regard to apparent trends on the first administration, followed by a discussion of the changes reported between the first and second administration. T-test comparisons were run on each question to determine what, if any differences were reported between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire. The results yielded no significant changes in responses between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire.

Pre-writing Category

For the first administration, the means reported in the pre-writing category indicate subject responses varied from a high frequency of 1.923 for Question one to a low of 4.00 for Question Two (see Table 3). These responses represent strategies used prior to instruction. The responses to three questions in this category had means above 3.6,

indicating these writers seldom engage in these strategies: Question Two (4.00), Question Three (3.769) and Question Five (3.615). This indicates that the subjects seldom talk to others, make a word list or freewrite.

Three questions had means of 2.3 or less, signifying a high frequency of activity. Question One (1.923) indicates subjects think until they know what they want to write. This response may be interpreted in several ways. If the students are effectively using this strategy to do some planning, then it is positive. However, if they feel they cannot write anything until they have a clear idea of what they want to express, then the composing process may be hindered. The high frequencies for Question Four, make a plan for writing (2.308), and Question Six, read about the subject (2.00), are desirable in that both strategies can lead to invention and a sense of direction.

Comparisons between the first and second administration yielded no statistically significant changes for the ELI group in the pre-writing category. It should be noted the small sample size (n=13) contributed to the lack of significant findings. Changes of .500 or greater were observed, however, for several questions. Table 5.1 reports for Question One a large decrease in frequency, from 1.923 to 3.342 (1=always, 5=never), possibly indicating the subjects are more able to use writing itself for invention. Question Two increased in frequency from 4.00 to 3.231, and a frequency increase from 3.615 to 2.846 was reported for

Question Five; these figures mean the subjects were more likely to talk to others and freewrite at the end of the semester.

TABLE 3

STATISTICS FOR THE ELI GROUP
1ST AND 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
PRE-WRITING CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
1	Think before writing		
	Mean	1.923	3.342
	SD	0.954	1.166
2	Talk to others		
	Mean	4.000	3.231
	SD	1.000	1.301
3	Make word list		
	Mean	3.769	3.358
	SD	1.301	1.050
4	Make writing plan		
	Mean	2.308	2.462
	SD	0.947	1.050
5	Freewrite		
	Mean	3.615	2.846
	SD	1.557	1.214
6	Read about subject		
	Mean	2.000	2.385
	SD	1.528	1.193

Overall, these students report a slight increase in the number of strategies used for pre-writing, even though t-tests found no statistically significant differences for the ELI group in the pre-writing category between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire. It should be

noted that pre-writing is a particularly difficult category to define and evaluate; strategies assessed by this questionnaire by no means include all possibilities, and it is quite possible these students were engaging in more kinds of pre-writing than were reported.

Initial Draft Category

Results for the first administration of the initial draft category, reported in Table 4, show frequency responses ranged from a 2.0 in Question Eight (1=always) to 4.692 in Question Fourteen (5=never). Two questions yielded frequencies under 2.5, Question Eight (2.00) and Question Fifteen (2.385), which indicate a high frequency for grammar focus and dictionary use. Frequencies of 3.0 or higher were reported for Questions Nine (3.077), Ten (3.231), Twelve (3.231), Thirteen (3.308), Fourteen (4.692) and Sixteen (3.154), indicating these students did not focus on grammar at the sentence level, and did not postpone grammar corrections until they were finished writing. They also did not concentrate on one sentence at a time, think or write in their L1, or frequently read the directions.

Means for most of the questions in this category are reported at 3.00 or greater, indicating low frequency. Questions Nine (3.077) and Ten (3.231) both indicate that subjects do not tend to correct grammar sentence by sentence, nor do they put it off until they finish the draft. However, Question Eight (2.00) does indicate a strong focus on grammar, and as Question Twenty (correct grammar and spelling) reports a mean of 2.538, it would

TABLE 4

STATISTICS FOR THE ELI GROUP
1ST & 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
INITIAL DRAFT CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
8	Careful about grammar		
	Mean	2.000	2.308
	SD	1.080	1.182
9	Grammar/sentence focus		
	Mean	3.077	2.923
	SD	1.115	1.188
10	Correct grammar when finished		
	Mean	3.231	2.923
	SD	1.423	1.038
11	Look over/think back		
	Mean	2.769	2.769
	SD	1.363	1.235
12	Sentence by sentence focus		
	Mean	3.231	2.846
	SD	1.363	1.573
13	Think in L1		
	Mean	3.308	3.538
	SD	0.855	0.877
14	Write in L1		
	Mean	4.692	4.692
	SD	0.630	0.480
15	Use dictionary		
	Mean	2.385	2.769
	SD	1.502	1.589
16	Read directions		
	Mean	3.154	3.077
	SD	1.281	1.320
17	Look at plan/word list		
	Mean	2.923	3.000
	SD	1.188	1.155
18	Read essay aloud		
	Mean	4.154	4.385
	SD	0.987	0.870
19	Talk to others		
	Mean	4.231	3.692
	SD	0.927	1.316
20	Correct grammar/spelling		
	Mean	2.538	2.462
	SD	1.198	1.266
21	Re-write sentences		
	Mean	3.231	3.154
	SD	1.013	1.405

appear, if they are neither correcting grammar as they write each sentence or waiting until the draft is completed, then the focus on grammar occurs at some point during the construction of the draft. Low frequencies were reported for questions addressing idea generating and development strategies, such as looking at a plan or word list (Question Seventeen, 2.923) reading the draft aloud (Question Eighteen, 4.154) or talking to others (Question Nineteen, 4.231). These responses parallel findings for the ELI group in the revision and "blocked" writing categories which suggest these students use very few strategies when writing.

Results between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire reflected very slight changes for the initial draft construction category. Only one was greater than .500: Question Nineteen, "I talk about my essay with others," increased in frequency from 4.231 to 3.692. This may be a positive change, as talking to others is an effective strategy for developing ideas and shaping their direction.

A clear pattern can be observed for the initial draft category. Students report high frequencies for strategies concerned with grammar and vocabulary, reflecting instructional emphases and strategies already used. All other questions, which reported low frequencies, can be categorized as alternative strategies for keeping the writing process going: talking to others, reading aloud, re-writing sentences, etc. These findings suggest a need

for attention to these alternative strategies in the classroom. The discussion for the revision category also reflects this lack of varied strategies.

Revision Category

Results for the revision category indicate the ELI group does not revise much at all. Means reported in Table 5 are all higher than 2.5, which would indicate all revision strategies assessed are infrequently practiced. These writers did not make major changes (Question Twenty-two, 3.385), did not change blocks of writing (Question Twenty-six, 4.000) and preferred to write each essay only once (Question Twenty-seven, 3.615). They made only minor changes (Question Twenty-nine, 3.00) and did not like to change their ideas once they had begun writing (Question Thirty, 3.00). They spent the most time on the first draft, as reported in Questions Thirty-one and Thirty-two, which makes sense if they are not revising.

By the end of the semester, only two questions reported a change of .500 or greater. Question Twenty-three increased in frequency from 3.538 to 2.846, indicating these subjects were more likely to re-write only after they had finished writing the first draft. However, Question Twenty-five, which did not reflect much change (3.615 to 3.538), suggests subjects retained a strong preference for revising only after completing the draft. Question Twenty-four decreased in frequency from 2.769 to 3.308, indicating an increased preference to correct grammar only, which reflects

classroom focus.

TABLE 5

STATISTICS FOR THE ELI GROUP
1ST & 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
REVISION CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
22	Make major changes		
	Mean	3.385	3.385
	SD	0.961	1.044
23	Re-write		
	Mean	3.538	2.846
	SD	1.266	1.463
24	Correct grammar only		
	Mean	2.769	3.308
	SD	1.235	1.182
25	Revise while writing		
	Mean	3.615	3.538
	SD	0.961	0.660
26	Change blocks		
	Mean	4.000	4.462
	SD	0.193	0.662
27	Prefer not to re-write		
	Mean	2.615	2.923
	SD	1.502	1.256
28	Write only once		
	Mean	3.615	3.538
	SD	1.193	1.330
29	Make minor changes only		
	Mean	3.000	2.769
	SD	1.000	1.092
30	Change ideas		
	Mean	3.000	2.538
	SD	1.414	0.967
31	Most time on 1st draft		
	Mean	2.769	2.923
	SD	1.166	1.320
32	Most time on 2nd draft		
	Mean	3.692	3.538
	SD	1.316	1.198
33	Use a dictionary		
	Mean	2.538	2.692
	SD	1.664	1.601

Again, the limited strategies reported for the revision category suggest these students do not possess many strategies for approaching the writing task, and are particularly resistant to revision, which is a necessity for ESL writers. However, as revision emphasis in the class was basically limited to surface concerns, it is not surprising they did not report using other alternatives. These results suggest these writers may need help understanding that revision can enhance communicative effectiveness, and is not merely an exercise carried out to please a teacher or receive a better grade.

"Blocked" Writing Category

The ELI group's strategies for "blocked" writing are also limited, according to the results shown in Table 6. Questions Thirty-five, Thirty-six and Forty-one, all involving reading (re-reading the essay or directions, and reading about the subject), were the only activities engaged in at a frequency of 2.5 or below. The remainder of the questions for this category reported frequencies of 3.0 or above. This data echoes findings for the other three categories assessed: the ELI group uses very few strategies across all stages of the writing process. All changes reported between the first and second administrations were minimal, less than .500. For ESL writers struggling with limited language proficiency and composition practice, instruction concerning what to do when you get stuck is very important; such instruction should therefore be incorporated

into this class.

TABLE 6

STATISTICS FOR THE ELI GROUP
1ST & 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
"BLOCKED" WRITING
CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
34	Throw out everything		
	Mean	3.615	3.077
	SD	1.446	1.256
35	Re-read essay		
	Mean	1.846	2.077
	SD	0.899	0.760
36	Re-read directions		
	Mean	2.385	2.538
	SD	1.193	1.266
37	Do something else		
	Mean	2.923	3.462
	SD	1.256	1.127
38	Read essay aloud		
	Mean	4.462	4.462
	SD	0.967	0.660
39	Look at previously made list		
	Mean	3.308	3.615
	SD	1.316	0.961
40	Talk to others		
	Mean	4.308	3.769
	SD	0.947	1.092
41	Read about subject		
	Mean	2.462	2.538
	SD	1.330	1.330
42	Make a word list		
	Mean	3.538	3.385
	SD	1.127	1.261

The results for the ELI group seem to be consistent with previous findings on unskilled writers (Raimes, 1985 &

1987; Zamel, 1983; Cummings, 1988). While an overall pattern of improvement cannot be determined from the information provided, it would seem students were responding to the classroom focus: they were concerned with grammar more than content and organization, and did not revise extensively. Overall responses for the "blocked" writing category indicated a lack of strategies for "attacking" the writing task, which is also indicative of unskilled writers. An interesting question emerges with regard to instruction. Did the instructional emphasis on structure merely serve to reinforce what these writers were already doing, while neglecting to provide instruction in problem areas such as multiple strategies for invention and revision, or development of content and organization?

Chapter Six, which discusses the results for the university group, indicates there are differences between the two groups, not only in writing process characteristics, but also in their responses to teaching.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

University Group

Findings for the first and second administrations of the university group are reported in this chapter. For each of the four categories, means and standard deviations are reported and discussed with regard to trends in the writing process. To assess the effect of instruction on these trends, t-tests were run to compare differences between the first and second administrations; these results are also reported below.

Pre-writing Category

For the pre-writing category, results reported for the first administration in Table 7 show that at the beginning of the semester the university group utilized a variety of pre-writing strategies, with means falling mostly in the mid-range (2.00 to 4.00). Two questions indicate high frequencies, with means below 2.5: Question One (2.103) and Question Seven (2.309) both involve thinking about the essay. Question One indicates they tend to postpone writing until they have formed a clear idea of what they want to say. This is not necessarily a desirable strategy, as writing itself can effectively serve to formulate ideas.

However, Raimes (1987) reports more experienced writers move easily from point to point while writing, which would make sense, if they already knew where they were going when they started writing. The frequency level for Question Seven indicates they try to think about their subject from several different perspectives, which reinforces the preference for thinking reported in Question One.

All other questions for the first administration of the pre-writing category reported means between 2.750 and 3.794, which indicates moderate to low frequencies for these strategies. They were least likely to talk to others about their subject (Question Two, 3.794) or make a word list (Question Three, 3.118). Questions Four (2.853), Five (2.779) and Six (2.750) fall within .500 of the mid-point, which indicates moderate frequencies. Overall, these findings indicate the university group was utilizing most of the strategies assessed in the pre-writing category with at least moderate frequency.

Results for the second administration of the questionnaire, when compared with the first administration, indicated only minor changes. All questions except Question One showed a slight increase in frequency, suggesting greater usage of most pre-writing strategies. T-test comparisons yielded only one statistically significant change: Question Two increased in frequency from 3.794 to 3.353. This is in keeping with instructional emphases in that class time was devoted to class and group discussions,

and students were encouraged to discuss their subjects outside class.

TABLE 7

STATISTCS FOR THE UNIVERSITY GROUP
1ST & 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
PRE-WRITING CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
1	Think until clear idea formed		
	Mean	2.103	2.176
	SD	1.067	0.945
*2	Talk to others		
	Mean	3.794	3.353
	SD	1.127	1.207
3	Make a word list		
	Mean 8	3.118	3.000
	SD	1.409	1.281
4	Make an outline		
	Mean	2.853	2.647
	SD	1.136	1.130
5	Freewrite		
	Mean	2.779	2.721
	SD	1.413	1.195
6	Read about subject		
	Mean	2.750	2.176
	SD	1.331	1.064
7	Think from different viewpoints		
	Mean	2.309	2.176
	SD	1.213	1.064

* = $p < .05$

In summary, results for the pre-writing category indicate a strong preference for thinking-related strategies, with low frequencies reported for other types of pre-writing. As stated in Chapter Five, pre-writing is

difficult to define, and therefore assess, so it is possible the university group is utilizing pre-writing strategies not addressed by the questionnaire. Table 7 indicates these writers, by the end of the semester, spent less time on the first draft than the second draft (Question Thirty-four, 2.603; Question Thirty-five, 2.059). This might mean they are using the first draft as a pre-writing excercise. The next section, which reports findings for the initial draft category, also indicates a preference for reflective strategies, along with a focus on grammar.

Initial Draft Category

Results reported for the first administration of the initial draft category (see Table 8), indicate that at the beginning of the semester these students were doing many different things while constructing their first drafts. Means less than 2.5, indicating high frequencies, were reported by Questions Eight (1.853), Twelve (1.926), Fourteen (2.221), Fifteen (2.265) and Eighteen (1.397). This indicates that students were focused on grammar, stopped frequently to think about and look over their drafts, focused on each paragraph as they wrote it, looked frequently at the directions and usually wrote the introduction first.

Low frequencies (5=never) were reported for the first administration on Questions Nine (3.206), Seventeen (3.529), Nineteen (3.912), Twenty (4.691), Twenty-one (3.632), Twenty-three (4.618) and Twenty-four (3.471). These

TABLE 8

STATISTICS FOR THE UNIVERSITY GROUP
1ST & 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
INITIAL DRAFT CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
*8	Grammar focus		
	Mean	1.853	2.162
	SD	0.996	0.956
9	Grammar focus/sentence		
	Mean	3.206	2.985
	SD	1.276	1.264
10	Grammar focus/paragraph		
	Mean	2.838	2.691
	SD	1.241	1.162
11	Make content changes		
	Mean	2.926	2.838
	SD	1.097	1.002
12	Stop/think/look over draft		
	Mean	1.926	2.088
	SD	1.201	0.973
13	Sentence focus		
	Mean	2.632	2.882
	SD	1.370	1.287
14	Paragraph focus		
	Mean	2.221	2.382
	SD	1.157	1.093
15	Look at directions		
	Mean	2.265	2.279
	SD	1.060	1.049
16	Refer to list/outline		
	Mean	2.706	2.706
	SD	1.270	1.107
17	Read draft aloud		
	Mean	3.529	3.176
	SD	1.481	1.424
*18	Write intro first		
	Mean	1.397	1.779
	SD	0.883	1.034
19	Write body first		
	Mean	3.912	3.691
	SD	1.368	1.175
20	Write conclusion first		
	Mean	4.691	4.632
	SD	0.815	0.667
21	Talk to others		
	Mean	3.632	3.324
	SD	1.303	1.177

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
*22	Use English dictionary		
	Mean	2.632	2.294
	SD	1.315	1.210
23	Write in L1 first		
	Mean	4.618	4.544
	SD	0.847	0.905
24	Use an L1/L2 dictionary		
	Mean	3.471	3.324
	SD	1.559	1.530

* = $p < .05$

findings indicate they seldom focused on grammar at the sentence level, read their draft aloud, wrote the body or the conclusion first, talked to others while they were writing the first draft, wrote first in their L1, or used an L1/L2 dictionary.

Comparison of the first administration results with the second administration results indicated several trends. Questions Nine and Ten (grammar focus) reported increases in frequency, from 3.206 to 2.985 and 2.838 to 2.691, respectively. However, Question Eight, which is also grammar focus, reported a statistically significant decrease in frequency from 1.853 to 2.162. A response of 2.162 is still a high frequency, though, and the increases reported for Nine and Ten are still at a relatively lower frequency than Question Eight. These reponses indicate a shift in the way grammar is approached in this category, but the

questionnaire does not provide the necessary detail to determine exactly what this shift is. It may be that these less experienced writers are concerned in a general way about grammar, but have no effective strategies for addressing grammar issues.

Questions dealing with the order in which segments of the draft are written indicate students are more likely to write the body or conclusion first and less likely to write the introduction first. Question Nineteen (write the body first) increased from 3.912 to 3.691, while Question Twenty (write the conclusion first) increased from 4.691 to 4.632. Question Eighteen (write the introduction first) reported a statistically significant decrease from 1.397 to 1.779.

Another trend is evident in the increased use of both L1 and L2 dictionaries. Question Twenty-two, use of an English dictionary, reported a statistically significant increase from 2.632 to 2.294, while Question Twenty-four, use of an L1/L2 dictionary, reported an increase from 3.471 to 3.324.

These trends reflect instructional emphases in that students were encouraged to postpone attention to grammar until later drafts, and also to try writing different segments of the draft first, such as the body or conclusion, rather than always beginning with the introduction. Another positive response to instruction is seen in the increases reported for the use of dictionaries. Very slight decreases were reported for reflective strategies, (Question Twelve,

1.926 to 2.088; Question Fifteen, 2.267 to 2.79), although their frequency levels remain high. This is probably indicative of the fact they are using a greater variety of strategies.

The findings for this category indicate a slight increase in the variety of approaches used. As a major goal of the course is to provide ESL writers with a wide variety of strategies to choose from, across all categories, one would expect greater changes. It is possible the students were already efficiently using the strategies they have in place, and therefore did not visibly respond to instruction. Another possibility is that instruction for these categories was ineffective or inadequate; these possiblities should be explored. The revision category discussion reveals a wider variety of strategies in place at the beginning of the semester, and also reports greater changes.

Revision Category

For the revision category, trends for the first administration of the questionnaire indicate these students are using many strategies for writing (See Table 9). Means of less than 2.5 were reported for six questions, indicating high levels of frequency for the strategies assessed. These included Questions Twenty-eight (1.456), Twenty-nine (1.588), Thirty (2.176), Thirty-two (2.441), Thirty-four (2.088) and Thirty-five (2.265). The figures mean they revised at least once; corrected grammar and spelling; re-wrote sentences to clarify meaning; corrected grammar, but

TABLE 9

STATISTICS FOR THE UNIVERSITY GROUP
1ST & 2ND ADMINISTRATIONS
REVISION CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
25	Prefer one draft only		
	Mean	3.353	3.544
	SD	1.474	1.215
26	Prefer two drafts only		
	Mean	2.779	3.044
	SD	1.303	1.298
*27	Prefer three or more drafts		
	Mean	3.529	3.029
	SD	1.511	1.516
28	Revise at least once		
	Mean	1.456	1.662
	SD	0.871	0.940
29	Correct grammar/spelling		
	Mean	1.588	1.809
	SD	0.902	1.047
30	Re-write sentences to clarify		
	Mean	2.176	2.088
	SD	1.092	1.047
*31	Major changes content/organization		
	Mean	3.000	2.588
	SD	1.146	1.136
32	Correct grammar, but keep info		
	Mean	2.441	2.382
	SD	0.968	0.993
33	Small revisions only		
	Mean	2.971	3.118
	SD	1.327	1.100
*34	Most time first draft		
	Mean	2.088	2.603
	SD	1.243	1.236
35	Most time second draft		
	Mean	2.265	2.059
	SD	1.241	1.131
36	Most time third draft		
	Mean	3.176	3.000
	SD	1.292	1.281

* = $p < .05$

did not take out information and spent the most time on the first and second drafts (more on the first than the second).

Means of 3.0 or greater, indicating moderate to low frequencies, were reported for Questions Twenty-five (3.353), Twenty-seven (3.529), Thirty-one (3.00) and Thirty-six (3.176). These results indicate these writers had a low preference for writing one draft only, but they also had a low preference for writing three or more drafts. Question Twenty-six (2.779), indicates a moderate preference for writing two drafts, which is evidently the middle ground for this group.

In comparing trends for the first administration with trends for the second, statistically significant results were obtained for Question Twenty-seven (3.529 to 3.029), "I prefer to write three or more drafts, "Question Thirty-one (3.00 to 2.588), "I make major changes in content and organization" and Question Thirty-four (2.088 to 2.603), "I spend the most time on the first draft." These results again reflect the instructional emphases for this course. Major emphasis was placed on the writing of multiple drafts and on making major changes in content and organization, as opposed to surface-level revisions. They also spent less time on the first draft, which is possibly a reponse to the fact no grade was assigned to this draft; slight increases in the time spent on both the second and third drafts, while not statistically significant, seem to confirm this.

Overall, it would appear at the beginning of the

semester this group of students was already, to some degree, viewing writing as an ongoing process, rather than as a one-shot event. Responses reported for this category demonstrate the clearest responses to instruction of all categories assessed for this study. Changes reported between the first and second administrations indicate significant increases in the number and extent of revisions being utilized by the end of the semester. These findings agree with reports by Raimes (1987) and Zamel (1983), who found that more experienced writers tend to view writing as a recursive, developmental process. Many significant changes were also reported in the "blocked" writing category, and are discussed in the following section.

"Blocked" Writing Category

The first administration results for the "blocked" writing category (Table 6.4) show the university group was using a variety of strategies to deal with "blocked" writing at the beginning of the semester. Strategies used most frequently for "blocked" writing included re-reading the draft (Question Thirty-eight, 1.794), re-reading the assignment (Question Forty-one, 2.059) and thinking about their subject from different perspectives (Question Forty-four, 2.294). They were not likely to throw everything out (Question Thirty-seven, 4.132), talk to others (Question Forty, 3.574), make a word list (Question Forty-three, 3.044) or get help from their teacher or the Writing Center (Question Forty-five, 3.353).

Statistically significant changes were reported for over half the questions between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire. Three significant increases were, Question Thirty-seven (4.132 to 3.632), "I throw out everything I have written," Question Forty-two

TABLE 10

STATISTICS FOR THE UNIVERSITY GROUP
FIRST & SECOND ADMINISTRATIONS
"BLOCKED" WRITING CATEGORY

Question		1st Admin.	2nd Admin.
*37	Throw out everything		
	Mean	4.132	3.632
	SD	1.118	1.359
*38	Re-read draft		
	Mean	1.794	2.294
	SD	1.016	1.198
39	Look at word list		
	Mean	2.897	2.882
	SD	1.478	1.409
*40	Talk to others		
	Mean	3.574	3.132
	SD	1.285	1.381
41	Re-read assignment		
	Mean	2.059	2.015
	SD	1.035	0.954
*42	Do something else		
	Mean	2.676	2.309
	SD	1.251	1.096
43	Make a word list		
	Mean	3.044	2.809
	SD	1.332	1.341
44	Think from different perspectives		
	Mean	2.294	2.343
	SD	1.023	1.033
*45	Get help		
	Mean	3.353	2.691
	SD	1.243	1.284

* = $p < .05$

(2.676 to 2.309), I go do something else for a while," and Question Forty-five (3.353 to 2.691), "I get help from the Writing Center." Question Thirty-eight (1.794 to 2.294) "I silently re-read what I have written," and Question Forty (3.574 to 3.132), "I talk about my subject with other people" showed significant decreases.

What students do when they get stuck is probably one of the best indicators of writing skill. The university group, in the results reported above, demonstrates a healthy tendency to appropriate a wide variety of strategies when they encounter writer's block. While they retained strategies in use at the beginning of the semester, they reported significant increases for getting help, doing something else and throwing everything out. It should be noted that getting help is not always a positive thing; the goal of composition instruction is to develop independent writers, and "help" should be given in such a manner as to enhance such development. These findings indicate a wider range of strategies in use at the end of the semester, and these changes reflect classroom focus. While this category does focus on "blocked" writing, it is possible that these students generalize these strategies to all parts of the writing process, which is desirable.

As a whole, trends for strategies used by the university group at the end of the semester were positive. They exhibited a great deal of variety with regard to the strategies used, particularly in the revision and "blocked"

writing categories. At the beginning of the semester they mostly utilized reflective strategies, and revised less, but by the end of the semester they were more willing to utilize active strategies such as talking or getting help, to make global changes in their writing and to write more drafts. Their reponses indicated they were able to view writing as a developmental process, requiring a willingness to change ideas or direction, as indicated by a greater willingness to make major content changes, or even to throw everything out when it was not working. These results reflect previous findings for more experienced writers: extensive, global revision, as well as varied strategies for "attacking" writing are characteristic of advanced ESL writers (Raimes, 1987; Zamel, 1983; Cumming, 1989). Overall, changes in the variety and frequency of strategies used also reflect positive responses to the instructional emphases for the course, particularly with regard to revision and "blocked" writing.

Chapters Five and Six have attempted to identify, for the ELI and university groups, respectively, writing process characteristics and the impact of instruction on those characteristics. It would appear, particularly from findings for the university group, that responses to instruction in revision and "blocked" writing strategies was more effective, or at least resulted in greater changes. Chapter Seven seeks to compare the findings for the two groups, hopefully highlighting the differences between the

two groups, as well as their responses to different instructional emphases.

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

First and Second Administrations

ELI vs. University

After establishing trends and significant changes for each group in previous chapters, this chapter compares the reported tendencies of the ELI group with that of the university group, looking initially at the first administration of the questionnaire and then at the second. T-test comparisons yielded a number of statistically significant differences for both administrations. The question numbers do not match content across questionnaire versions, so an exchange table is provided in Appendix C for clarification.

First Administration

Pre-writing Category. Most of the means reported in the first administration for the university group fell in the mid-range (2.00 to 3.00), indicating they were using all strategies with at least moderate frequency (See Table 11). The ELI group, however, tended more toward the extremes; in general the means for this group indicated they either use a strategy frequently, or they do not use it much at all. Both groups were most likely to think about their subject

until they formed clear ideas about what they wanted to write (Question One, ELI=1.923, university=2.103), as well as to read about their subject (Question Six, ELI=2.00, university=2.750). For both groups, means for Question Two indicate they were least likely to talk to others about their subject (ELI=4.00, university=3.794).

TABLE 11

FIRST ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
PRE-WRITING CATEGORY
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Question		ELI	University
1	Think until clear idea formed		
	Mean	1.923	2.103
	SD	0.954	1.067
2	Talk to others		
	Mean	4.000	3.794
	SD	1.000	1.127
3	Make a word list		
	Mean	3.769	3.118
	SD	1.301	1.409
4	Make an outline		
	Mean	2.308	2.853
	SD	0.947	1.136
5	Freewrite		
	Mean	3.165	2.779
	SD	1.557	1.413
6	Read about subject		
	Mean	2.000	2.750
	SD	1.528	1.331

Differences between groups were not statistically significant for any question in this category, so discussion of differences is not particularly meaningful. However, Question One (think until clear idea is formed) raises an

interesting point for further investigation: How are these two groups using this strategy, and how effectively is each group using it? Previous studies indicate there are differences: once skilled writers begin to write, they seem to know, with some confidence, where they are going (Raimes, 1987; Zamel, 1983); unskilled writers, once they begin writing, seem to have far more difficulty proceeding smoothly (Raimes, 1985, 1987). Differences reported between groups in the initial draft category are more marked.

Initial Draft Category. Means for the initial draft category (first administration) are reported for each group in Table 12. Both groups reported a concern with grammar (Question Eight), while neither tended to read a draft aloud (Question Seventeen), talk to others (Question Twenty-one) or write first in their L1 (Question Twenty-three). While most differences were slight, t-test comparisons did yield several statistically significant differences. The university group was more likely to engage in the activities referred to in the following questions: Question Twelve, "I stop frequently to look over and think about what I just wrote," Question Fifteen, "I refer often to the directions for the assignment" and Question Seventeen, "I read the draft aloud." These results reflect the overall trend for the questionnaire: the university group shows a tendency to use a greater variety of strategies. For Question Twenty-four, "I use an other language/English dictionary," the ELI group reported a greater tendency than the university group;

this is not surprising, given the ELI group's smaller vocabulary. In the following section, the revision category also reports several significant differences between the two groups.

TABLE 12

FIRST ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
INITIAL DRAFT CATEGORY
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Question		ELI	University
8	Grammar focus		
	Mean	2.000	1.853
	SD	1.080	0.996
9	Grammar focus/sentence		
	Mean	3.077	3.206
	SD	1.115	1.276
*12	Stop/think/look over draft		
	Mean	2.769	1.926
	SD	1.363	1.201
13	Sentence focus		
	Mean	3.231	2.632
	SD	0.855	1.370
*15	Look at directions		
	Mean	3.154	2.265
	SD	1.281	1.060
16	Refer to list/outline		
	Mean	2.923	2.706
	SD	1.188	1.270
*17	Read draft aloud		
	Mean	4.154	3.529
	SD	0.987	1.481
21	Talk to others		
	Mean	4.231	3.632
	SD	0.927	1.303
23	Write in L1 first		
	Mean	4.692	4.618
	SD	0.630	0.847
*24	Use an L1/L2 dictionary		
	Mean	2.385	3.471
	SD	1.502	1.559

* = $p < .05$

Revision Category. Means reported for the first administration in Table 13 show that, across the board, the university group reports higher frequencies for use of strategies assessed in the revision category. T-test comparisons for the first administration indicated the university group exhibited a statistically significant greater tendency to engage in the activities addressed in the following questions: Question Twenty-eight, "Before I

TABLE 13

FIRST ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY
REVISION CATEGORY

Question		ELI	University
25	One draft only		
	Mean	2.615	3.353
	SD	1.502	1.474
*28	Revise at least once		
	Mean	3.615	1.456
	SD	1.193	0.871
*29	Correct grammar/spelling		
	Mean	2.769	1.588
	SD	1.235	0.902
31	Major changes content/organization		
	Mean	3.385	3.000
	SD	0.961	1.146
33	Small revisions only		
	Mean	3.000	2.971
	SD	1.000	1.327
34	Most time first draft		
	Mean	2.769	2.088
	SD	1.166	1.243
*35	Most time second draft		
	Mean	3.692	2.265
	SD	1.316	1.241

* = $p < .05$

turn in a paper, I revise it at least once," Question Twenty-nine, "I correct grammar and spelling errors," and Question Thirty-five, "I spend the most time on the second draft." These findings are in keeping with previous findings on the differences between more and less experienced writers; the university group is already engaging in more revision than the ELI group, even without instruction. Question Twenty-nine is also interesting in that one would expect the ELI group to do more correcting of grammar and spelling, given the focus of their course. However, some editing is desirable, and is actually encouraged in the university course, although surface concerns are de-emphasized until later drafts. While findings for the revision category indicate clear differences, findings for the "blocked" writing category indicate some similarities.

"Blocked" Writing Category. Table 14 reports the means for the first administration of the "blocked" writing category. For both groups, the most frequent strategies reported involved reading (Questions Thirty-eight and Forty-one); these were the only questions with means less than 2.5. All other questions reported means of 2.5 or greater, indicating low frequencies for throwing anything out, looking at a word list, talking to others, doing something else and making a word list.

T-test comparisons for the first administration of the "blocked" writing category revealed only one statistically

significant difference between the two groups. For Question Forty, the university group was significantly more likely to talk to others, with a mean of 3.574, than the ELI group, with a mean of 4.308. The results for this category indicate that while the university group tended to report slightly higher frequencies for various strategies, the two groups were similar in tendencies for the first administration.

TABLE 14

FIRST ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
"BLOCKED" WRITING CATEGORY
ELI VS. UNIVERSTIY

Question		ELI	University
37	Throw out everything		
	Mean	3.615	4.132
	SD	1.446	1.118
38	Re-read draft		
	Mean	1.846	1.794
	SD	0.899	1.016
39	Look at word list		
	Mean	3.308	2.897
	SD	1.316	1.478
*40	Talk to others		
	Mean	4.308	3.574
	SD	0.947	1.285
41	Re-read assignment		
	Mean	2.385	2.059
	SD	1.193	1.035
42	Do something else		
	Mean	2.923	2.676
	SD	1.256	1.251
43	Make a word list		
	Mean	3.538	3.044
	SD	1.127	1.332

* = $p < .05$

In comparing the first administration results between groups there are some marked similarities and differences. Both groups reported preferences for reflective, passive strategies, such as re-reading or thinking. They were both also moderately to highly focused on grammar. Tendencies for the "blocked" writing category were also quite similar. The greatest differences were reported for the revision category; overall, the university group utilized a greater variety of strategies with higher frequencies than the ELI group. Comarison of the two groups for the second adminstration showed that differences remained consistent at the end of the semester; the second section of this chapter reports these findings.

Second Administration

Evaluation of the differences between groups reported for the second administration of the questionnaire yielded findings similar to the first. The university group continued to engage in a greater variety of strategies, at a higher frequency, than the ELI group, particularly in the revision and "blocked" writing categories. For all questions yielding significant differences for t-test comparisons, the university group engaged in the activity more frequently than the ELI group.

Pre-writing Category. Means for the second administration of the pre-writing category are reported in Table 15. The university group was most likely to think until forming a clear idea (Question One, 2.176) and to read

about their subject (Question Six, 2.176). For all other questions in this category the university group reported means of 2.5 or greater, indicating moderate to low frequency for strategies in Questions Two (3.353), Three (3.00), Four (2.647) and Five (2.721) The ELI group reported two means less than 2.5, Question Four (2.462) and Question Six (2.385); these results indicate they were most

TABLE 15

SECOND ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
PRE-WRITING CATEGORY
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Question		ELI	University
1	Think until clear idea formed		
	Mean	3.342	2.176
	SD	1.166	0.945
2	Talk to others		
	Mean	3.231	3.353
	SD	1.301	1.207
3	Make a word list		
	Mean	3.358	3.000
	SD	1.050	1.281
4	Make an outline		
	Mean	2.462	2.647
	SD	1.050	1.130
5	Freewrite		
	Mean	2.846	2.721
	SD	1.214	1.195
6	Read about subject		
	Mean	2.385	2.176
	SD	1.193	1.064

likely to make an outline or read about their subject. For all other questions, the ELI group reported frequencies

above 2.5: Question One (3.342), Question Two (3.231), Question Three (3.358) and Question Five (2.846). Overall, neither group reported using pre-writing strategies with much frequency; the ones they did use were passive (reading or thinking), except for the ELI group's outlining.

T-tests comparing the responses of the two groups for the second administration revealed no statistically significant differences. As mentioned previously, it would be interesting to look more extensively at how each group is using each strategy. Although differences were not judged to be significant, it should be noted the ELI group reported a relatively large decrease in frequency for Question One, involving thinking, from 1.923 to 3.342. It is unclear what caused this change, but it may be they are more willing to actually begin writing. Blanton (1987) reports that ESL writers tend to be "scared to death to write English" (p. 112), so maybe they had become more confident by the end of the semester.

Initial Draft Category. In the initial draft category, means reported in Table 16 reveal only one question for which the ELI group reported a frequency of less than 2.5: Question Eight (2.308) indicates a high degree of focus on grammar. Means of 2.769 (Questions Twelve and Twenty-four) or higher are reported for all other questions, indicating low frequency. The university group, interestingly, reported a slightly higher frequency of grammar focus in Question Eight (2.162). Although previous research has

indicated less experienced writers tend to focus more on grammar, these more experienced writers were encouraged to attend to grammar, although the intent of instruction was to postpone this focus until later drafts. The university group was also more likely to stop, think and look over their drafts (Question Twelve, 2.088) and to look at the directions (Question Fifteen, 2.279). Moderate to low frequencies were reported for all other questions (greater than 2.5).

T-test comparisons revealed three significant differences between groups for the second administration; for each, the university group reported higher frequencies. The questions included, Question Twelve, "I stop frequently to look over and think about what I just wrote, "Question Fifteen, "I refer often to the directions for the assignment" and Question Seventeen, "I read portions of the draft out loud."

For this category, Questions Twelve and Fifteen were also significant for the first administration. Question Twenty-four dropped out, and means reported in Table 7.2 for the first administration show the ELI group was less likely to use an other language/English language dictionary, while the university group was more likely to do so by the end of the semester. This is odd, because previous research has found writers at lower levels of language proficiency tend to use a dictionary more often than those at higher levels. Given the ELI's focus on vocabulary, one would expect the

ELI writers to increase dictionary usage. However, the increase for the university group is in keeping with an instructional emphasis on dictionary usage. Furthermore, they may be attempting to address more complex topics which require more vocabulary.

TABLE 16

SECOND ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
INITIAL DRAFT CATEGORY
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Question		ELI	University
8	Grammar focus		
	Mean	2.308	2.162
	SD	1.182	0.956
9	Grammar focus/sentence		
	Mean	2.923	2.985
	SD	1.188	1.264
*12	Stop/think/look over draft		
	Mean	2.769	2.088
	SD	1.235	0.973
13	Sentence focus		
	Mean	2.846	2.882
	SD	1.573	1.287
*15	Look at directions		
	Mean	3.077	2.279
	SD	1.320	1.049
16	Refer to list/outline		
	Mean	3.000	2.706
	SD	1.155	1.107
*17	Read draft aloud		
	Mean	4.385	3.176
	SD	0.870	1.424
21	Talk to others		
	Mean	3.692	3.324
	SD	1.316	1.177
23	Write in L1 first		
	Mean	4.692	4.544
	SD	0.480	0.905
24	Use an L1/L2 dictionary		
	Mean	2.769	3.324
	SD	1.589	1.530

* = $p < .05$

Overall, the university group reported using more strategies than the ELI group at the end of the semester, which reflected instructional emphases. Findings for the revision category also indicate the university group was using more revision strategies than the ELI group at the end of the semester.

Revision Category. In the second administration of the revision category (Table 17), the ELI group still used fewer strategies overall than the university group. All means reported for the ELI group were above 2.9, indicating low frequencies for all strategies assessed. The university group reported means below 2.5 for Questions Twenty-eight (1.662), Twenty-nine (1.809) and Thirty-five (2.059), indicating high frequencies for revising at least once, correcting grammar and spelling, and spending the most time on the second draft. They were least likely to write only one draft (Question Twenty-five, 3.544) and make only small revisions (Question Thirty-three, 3.118).

T-tests for the second administration of the revision category yielded four significant differences: Question Twenty-eight, "Before I turn in a paper, I revise it at least once," Question Twenty-nine, "I correct grammar and spelling errors," Question Thirty-one, "I make major changes in content/organization" and Question Thirty-five, "I spend the most time on the second draft." See Table 17 above.

All significant questions on the first administration were also significant for the second administration, except

TABLE 17

SECOND ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY
REVISION CATEGORY

Question		ELI	University
25	One draft only		
	Mean	2.923	3.544
	SD	1.256	1.215
*28	Revise at least once		
	Mean	3.538	1.662
	SD	1.330	0.940
* 29	Correct grammar/spelling		
	Mean	3.308	1.809
	SD	1.182	1.047
* 31	Major changes content/organization		
	Mean	3.385	2.588
	SD	1.044	1.136
33	Small revisions only		
	Mean	3.000	3.118
	SD	1.000	1.100
34	Most time first draft		
	Mean	2.923	2.603
	SD	1.092	1.236
35	Most time second draft		
	Mean	3.538	2.059
	SD	1.198	1.131

* = $p < .05$

for the addition of Question Thirty-one. This would reflect the change previously discussed in Chapter VI, where a significant increase was reported for this question and attributed to instruction. The focus for the ELI group did not include major content or organization changes. Because previous research indicates less advanced writers do not revise extensively for content and organization, it would be

interesting to see how writers at the ELI group's level would have responded to instruction in these areas.

"Blocked" Writing Category. Means reported in Table 18 for the second administration show the university group tends to use more strategies in this category than the ELI. The ELI was most likely to re-read the draft or assignment (Question Thirty-eight, 2.077 and Question Forty-one, 2.538), but reported low frequencies for all other questions. The university group also was most likely to read (Question Thirty-eight, 2.294 and Question Forty-one, 2.015), as well as to go do something else for a while (Question Forty-two, 2.309).

Statistically significant differences for the "blocked" writing category are also marked in Table 7.8. They include, Question Thirty-nine, "I look at a list of key words written before I begin to write the essay" and Question Forty-two, "I spend the most time on the second draft."

The only question for which the means of the two groups were significantly different on the first administration, Question Forty, "I talk about my subject with other people," is not significant for the second administration. In comparing Table 14 and Table 18, it is apparent the ELI group was more likely to talk about their subject at the end of the semester than at the beginning, as was the university group. For Questions Thirty-nine and Forty-two, the university group was more likely to both look at a word list

and do something else, again consistent with findings that skilled writers have more strategies at their disposal than do less skilled writers.

TABLE 18

SECOND ADMINISTRATION STATISTICS
"BLOCKED" WRITING CATEGORY
ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Question		ELI	University
37	Throw out everything		
	Mean	3.077	3.632
	SD	1.256	1.359
38	Re-read draft		
	Mean	2.077	2.294
	SD	0.760	1.198
*39	Look at word list		
	Mean	3.615	2.882
	SD	0.961	1.409
40	Talk to others		
	Mean	3.769	3.132
	SD	1.092	1.381
41	Re-read assignment		
	Mean	2.538	2.015
	SD	1.330	0.954
*42	Do something else		
	Mean	3.462	2.309
	SD	1.127	1.096
43	Make a word list		
	Mean	3.385	2.809
	SD	1.261	1.341

* = $p < .05$

These results indicate the the university group responded more noticeably to instruction, and utilizes a greater variety of strategies for writing, particulary those

concerned with extensive multiple draft revisions. Results for both group affirm previous findings: the ELI group focuses heavily on grammar, with little attention to more global concerns, and utilizes relatively few strategies across all categories of the writing process. Findings for the university group indicate they are able to approach writing as a developmental process, requiring revision on several planes. It should be noted, however, that the ELI group reported using strategies which are said to characterize less experienced writers, and that the instructional emphases for the course paralleled what they were already doing. As instruction was merely reinforcing strategies already in place, it is not surprising there were few changes in their reported behaviors. The implications of the findings for research and pedagogy are discussed in Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER VIII

IMPLICATIONS

Results for this study indicate there are significant differences between ESL writers at the university level and the intensive English language study level. These differences are particularly marked with regard to focus on structure, and to revision and "blocked" writing strategies. The ELI group reported high frequencies for focus on grammar, and reported high frequencies for only a few strategies in the various categories, such as reading about their subject or re-reading what they have written. The university group, while demonstrating concern for grammatical issues, was somewhat less focused on grammar throughout the writing process. They also used a greater variety of strategies than the ELI group, and used them with greater frequency.

It is clear instruction was having an effect on the focuses and strategies used. In both cases, those strategies or focuses emphasized instructionally showed increases. For the university group, these increases were underscored by statistically significant results: they postponed focus on grammar until later drafts, talked more

to others across categories, preferred to write more drafts, made more extensive content and organizational changes.

On the other hand, none of the changes reported for the ELI group were statistically significant, but the number of subjects (n=13) probably contributed to this. However, it is interesting to note that instructional emphasis was placed on grammar and vocabulary, which previous research has reported as being characteristic of less experienced writers. This further accounts for the fact there were no significant changes: instruction was merely reinforcing what the students were already doing. Therefore, subsequent research should investigate the impact of instruction in multiple strategies for invention, revision and "blocked" writing. This instruction should also encourage them to better understand that writing is a complex, on-going process which requires more than just writing down what comes to mind, making a few cosmetic revisions and turning in the "finished" piece of writing. Raimes (1987) suggests that even ESL writers with little experience have strategies for writing; they merely need instruction and practice which will allow them to use their strategies more efficiently, as well as expand them.

It is interesting to note, that even though instruction for the university group did include emphasis on pre-writing strategies, both groups reported relatively low frequencies for questions in this category. The highest frequencies reported for both groups involved thinking or reading, which

are passive strategies in that they are not actually writing. As mentioned earlier, this may be that subjects were using strategies not assessed in this study. The questionnaire format used did not investigate this category in-depth, so further research in this area should look more extensively at what these students are doing to prepare to write, as well as which instructional approach is most appropriate.

Several response patterns raised possible problems. For the university group, responses indicated that by the end of the semester, subjects were spending less time on the first draft, which may not be desirable. Were they using it as a pre-writing draft to develop ideas, or were they de-emphasizing it in favor of later drafts which received actual grades? Furthermore, this group reported less focus on grammar. This might be positive, if they were postponing surface revisions until content and organization were finalized, but it may be they were depending on the teacher to mark grammar errors for them, which is not desirable. Another trend showed they were more likely to get help, particularly with "blocked" writing. This can be an effective strategy, but over-dependence on the teacher or tutors undermines the development of independent writers. These questions cannot be answered from the data available, and merit further exploration.

One area of investigation, not pursued by this study, is a comparison of the ELI group characteristics at the end

of the semester with those of the university group at the beginning of the semester. As the ELI group should be ready to enter full-time academic study at the university level, one would assume the ELI group's end-of-semester results would be similar to those of the university group at the beginning of the semester. However, the university group had had an average of 7.9 years of English study and 2.00 years of English composition study, while the ELI group had had an average of two years less English study (5.9) and over a year less of composition study (.736). The ELI group then, in only four month's time, would not have the same amount of experience as the university group began with. Furthermore, it is not known what kind of impact previous instruction or L1 interference was having on the writing process.

The questionnaire format does present several problems. It is impossible to judge how subjects are "reading" the question, and to interpret just what their responses mean. Furthermore, with a self-reporting format, degree of accuracy cannot be determined with certainty. However, as discussed previously, the results of this study do indicate findings in keeping with prior research, and it does serve to make feasible obtaining and assessing a larger body of data.

One particularly useful application for this questionnaire is in the regular classroom. As instruction does demonstrate an impact on the writing process, the

questionnaire makes it possible for the classroom teacher to quickly and effectively assess what strategies students are using and which ones require emphasis. Classroom and individualized instruction can then be tailored to meet the needs of those particular writers. This sort of response also allows the teacher to monitor which instructional approaches and techniques result in favorable improvements in composition. After all, it does not matter what strategies writers are using, as long as those strategies enable the student to effectively and efficiently communicate their ideas on paper.

References

Blanton, L. L. (1987). Reshaping ESL students' perceptions of writing. ELT Journal, 41, (2), 112-118.

Charles, M. (1990). ELT Journal, 44, (4), 286-293.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. Language Learning, 39 (1), 81-141.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1977). Problem-solving strategies and the writing process. College English, 39 (4), 449-461.

Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. TESOL Quarterly, 24, (3), 443-460.

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F. & Hughey, J. B. (1981). Testing ESl composition: A practical approach. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. ELT Journal, 44, (4), 294-304.

Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, (4), 317-336.

Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. Research in Teaching English, 13, 5-22.

Raimes, A. (1983a). Anguish as a second language? In A. Freedman, I. Pringle & J. Yalden (Eds.), Learning to write: First language/second language. New York: Longman, pp. 258-272.

_____. (1983b). Techniques in teaching writing. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229-258.

_____. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. Language Learning, 37(3), 439-467.

Selzner, J. (1984). Exploring options in composing. College composition and Communication, 35, (3) 276-284.

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). Errors and expectations. New York: Oxford University Press.

Spack R., & Sadow, C. (1983). Student-teacher working journals in ESL freshman composition. TESOL Quarterly, 17, (4), 575-593.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication, 31, 371-388.

Taylor, B. (1981). Content and written form: A two-way street. TESOL Quarterly, 15, 5-13.

Wallace, D. L., and Hayes, J. R. (1991). Redefining revision for freshman. Research in the Teaching of English, 25(1), 54-65.

Widdowson, H. G. (1983). New starts and different kinds of failures. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle & J. Yalden (Eds), Learning to write: First language/second language. New York: Longman, pp. 34-48

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195-209.

_____. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165-187.

_____. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, (1), 79-101.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE: ELI VERSION

NAME:_____DATE of BIRTH:_____SEX:_____
HOW LONG HAVE YOU STUDIED ENGLISH?:____YEAR(S) ____MONTH(S)
HAVE YOU STUDIED ENGLISH COMPOSITION BEFORE?:_____
HOW LONG?_____WHERE?_____
HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN IN THE U.S.?_____
WHAT IS YOUR NATIVE LANGUAGE?_____
NATIVE COUNTRY?:_____
INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully. Think about what **YOU** do when you write and try to give your best answer.

BEFORE I BEGIN TO WRITE	Always				Never
1. I think about the the main idea until I know everything I want to say.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I talk about my subject with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I make a word list of everything about my subject that I can think of.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I make a plan for writing.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I write some sentences about anything that comes to mind, just to get ideas started.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I read about my subject.	1	2	3	4	5
WHILE I AM WRITING,					
8. I pay close attention to grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I correct my grammar after completing each sentence.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I correct my grammar after I finish writing.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I stop many times to look over and think about what I wrote.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I think about writing one sentence at a time.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I think of the sentence in my language then write it in English.	1	2	3	4	5

WHILE I AM WRITING,	Always				Never
14. I write the essay in my language, then change it to English.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I use a dictionary.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I read the directions many times.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I look at my plan for writing or list of ideas to help me write.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I read parts of the essay out loud.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I talk about my essay with others.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I correct grammar and spelling errors.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I re-write sentences to make them clearer.	1	2	3	4	5
AFTER I FINISH WRITING,					
22. I make major changes in ideas or put things in different places.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I re-write only after I have finished the assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I correct grammar, but I do not take out any information.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I read again and change each sentence as soon as I have written it.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I change four or five sentences at a time.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I like to write each paper only once, without re-writing it.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Before I turn in a paper, I usually change and re-write it at least one time.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I make only minor changes after I write my first draft.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I change the ideas of my paper if writing the first draft gives me better ideas about how to express my meaning.	1	2	3	4	5

AFTER I FINISH WRITING,	Always				Never
31. I spend the greatest amount of time on the first writing of the paper.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I spend the greatest amount of time on the second writing of the paper.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I use a dictionary to check spelling and word meanings.	1	2	3	4	5
WHEN I CANNOT THINK OF WHAT TO WRITE NEXT,					
34. I throw out everything I have written and I start again.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I silently re-read what I wrote.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I re-read the directions.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I do something else for a while.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I read my essay aloud.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I look at the list of words I wrote before I began writing.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I talk about my subject with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I read about my subject.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I make a word list of everything about my subject I can think of.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE: UNIVERSITY VERSION

NAME:_____ DATE of BIRTH:_____ SEX:_____

HOW LONG HAVE YOU STUDIED ENGLISH?:____YEAR(S)____MONTH(S)

HAVE YOU STUDIED ENGLISH COMPOSITION BEFORE?:_____

HOW LONG?_____WHERE?_____

HAVE YOU BEEN IN THE U.S.?_____

WHAT IS YOUR NATIVE LANGUAGE?_____

NATIVE COUNTRY?:_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully. Think about what **YOU** do when you write and try to answer as accurately as possible.

BEFORE I BEGIN TO WRITE AN ESSAY,

		Always				Never
1.	I think about the topic until I know everything I want to say.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I talk about my subject with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I make a word list of everything related to my subject that I can think of.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I make an outline.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I write a paragraph or two of whatever comes to mind, just to get ideas started.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I read about the subject of the essay.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I try to think about my subject from several perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I pay close attention to grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I correct my grammar after completing each sentence.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I correct my grammar after completing each paragraph.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I stop frequently to look over and think about what I have already written.	1	2	3	4	5

WHILE WRITING THE FIRST DRAFT OF AN ESSAY,	Always				Never
12. I concentrate on writing one sentence at a time.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I concentrate on writing one paragraph at a time.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I refer to the statement of the assignment often.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I refer to a list or outline.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I read portions of the draft out loud.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I write the introduction first.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I write the body of the essay first.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I write the conclusion first.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I talk about my essay with others.	1	2	3	4	5
WHEN I REVISE,					
21. I correct grammar and spelling errors.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I re-write sentences to make them more understandable.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I make major changes in content and/or organization.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I revise only after I have completed it.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I correct grammar, but I do not delete any information.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I revise each sentence as soon as I have written it.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I revise at the end of each paragraph.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I prefer to write only one draft for each essay.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Before I turn in a draft, I usually revise it at least once.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I make only minor revisions after I write my first draft.	1	2	3	4	5

WHEN I REVISE,	ALWAYS				NEVER
31. I change the content of my essay if writing the first draft gives me better ideas about how to express my meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I spend the greatest amount of time on the first draft.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I spend the greatest amount of time on the second draft.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I spend the greatest amount of time third draft.	1	2	3	4	5
WHEN I CANNOT THINK OF WHAT TO WRITE NEXT,					
35. I throw out everything I have written.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I silently re-read what I have already written.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I re-read the assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I go do something else for a while.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I read out loud what I have already written.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I look at a list of key words which I wrote before I began to write the essay.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I talk about my subject with others.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I read about my subject.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I make a word list of everything related to my subject I can think of.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I write down whatever comes to my mind.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I try to think about my subject from a different perspective.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

EXCHANGE TABLE FOR COMPARING THE ELI AND UNIVERSITY VERSIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

University		ELI
1	=	1
2	=	2
3	=	3
4	=	4
5	=	5
6	=	6
8	=	8
9	=	9
12	=	11
13	=	12
24	=	15
15	=	16
16	=	17
17	=	18
21	=	19
23	=	14
25	=	27
28	=	28
29	=	24
31	=	22
33	=	29
34	=	31
35	=	32
37	=	34
38	=	35
39	=	39
40	=	40
41	=	36
42	=	37
43	=	42

APPENDIX D

SIGNIFICANT T-TEST RESULTS FOR THE FIRST AND SECOND ADMINISTRATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY GROUP

Pre-writing

Question #2: I talk about my subject with other people.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	3.694	1.127	.008
Second	3.353	1.207	

Construction of the First Draft

Question #8: I am careful about my grammar.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	2.309	.996	.013
Second	2.162	.956	

Question #18: I write the introduction first.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	1.397	0.883	.006
Second	1.779	1.034	

Question #22: I use an English/English dictionary.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	2.632	1.315	.029
Second	2.294	1.210	

Revision

Question #27: I prefer to write three or more drafts.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	3.529	1.511	.039
Second	3.029	1.516	

Question #31: I make major changes in content and organization.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	3.00	1.146	.006
Second	2.588	1.136	

Question #34: I spend the most time on the first draft.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	2.088	1.243	.003
Second	2.603	1.236	

"Blocked" Writing

Question #37: I throw our everything I have written.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	4.132	1.118	.002
Second	3.632	1.359	

Question #38: I silently re-read what I have already written.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	1.794	1.016	.004
Second	2.294	1.198	

Question #40: I talk about my subject with other people.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	3.132	1.381	.015
Second	3.574	1.285	

Question #42: I go do something else for a while.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	2.767	1.251	.048
Second	2.309	1.096	

Question #45: I get help from the Writing Center.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
First	3.353	1.243	.000
Second	2.681	1.284	

APPENDIX E

SIGNIFICANT T-TEST RESULTS

FIRST ADMINISTRATION

ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Initial Draft Category

Question #12: I stop frequently to look over and think about what I just wrote.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	1.926	1.201	.026
ELI	2.769	1.363	

Question #15: I refer often to the directions for the assignment.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.265	1.060	.009
ELI	3.154	1.281	

Question #24: I use an other language/English dictionary.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	3.471	1.559	.023
ELI	2.385	1.502	

Revision Category

Question #28: Before I turn in a paper, I revise it at at least once.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	1.456	0.871	.000
ELI	3.615	1.193	

Question #29: I correct grammar and spelling errors.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	1.588	0.902	.000
ELI	2.769	1.235	

Question # 35: I spend the most time on the second draft.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.265	1.241	.000
ELI	3.692	1.316	

"Blocked" Writing Category

Question #40: I talk about my subject with other people.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	3.574	1.285	.054
ELI	4.308	0.947	

APPENDIX F

SIGNIFICANT T-TEST RESULTS SECOND ADMINISTRATION, ELI VS. UNIVERSITY

Initial Draft Category

Question #12: I stop frequently to look over and think about what I just wrote.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.088	0.973	.030
ELI	2.769	1.235	

Question #15: I refer often to the directions for the assignment.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.279	1.049	.018
ELI	3.077	1.320	

Question #17: I read portions of the draft out loud.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	3.176	1.424	.004
ELI	4.385	0.870	

Revision Category

Question #28: Before I turn in a paper, I revise it at least once.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	1.662	0.940	.000
ELI	3.538	1.330	

Question #29: I correct grammar and spelling errors.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	1.809	1.123	.000
ELI	3.308	1.182	

Question #31: I make major changes in content/organization.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.588	1.136	.022
ELI	3.385	1.044	

"Blocked" Writing Category

Question #39: I look at a list of key words written before I begin to write the essay.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.882	1.409	.030
ELI	3.615	0.961	

Question #42: I go do something else for a while.

Administration	Mean	SD	Prob.
University	2.309	1.096	.001
ELI	3.462	1.127	

VITA

Paula S. Robertson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: A STUDY OF THE WRITING PROCESSES OF ESL WRITERS AND THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION ON THOSE PROCESSES

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, August 16, 1961, the daughter of Bob J. and Pat Coffman Robertson.

Education: Graduated from Farmington High School, Farmington, New Mexico, in May, 1979; received Bachelor of Science Degree in Education (Major: Speech-Language Pathology) from New Mexico State University, July, 1983; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1991.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, August, 1989, to May, 1991. ESL Instructor, Intensive English Language Program, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, May through August, 1990. Assistant Director, Writing Center, Oklahoma State University, August, 1990 to December, 1990. Assistant Director, ESL Composition, Oklahoma State University, January, 1991 to May, 1991.