

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: The Effects of Revision
Instruction On Eighth Graders'
Persuasive Writing

William G. Wise, Doctor of Education, 1992

Dissertation directed by: Wayne H. Slater, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and
Instruction

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of teacher-guided direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision on the quality of eighth grade students' persuasive essays. Teacher directed revision instruction was direct instruction by the teacher in the use of additions, deletions, substitutions and rearrangements and in the use of the compare, diagnose, operate (CDO) procedure. Small-group peer generated revision included researcher organized small-group cooperative learning activities during which peers read, responded to, and made suggestions for changes to improve essay drafts. Control group subjects were given instruction in persuasive writing, were asked to respond to the persuasive writing prompt, and were told to revise their essays.

This study was a pretest, posttest, control group design utilizing six, intact, average reading/language arts class groups, 134 subjects, from grade eight. The pretest was the students' first draft, and the posttest was a final draft.

The six classes participating in the study included two classes in each of three different schools with the research and control group schools being randomly assigned. The duration of the treatment was for six consecutive class periods. As a final activity, all students were given 30 minutes to write a final draft.

The results of the study indicated that the Direct Instruction Group and the Small-Group students were rated significantly higher for quality ($p < .05$) than were the students in the Control Group (only directions to revise). All groups utilized a variety of revision levels, but results indicated significant correlations between quality and surface level revisions ($p < .001$), between quality and lexical level revisions ($p < .01$), and between quality and sentence level revisions ($p < .01$).

THE EFFECTS OF REVISION INSTRUCTION ON EIGHTH GRADERS'
PERSUASIVE WRITING

by

William G. Wise

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of The University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

1992

CI

100

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDRS

Advisory Committee:

Professor Wayne H. Slater
Professor E. G. Campbell
Professor Richard Jantz
Professor Olivia N. Saracho
Professor Bonnie Tyler

© Copyright by
William Griffith Wise
1992

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my wife Bobbie, my daughter Jennifer,
my aunt Mrs. Marjorie D. Golden,
and my uncle Mr. Robert A. Golden.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this time to recognize those who have helped make this dissertation possible.

First, I thank Dr. Wayne Slater for his patience and endurance in directing this dissertation and in directing me. I also thank Dr. E. G. Campbell, Dr. Richard Jantz, Dr. Olivia N. Saracho, and Dr. Bonnie Tyler, the other members of my committee, for agreeing to serve.

Next, I must recognize the teachers whose classrooms and time were provided for pilot studies and treatment interventions. These most gracious educators were Ms. Debra L. Carpenter, Mr. David T. Lay, Ms. Linda I. Machetto, and Ms. Charlotte Watson-Wales. I also recognize and appreciate the cooperativeness of school principals Mr. J. Ronald Black and Mr. John H. Cox.

Also, I recognize the patience, persistence, and quality of Dr. Sharon P. Brown, Dr. Lorraine Fulton, Ms. Linda D. Flanagan, and Ms. Kathleen G. Jenkins, who served as raters during the most exhaustive and grueling segments of this study. I also wish to thank my first advisor, Dr. Robert Wilson for his assistance, Mr. John Bloom, Charles County Superintendent of Schools, for approving the study, and Dr. Mary Jo Comer for her suggestions and support.

Finally, I wish to thank Dr. Doug Coulson and Ms. Edith C. Washington for technical assistance and the staff of Stoddert Middle School for being excellent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	6
Rationale	7
Related Literature.	9
Statement of the Problem.	11
Significance	12
Research Questions.	13
Direct Revision Instruction	13
Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction	14
Regular Revision Instruction	15
Relationships Between Levels of Revision Stages of Revision and Rated Quality	15
Definitions	16
Limitations	17
Summary	17
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	18
Overview.	18
Revision.	19
Review of Composition Research Literature	21
Reviews of Critical Significant Research Early Revision Research	26
Studies of Revision Instruction	43
Direct Instruction	48
Cooperative Learning	51
Summary of Purpose	51
Present Study	52
Summary	53
Summary	55
III. METHOD	56
Subjects	56
Design.	60

Teachers	61
Training of Teachers	62
Materials	62
Procedure	64
Training of Raters	70
Holistic Score Training Sessions	71
Revision Scoring Training Sessions	73
Instructional Procedures and Treatments	75
Day One: All Classes	76
Day Two: Direct Instruction	77
Day Two: Small-Group Instruction	77
Day Two: Control Group	77
Day Three: Direct Instruction	78
Day Three: Small-Group Instruction	78
Day Three: Control Group	78
Rating Procedures	78
Reliability/Validity of the Holistic Score Measure	79
Limitations	82
Assumptions	83
Summary	83
 IV. RESULTS	 84
Direct Revision Instruction	84
Research Question #1	84
Research Question #2	87
Research Question #3	90
Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction	109
Research Question #4	109
Research Question #5	109
Research Question #6	110
Regular Revision Instruction	111
Research Question #7	111
Research Question #8	111
Research Question #9	112
Relationships Between Levels of Revision, Stages of Revision, and Rated Quality	113
Research Question #10	114
Research Question #11	114
Summary	116
 V. OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 117
Overview	117
Summary	117
Statement of the Problem	117
Purpose of the Study	118
Research Questions	119
Patterns of Revision	121

Results.	124
Conclusions.	129
Discussion.	135
Holistic Measure	135
Bridwell's Revision Scoring Guide. Implications for Writing	136
Instruction.	137
Recommendations for Continued Research	138
APPENDIX	141
A. Dissertational Study Approval Form. . .	141
B. Holistic Scoring Rubric For Persuasive Writing	144
C. Revision Scoring Guide.	146
D. Scripted Lessons For Research Group A .	149
Research Group A Script For Day 1	150
Research Class A1 Script For Day 2	156
Research Class A2 Script For Day 2	163
Research Class A1 Script For Day 3	167
Research Class A2 Script For Day 3	170
E. Scripted Lessons For Research Group B .	173
Research Group B Script For Day 1	174
Research Class B1 Script For Day 2	180
Research Class B2 Script For Day 2	187
Research Class B1 Script For Day 3	191
Research Class B2 Script For Day 3	194
F. Scripted Lessons For Control Group C .	197
Control Group C Script For Day 1	198
Control Classes C1/C2 Script Day 2	204
Control Group C Script For Day 3	208
G. Persuasive Writing Prompt	211
H. Elements of a Persuasive Essay.	213
I. Examples of Well-Organized Persuasive Essays.	215
J. Revision Guide Sheet.	219
K. Peer Response Sheet	221
L. Introduction (STUDENT).	223
M. Persuasive Writing Revision Practice Example	225
N. Teacher Direction and Information Sheet	227
REFERENCES	229

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for the Holistic Score Measuring Quality	69
2.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Holistic Score.	70
3.	Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Holistic Scores	71
4.	Analysis of Variance Among Treatment Groups for Quantity of Revisions.	72
5.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Quantity of Revision.	73
6.	Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Quantity of Revisions	74
7.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Surface Level.	75
8.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Surface Level.	76
9.	Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Surface Level.	77
10.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Lexical Level.	77
11.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Lexical Level.	78
12.	Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Lexical Level.	79
13.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Phrase Level.	80
14.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Phrase Level.	81
15.	Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Phrase Level.	82

16.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Clause Level.	82
17.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Clause Level.	83
18.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Sentence Level.	84
19.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Sentence Level.	85
20.	Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Sentence Level.	86
21.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Multi-Sentence Level	86
22.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Multi-Sentence Level	87
23.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Text Level	88
24.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Text Level	89
25.	Correlations of Number of Revisions In Levels and Quality.	113
26.	Analysis of Variance Among Groups for the Holistic Score Measure of Quality for Draft One.	96
27.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Holistic Score Measure for Quality for Draft One. . .	96

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Research and control groups with treatment procedures.	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Writing is an integral part of instruction in most formal educational settings, and it is also important for purposes of communication in general. Writing is important because it may be utilized not only in academic and social activities but also in people's personal and work lives. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (1987) highlights writing occurrences in people's lives with these statements:

People write to accomplish many different purposes, such as straightening out a billing error by letter, explaining a personal viewpoint on an issue in a speech, or expressing an artistic impulse in a story or poem. The ability to explain ideas or document events in writing can also help in a variety of job situations. Letters, reports, inventories, and a wide range of recordkeeping systems are integral to many businesses. (p. 9)

In more global terms, writing is universally important as stated by Freedman, Dyson, Flower, and Chafe (1987).

Written language allows us to come to know and understand our human nature, to chronicle our history and culture, to learn in all disciplines. (p. 1)

Although there has been renewed interest in writing research, and some improvement has been reported by NAEP, (1986) in the results of a national sample, writing continues to be identified as an educational issue in need of attention. The concern with the quality of writing produced by students in public schools has been clearly voiced.

A December, 1975 Newsweek article titled "Why Johnny Can't Write", indicated that there was an inexcusable lack of writing skill being demonstrated at all levels of the American educational system. Since that time, there have been many efforts made toward understanding and improving students' ability to write. Although such efforts have been made, writing continues to be identified as an area that needs attention and improvement. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress report, writing performance had improved since the first assessment in 1973, but it was still not at an acceptable level (NAEP, 1977). A more recent report from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 1986) summarizes the trends from 1974 to 1984 as follows:

American students are writing no better in 1984 than they were ten years earlier. Performance of these 9, 13- and 17-year old students is distressingly poor.

(p.3)

Some good and encouraging findings are also reported by

the 1986 NAEP report. It indicates that since 1979, the trends in students' writing performance are toward improvement and that writing instruction is receiving increased time allocations in classrooms.

In January, 1990, the results of the 1988 NAEP study were released. The results indicate additional concern about writing performance, stating that it appears to be essentially the same as it was in 1974 (Applebee, Langer, Mullis, & Jenkins, 1990). Additionally, the latest NAEP study (Applebee et al., 1990) reports "...between 1984 and 1988, eighth-grade students showed more declines than gains, reducing performance gains to approximately the 1974 and 1979 levels" (p.6). Writing is a skill that involves a variety of steps and seems to develop through a series of complex recursive processes (Flower & Hayes, 1980).

Writing is a skill that involves an integrated, recursive process (Planning, Translating, Reviewing). Improving student writing is important to improving student literacy. Revision is one of the steps in writing that may, with appropriate instruction and use, help to improve the quality of students' writing.

Writing instruction seems to be critical to writing improvement. Process writing instruction focuses on activities such as prewriting, drafting, revising and editing in a recursive format rather than by simple linear

procedures (Flower & Hayes, 1980).

Improvement in the quality of writing has focused on each of these process steps. One step, revision, has received attention as an element in the writing process that may offer possibilities for improving writing quality (Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987).

In order to address the continuing concern with students' writing performance, attention needs to be directed toward writing instruction in the classroom. The ability to revise one's own writing is important because rewriting skills are at times considered critical to good writing and how one revises may allow an understanding of the plans a writer has for good writing (NAEP, 1977).

Revision instruction may be one of the ways to help improve writing, but revision is a problem for teachers of writing. It may be an even greater problem for the teachers of inexperienced writers at the middle school age level. Dudley (1989) reports that "Revision is the most difficult part of the writing process...." (p. 31). It is a problem because except for limited evidence to the contrary, many students do not revise, especially younger students and less competent writers (Graves & Murray, 1980; Scardamalia, 1981). Faigley and Witte (1981) suggest that revision may be an issue of student developmental tendencies with older students producing more substantive revisions. Apparently revision does not

occur for several reasons: (1) Writers do not know how to make the appropriate changes. (2) Writers do not recognize problems (intended ideas versus actual text). (3) Writers have difficulty actually making the changes operational and appropriate to a particular audience (Flower, et al., 1986; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1983; Scardamalia, Bereiter, Gartschore & Cattani, 1980; Sommers, 1980; Sun, 1989).

Empirical studies suggest the generally regarded importance of revision in the writing process (Faigley & Witte, 1981; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1986). It is important because it may affect the knowledge students bring to the writing event, thus promoting learning in general and because it can possibly improve writing quality (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1986; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987). Research suggests that revision seems to improve quality in compositions for high school age or older writers and for more experienced writers (Ash, 1983; Bracewell, Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1978; Bridwell, 1980). Although limited, some evidence does seem to indicate that for some (younger students and less competent college students) revision either has no effect or at times a negative effect on the quality of writing (Bracewell, Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1978; Perl, 1979). Interestingly, some intervention studies with younger students report increased revision activity (Calkins, 1980; Graves, 1975),

writing efforts producing higher level revisions (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1983, 1986), and improved text and revision quality by children (Cohen & Scardamalia, 1983).

One of the steps in the recursive process of writing is revision. Revision has not always received special attention concerning its operational definition or its place in helping to improve writing. One of the perplexing problems with revision studies seems to be a definition for revision. Fitzgerald and Markham (1987), investigating the effects of revision instruction on sixth graders, used an all inclusive definition. Their definition of revision was " Revision means making any changes at any point in the writing process" (p.4). Other definitions have not been as inclusive or as clear. Early views of revision focused on sentence level improvements or what is now included in editing or error correction (Fitzgerald et al., 1987). More recently there has been a renewed interest in revision and factors related to revision as potentially important elements in the writing process (Gordon, 1990; Shrofel, 1991). There continues to be this special interest because, if utilized properly, revision might possibly lead to improved writing.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects

of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. It also examined the quantity and types of revisions made in students' essays.

Rationale

The study of writing continues to be an active research area within the study of English. Developmental changes have occurred over a number of years. One important effort that seemed to generate change was the work of Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Schoer (1963). Their review of the research on composition reported that most studies reviewed did not control for important variables and that many of the studies were exercises in error counts or were comparative studies. They also posed the very important question "What is involved in the act of writing?" (p.53).

Much has happened in the more than two and one-half decades since then. Hillocks (1986) summarizes resulting research efforts by groups including many small-sample, think aloud studies of in-process composition, in-class observation of children actually writing, and sometimes larger group experiments to study the composing process.

The most visible of the changes has been the influence of the theory that writing is a process and more specifically a recursive process rather than a linear

process (Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Sommers, 1978; Sommers, 1980). Adding to the research on writing in general and on revision specifically, studies suggest that revision or revising in writing is different for various groups of writers (Beach, 1976; Bridwell, 1980; Faigley & Witte, 1981; Murray, 1978; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980).

Not surprisingly, many factors are reported as having a strong influence on revision. There is much evidence of limited substantive revision by many secondary and college students (NAEP, 1977; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980).

Bridwell (1980) reported twelfth-graders' revision tended to be concentrated in minor editorial changes (surface, word, lexical level changes), although substantive revision (clause, sentence, multiple-sentence level changes) occurred between drafting. Of additional importance is the possibility that writing quality does not necessarily improve with substantive revision, and as Perl (1979) suggests, it may even deteriorate.

Revision and revision research continue to be vital to the writing process. Research suggests that given the proper circumstances, revision may have a positive influence on the quality of final written products (Ash, 1983; Bamberg, 1978; Bracewell, Scardamalia, & Bereiter, 1978; Bridwell, 1980). Although much more research is appearing concerning revision, additions to the body of research focusing on this important step in the writing

process seem appropriate and necessary.

There are many studies that address the writing process in general and include limited information about the subprocess identified as revision. There are relatively few that focus only on revision and even fewer that focus on the relationship of revision instruction or intervention on the quality of the final written product (Fitzgerald, 1987; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987).

The present study examines the effects of direct teacher instruction in revision, and small-group peer generated revision activities on the quality of students' final persuasive essays.

Related Literature

Revision is one of the elements in the writing process that may hold promise for helping to improve the quality of student writing. Although research findings suggest that revision is a recursive and problem-solving process, how the revision process is related to the quality of writing remains as an essentially unexplored area (Fitzgerald, 1987; Hillocks, 1986). Revision instruction activities may affect student revision.

In an attempt to determine the effect revision may have on the quality of students' persuasive writing, this study also utilizes two instructional components, direct instruction and cooperative learning (peer-response

groups). Intervention studies suggest that for older and more experienced writers, revisions seem to improve the quality of writing (Bracewell, Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1978; Bridwell, 1980). Some research indicates improved quality of second drafts after revision instruction (Cohen & Scardamalia, 1983; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987).

Certain writing research indicates that cooperative learning activities promote students' awareness of audience, purpose and goals in their writing (Dahl, 1988; Elbow, 1981; Macrorie, 1980; Rackham, 1984). One recent study of 24 fourth grade students in a two part study of peer conference activity reported that 64% of the interactions addressed revision (38%) or written draft information (26%) (Dahl, 1988). Interestingly, 46% of the suggested revisions made during the peer conferences resulted in actual revisions, and the revisions included title changes, deletions, and additions to clarify or describe (Dahl, 1988). Dudley (1989) reporting on seventh and eighth graders in a writers' workshop with peer response groups, writes "I note the extensive revision processes, the more organized and insightful thinking, the fuller exposition of ideas..." (p.32). Cooperative learning emphasizes a cognitive approach to learning in which students discover and help direct their own learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Slavin, 1980). A form of cooperative learning, small group peer-instruction (peer

response groups) may be very effective with adolescents (Atwell, 1987).

The term "direct instruction" has been used to describe a fairly common pattern of teaching in which a teacher explains a new concept to the students in the large group, has them practice under teacher direction and encourages continued practice individually at the students' seats (Joyce & Weil, 1986). It is characterized by strong teacher direction and control of the learning tasks with academic focus having priority. Some studies indicate that strong academic focus may result in higher "on task" behaviors and, as a result, higher academic achievement (Fisher, et al., 1980; Rosenshine, 1985).

Statement of the Problem

One of the concerns in education today is the quality of students' writing. Given the possible emphases in writing instruction, one potential solution to the problem is an emphasis on instruction in revision. Researchers consider revision to be an important part of the writing process. However, research results are mixed as to what causes writers to revise, what activates the connection between intended and actual text, or what, if any, instruction in revision affects the quality of writing. This study will attempt to build on previous studies to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and

small-group peer generated revision instruction on eighth graders' persuasive essays.

Significance

Literacy, the ability to read and write, continues to be an issue at the national, state and local level. Students' ability to write seems to get special attention. In early January, 1990 the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) released the results of the 1988 national study of the writing proficiency of 9-, 13- and 17-year-olds. The summary of major findings reports "Levels of writing performance in 1988 appeared to be substantially the same as in 1974. Many students continued to perform at minimal levels..." (p.6). This prompted a statement of national concern from the Education Secretary Lauro Cavazos. The Washington Post reported Cavazos as characterizing students' reading and writing skills as remaining "virtually unchanged" and "dreadfully inadequate" (Cooper, 1990). This problem continues to be a national, state and local concern.

Not unlike some other states, Maryland has a functional writing assessment required as part of graduation criteria for students. Early assessments for students in elementary schools, improved instruction in the writing process and improved student pass rates beginning at grade nine are concerns from the state level.

In response to these requirements, local county systems continue to promote a major initiative on writing improvement. The local and school levels are where the actual writing instruction occurs and where improvement will be generated. The local level incorporates all of the national and state concerns plus the most crucial concern which deals with the everyday writing instruction process in the classroom. What are the most effective procedures to use in teaching writing and specifically the subprocess of revision?

Revision is generally viewed as a critical and important element in the writing process (Fitzgerald, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1986). This study will investigate the effects of revision instruction interventions on the quality of eighth grade students' persuasive essays. It will add to previous revision intervention research, and the results may provide data from which an improved revision instruction model may be developed.

Research Questions

Direct Revision Instruction

1. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

2. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

3. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction

4. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

5. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

6. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

Regular Revision Instruction

7. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

8. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

9. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

Relationships Between Levels of Revision,
Stages of Revision and Rated Quality

10. What are the relationships between levels of revision and the rated quality (holistic score) of the essays?

11. Are there initial group differences in writing quality among the direct revision instruction, the small-group peer generated revision instruction, and the regular revision instruction groups?

Definitions

Direct revision instruction - direct instruction by the teacher in the use of addition, deletion, substitutions and rearrangement revision and the compare, diagnose, operate (CDO) procedure (Joyce & Weil, 1986; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1983).

Small-group peer generated revision - text changes generated in cooperative learning peer response groups (Operational definition by the researcher).

Regular revision instruction - school district writing instruction and directions to make any and all changes necessary to improve the writing draft (Operational definition by the researcher).

Revision - any change made on subjects' papers after completing the writing of a first draft (Operationally adapted from Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987).

Quality of writing - a characteristic that was assessed utilizing a holistic rating score for the quality of students' persuasive essays.

Number and type of revisions - Characteristics that were assessed utilizing a Revision Classification Scheme (Bridwell, 1980).

Persuasive essay - a composition that attempts to influence others to bring about some action or change (NAEP, 1987).

Cooperative learning - instructional methods in which

students work on learning activities in small groups and receive rewards or recognition based on their group's performance (Slavin, 1980).

Holistic scoring - a means of rank ordering students by writing ability according to the criteria established in a scoring guide (Cooper, 1977).

Limitations

There are several limitations in the present study. They involve subjects, methodology and generalizability.

1. Subjects were not randomly assigned to treatment groups due to the use of intact classes.

2. Since access to the public school system was limited, this was a short-term study.

3. Revision is but one stage in the writing process and, as such, other elements may affect the final quality of a student's writing.

Summary

In this chapter, I have presented an introduction which includes a presentation of the purpose of the study, the research questions, a rationale, related literature, the significance of the study, definitions, and limitations.

In Chapter II, I will review the literature.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. In this chapter, I identify and discuss the literature related to revision. I begin with an introduction to revision and include related composition research, research that is critical to this study, and revision instruction research with direct instruction and cooperative learning presented as methods of revision instruction.

Writing is an integral part of instruction in most formal educational settings and it is also important for purposes of communication in general. Although there is renewed interest in the process of writing, the concern with the quality of writing from students in public schools has been clearly voiced.

A December, 1975 Newsweek article titled "Why Johnny Can't Write", indicates that there was an inexcusable lack of writing skill being demonstrated at all levels of the American educational system. Similarly, a January, 1990 editorial in The Washington Post titled "Another Bad

Report Card" referring to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report emphasizes the unacceptably low reading and writing results. Writing performance continues to be a problem. Writing is a skill that involves a variety of steps.

One of the steps in the process of writing is revision. Revision has not always received special attention concerning its operational definition or its place in helping to improve writing. More recently there has been a renewed interest in revision as an element in the writing process. There continues to be this special interest because, if utilized properly, revision may possibly lead to improved writing quality.

Revision is one of the elements in the writing process that may hold promise for helping to improve the quality of student writing. Although research indicates the recursive and problem-solving nature of revision, how the revision process is related to the quality of writing remains as an essentially unexplored area (Fitzgerald, 1987; Hillocks, 1986).

Revision

The teaching of writing is a major element of instruction in education today. Nestled in the very nature and fabric of writing composition is the process of revision. Continuing research on revision has left

many unanswered questions concerning the nature of and the appropriate instructional techniques to be utilized in the instruction of revision. Revision certainly seems to be a necessary consideration when addressing concerns for the instruction of writing.

Much public attention has been given to student deficiencies in this area and the result has been renewed interest in the teaching of writing. Educators at all levels seem to have responded by attempting with renewed vigor to identify and solve the apparent complex problems associated with the teaching of composition. When attention is focused on the research to provide information that might be useful for instructional implications, a variety of studies seem to provide a variety of possible useful information.

Addressing the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College, Muller (1967), referring to composition, suggested that nothing was taught in English less effectively, amid more confusion and conflict of theory or hunch. According to Squire and Applebee (1968), the standard procedure in English classes of writing, correcting, returning and occasionally rewriting insured a rather fragmentary approach to the writing process. Murray (1978) notes a similar circumstance for revision in suggesting that it may be the least examined,

understood, researched and possibly least taught of the writing skills. Since that time a number of studies have sought to address those concerns and to provide information.

Given the expressions of concern and dissatisfaction with composition instruction, teachers and researchers needed and continue to need to seek improved, more effective methods for providing informed composition instruction. Since these concerns were expressed, a number of studies have expressly sought to solve some of the problems.

One of the purposes of this study was to examine the effects of revision on the quality of eighth grade students' writing. More specifically, the study examined the effects of teacher directed revision, small-group student generated revision, and traditional revision instruction on the quality of students' persuasive essays and on the quantity and type of students' revisions.

Review of Composition Research Literature

One area of composition research that continues to need attention seems to be the revision process. Although much work has been reported recently concerning composition in general and revision in particular, there is a variety of findings and conclusions. Not the least of these seems to be a

working definition of revision. Walkup (1982) describes revision as "those activities, including rewriting, that involve the writer's reconsideration of form and content" (p. 3). According to Murray (1978) the one writing skill that is least researched or understood is "rewriting". Calkins (1980), in a study of third grade writers, notes that "rewriting (drafting) does not necessarily involve revision (deliberate change)" (p. 333). Emig (1971) used "reformulation" to include editing and revision. According to Faigley and Witte (1981), revision was also seen as a tidying-up activity that included eliminating surface errors usually after a draft was completed.

The linear theory of composing which includes the three-stage model of composing, one stage being "rewriting," has largely been discredited as the only way that writers always compose (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Sommers, 1980). Mohr (1984) states that "All revision is toward meaning in form, toward communicating meaning to an expected reader" (p. 236). All of the views of revision may have elements of merit about them and may be instrumental in the renewed interest in revision.

Since the study of writing has been and continues to be an active research area within the study of English, certain changes have occurred that have influenced the

study of writing. The work of Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer (1963) seemed to generate new interest in writing research. Their review of the research reported many educational studies of writing, but most were without any theoretical considerations of writing abilities or recognition of similar completed studies.

Much has happened in the more than two and one-half decades since then. The most visible of the changes has been the influence of the theory that writing is a process. Early "process theory" researchers proposed linear models of composing, usually including three separate stages (Rohman, 1955; Rohman & Wlecke, 1964).

Importantly, the status and theory of revision evolved with increased research on the writing process. Revision has been described in many textbooks as "the process by which a writer merely cleans up the mechanical and stylistic infelicities of an otherwise completed text" (Witte, 1983, p. 313). The linear process theory of revision seems to have been refuted as "the writing process" by research findings that tend to demonstrate a recursive rather than a linear process (Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Sommers, 1978; Sommers, 1980). Adding to the research on the effects or results of revision, studies suggest that revision or revising in writing is different for various groups of writers (Beach, 1976; Bidwell, 1980; Faigley &

Witte, 1981; Murray, 1978; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980). Additionally, in attempting to study and explain the revisions that writers make, researchers have developed systems of classifying revisions (Bridwell, 1980; Faigley & Witte, 1981).

Not surprisingly, many factors may have a strong influence on revision. There is much evidence of limited substantive revision by many secondary and college students (NAEP, 1977; Perl, 1979; Sommers, 1980). Bridwell (1980) reported twelfth-graders' revision tended to be concentrated in minor editorial changes although substantive revision occurs between drafting. Writing quality does not necessarily improve with substantive revision, and as Perl (1979) suggests, it may even deteriorate. Results from the study (Perl, 1979) have been questioned (Hillocks, 1986) and may be somewhat suspect due to the use of few subjects (5) and few higher level revision categories.

One of the first studies to concentrate on revision reported results that indicated that "extensive" revisers were more competent writers than "nonextensive" revisers (Beach, 1976). That conclusion was quickly argued on the basis that indeed more competent writers, because of augmenting skills, may not have the need to revise extensively to produce quality writing (Dieterich, 1976). There has been some evidence to suggest that lack

of substantive revision at the secondary grade level may involve conditions of cognitive development and the inability in the area of critical self-assessing (Beach, 1979; Beach & Eaton, 1984; Beach, 1986). Difficulty in self-assessing and revising may also be linked to anxiety. According to Daly and Miller (1975); Daly (1979), students scoring high on the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Scale were reported to have had decision making problems due to the multiple and sometimes competing task demands of their writing plus having limited satisfaction with their writing. In a study of self-assessment of writing drafts by college freshmen, the findings indicate sex of the subjects and apprehension were factors in the reported significant differences in the number of their self-assessing inferences (Beach & Eaton, 1984).

Although questions remain unanswered concerning how revision and qualitative improvement in writing are related, there is some evidence to indicate improvement in revising abilities with normal cognitive or linguistic development. A study of nine, thirteen, and seventeen-year-old students reported that all three groups made more stylistic, informational and mechanical changes than surface, continuational, transitional, organizational, or holistic changes, but older students made more of the latter changes

(NAEP, 1977). Interestingly, that National Assessment study reported that overall organization, tone, or ideational ratings were not significantly improved by revision. In a study by Bracewell, Scardamalia, and Bereiter (1978) of fourth, eighth and twelfth grade students revising with multiple sets of directions, significant differences were reported. The results indicated no significant changes at grade four, harmful changes at grade eight and limited improvements at grade twelve. Stallard (1974), in a study comparing writing behaviors of good writers to a randomly selected group of writers, reported that the good writers made more multiple level changes, were more likely to reread their drafts, and were more likely to revise during rereading. Many factors seem to be involved in the complicated revision process.

Reviews of Critical Significant Research

For some time, research concerning the composing process seems to generally have followed two not unrelated directions. One includes studies that focus on observing writers while they work (Berkenkotter, 1983; Emig, 1971; Graves, 1975; Perl, 1979; Pianko, 1979; Stallard, 1974). Another focuses on studies that consider some limited area of composing which might give rise to some cognitive/developmental theory of

writing or a model of linguistic ability based on surface or product features of writing (Crowhurst & Piche, 1979; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Kroll, 1978; Rubin & Piche, 1979). Additionally, some studies of revision focus on the kinds, numbers and quality of revisions made by writers while others focus on attempts to determine the cognitive processes that are involved with revision.

Production studies focus on information about numbers and kinds of revisions students produce. Differences in findings give rise to continued research. Emig (1971), in discussing "reformulation" as including editing and revising, indicates students do not engage in "reformulation". In contrast, Bridwell (1980) reports an average of 61 revisions per student in her study of twelfth grade students' revisions. Stallard (1974) reports good writers having made an average of slightly over twelve revisions per paper and the randomly selected writers made an average of only a bit over four per paper. Of the 248 total revisions made by the subjects in Stallard's study only six were at the paragraph level. There was no category for higher level changes or revisions such as point of view or type of discourse. Calkins (1980) in a study of seventeen third graders included classifying them into four groups: random drafting, refining, transition, and

interacting. The classifications were based on the students' revision behavior of their own work and on their revision behavior in revising a researcher-prepared composition. These studies suggest differences and complexities in revision.

The importance of revision in the composing process is suggested in the theoretical and empirical research. One of the critical studies involved experienced and inexperienced writers. Sommers (1980) conducted a case study with twenty college freshmen student writers and twenty identified experienced writers. Revision processes were compared to attempt to determine the role of revision in the writing process. Each student wrote expressive, explanatory and persuasive essays and rewrote each essay. This activity was followed by interviews and requests for suggested revisions of an anonymous composition. Essays were analyzed by counting and categorizing changes produced. Four revision operations - deletion, substitution, addition, and reordering were identified along with four levels of changes (word, phrase, sentence, and theme). A coding system for identifying the frequency by level and operation of revisions and a "scale of concerns" for determining writers' level of concerns when revising were developed and utilized for the study.

Sommers reported that the results of the study indicated student writers view the revision process as necessitating lexical but not semantic changes. It is suggested that students are not necessarily unwilling to revise but do so in a very limited and predictable manner. Additionally, students seem to view their writing in a linear fashion, and revising stops when they determine no revising rules have been violated; all are strategies that have been taught to them.

In comparing student revision with experienced writer revision, several differences seem to be evident. Experienced writers see revising as discovering the form or shape of their thesis and discovering a concern for their readership or audience. Any perceived dissonance seems to generate revision in the writer's work according to the researcher. It is suggested that writing cannot develop "like a line" since any addition or deletion is a reordering. Results suggest that where student writers struggle to have their essays conform to predefined meanings, experienced writers seek to discover meanings through revision. Additionally, the findings suggest that students need to utilize, as do experienced writers, the difference between writing and speech - which is that "revision is possible".

Another study that investigated the factors

influencing revision was conducted by Bridwell (1980). The subjects of the study were 171 of 195 twelfth grade students in eleven English classes in a Georgia high school which usually reports achievement scores on or above the national average. Analyzed for revisions were 100 randomly selected student papers.

Although the Bridwell study was an exploratory, descriptive study, there were several research questions which were used as guides during the research:

1. What are the general characteristics of the revisions in the composing process of twelfth grade students?
2. What are the associations between levels of revision and the rated quality of the essays?
3. What are the associations between stages of revision and the rated quality of the essays?
4. What are the associations between each level at each stage of revision and the rated quality of revision?

The writing assignment used by the researcher was an adaptation of an "explanatory" task used as part of the Buffalo Cross-sectional Study of Writing Performance and it asked students to describe something that was very familiar to them. Transactional writing, used to record facts, exchange opinions, explain and

explore ideas, construct theories, transact business, conduct campaigns and change public opinion was selected since it is most representative of the type of writing required most frequently in school.

Addressing a concern for a possible partially flawed result from the National Assessment revision study where the writing tasks were arbitrarily imposed and impromptu in nature, students were permitted to use "fact sheets" in order to develop ideas ahead of time, thus giving the subjects a choice within the controlled transactional assignment. The writing assignments were administered by the regular classroom teachers with directions and fact sheets distributed the day before the writing assignment. Directions given on the writing day included task information plus a specific statement to mark through lightly any changes on notes or drafts and that the students would be able to revise the next day in class.

Bridwell included additional procedures in her study. Blue pens were used for the first session, and black for the second in order to distinguish draft and production marks. Although considered a regular class assignment, the essays were not graded, but the incentive of possible publication was offered. The researcher developed "an exhaustive and mutually exclusive scheme for classifying revisions" (p. 103).

It included many subcategories under seven major categories or levels (surface, lexical, phrase, clause, sentence, multi-sentence and text). Two doctoral students in English were trained using the researcher's scheme and after tests of reliability, they classified every revision. To assess the quality of the written products of the study, a slightly modified version of the Analytic Quality Scale developed by Deiderich was utilized. After preliminary reliability assessments, they scored the actual sample. General differences between first and second drafts were analyzed on qualitative ratings, overall word count, and total number of revisions. Analysis of associations among levels and stages of revision, between revision and quality and between revision levels, stages, and levels at each stage was also conducted.

The findings concerning general differences between drafts focus on the areas of cosmetic, quality and length. The most apparent differences were reported to be cosmetic or general neatness of papers. Quality ratings were significantly higher for second drafts $p < .0001$ for general merit and $p < .0001$ for mechanics. The findings concerning length indicated significant increases in the length of the second drafts $p < .0001$. Significant positive correlations between essay length and general merit and total

quality improvements were also reported. The study indicated that there were patterns in revising strategies of twelfth graders' transactional writing and that differences in the patterns were related to the quality of the writing. Surface level, spelling, punctuation, and word choice changes were most frequent. The study reported support for developmental differences in tendency and ability to revise. Successful students' revisions were across levels and stages. Poorer writers either revised very little or revised extensively in-process at only surface and word levels.

The model for revision in the composing process suggested by Bridwell is based on the assumption that the process is both linear and recursive. The loops of the model continue recursively until dissonance in the product is resolved or until no further alterations by the writer are desired. The researcher suggests a need for a variety of perspectives to be examined in order to get a clearer picture of revision in the composing process.

The research on revision has progressed through stages as is true with most attempts at serious, continuing research. According to Faigley and Witte (1981), the more recent view of revision as a complex activity had to overcome the teacher view of revision

as copy-editing, a tidying-up activity aimed at eliminating surface errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling and diction. The three-stage linear model of composing, prewriting, writing and rewriting activities assumed in the tidying-up version of revision suggested that revision was something to be completed by a writer after writing a first draft. Earlier studies suggested that the linear model of composing has essentially been discarded especially in regard to the causes and effects of revision (Flower & Hayes, 1980). Sommers (1980), in a study of the effects of revision in the composing process, suggested that the linear model was simplistic at best and possibly completely inaccurate. The results also indicated that writers of different abilities make different types of revisions.

Two studies by Faigley and Witte (1981) indicated support for the Sommers' study. The researchers essentially learned through a method of text analysis, that expert and inexperienced writers revise in different ways, what Sommers learned by using interviews. The investigators proposed a taxonomy of revision changes in order to be able to analyze revision (Faigley & Witte, 1984). Changes were based on "whether new information is brought to the text or whether old information is removed in such a way that it cannot be recovered through drawing inferences"

(Faigley & Witte, 1981, p. 402). The system included surface changes and meaning changes. Surface change subcategories of formal changes and meaning-preserving changes plus meaning change subcategories of microstructure and macrostructure changes were devised. Each of the four subcategories included specific operations.

After testing for reliability, the system was utilized to analyze revisions from six inexperienced student writers, six advanced student writers and six expert adult professional writers. Subjects were from the University of Texas writing classes. The results suggest differences in revision activities of the three groups. Expert writers showed the least (144) changes per 1000 words on final drafts. Inexperienced writers' changes were primarily surface changes and only twelve percent of their revisions were meaning changes. Meaning change revisions by advanced students and expert adults were reported as 24 percent and 34 percent, respectively. The number of revisions during the first draft indicated more revisions of all kinds by expert adults and advanced students than by inexperienced students. More significantly, meaning change frequencies for expert adults, advanced students and inexperienced student writers were reported as an average of 15.4, 10.4, and 3 meaning changes per 1000

words, respectively. The researchers attribute the first stage revision differences to different methods used in composing. Studies of experienced and inexperienced writers' revisions tend to support such claims (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Perl, 1979).

After analyzing the results of their first study, Faigley and Witte (1981) were hesitant to draw firm conclusions since adult expert writers unexpectedly revised much less than the advanced student writers. In order to possibly determine what revision strategies might be taught to inexperienced writers, a second study was conducted. Copies of three inexperienced writers' first drafts were given to expert adults to revise as they would do it. The experts' changes were compared with the changes made in the inexperienced writers' second drafts. Wide differences were again reported with inexperienced writers making many surface changes (98 per 1000 words) and few macrostructure changes (1.3 words per 1000 words) while expert adult writers made macrostructure changes 65 percent of the time. Considering the methods reported for the studies, the researchers' somewhat hesitant conclusions based on the reported results seem more than justified.

According to the researchers, the results tend to support the conclusion that expert adult and inexperienced student writers revise differently. Since

even expert writers demonstrated a variety of revision patterns, demanding that inexperienced writers simply revise more does not seem justified.

It is suggested that revision changes are dependent on many variables, including the skill of the writers. Such variables, "situational variables", including the purpose for writing the text, the format, the medium, the genre, familiarity with the task, subject and audience, formality level, length of the task and the proposed text must be included in the writing process in general and for research on revision in particular.

As a tool to be considered in the text analysis investigations of revision, a method of quantifying revision changes is presented in these studies. The taxonomy of revision changes suggests a method to assist with research on the many variables associated with revision in the composing process.

Looking past the results of effects of revision, there is logical concern for investigating the causes of revision. Although the issue of composing aloud is problematical for researchers, Flower and Hayes (1980) address the issue of causes in case studies using composing-aloud protocols. Expert writers reportedly revise frequently when the audience and the goals of texts are redefined or clarified by the writers (Flower & Hayes, 1980).

Witte (1983) examined textual causes and effects of revision by examining the T-unit, clause, and text length with a focus on the revision/topical structure relationship at the sentence and whole discourse levels. Approximately eighty university students with varying abilities were asked to revise a passage from Anne and Peter Doughty's "Language and Community". Subjects were given forty minutes to read and revise the passage to make it more readable and understandable, but to retain its identity as informative discourse. The audience was assumed to be a college-level audience with some knowledge of the text subject. From these revised texts, trained raters selected texts for a "low score" group (N = 20) which were judged as being difficult to read and understand and a "high score" group (N = 24) which had been judged as easy to read and understand.

The revisions were analyzed in terms of selected features: number of words; T-units; clauses; sentence topics; parallel, sequential, and extended parallel progressions; and T-units in each type of topical progression. For additional analysis of the raw data, five computed variables were utilized by the researcher. The variables are stated as words per sentence topic, T-units per sentence topic, percentage of T-units in the three types of topical progressions, words per clause and words per T-unit. Comparing the

two groups of texts, the findings indicate that five significant differences appeared in the two sets of revisions. Text length and the means for the number of sentence topics differed significantly in the sets of revisions. Additionally, it was reported that only the means for clause length of the two computed syntactic variables were significantly different as were the mean number of T-units per sentence topic and the mean percentage of T-units in sequential progressions.

This study suggests that "a successful reviser must understand the topical structure and the macrostructure of the text being revised" (p., 331). Results also indicate that low-score revisions usually reflected an incomplete understanding of the original text and the researcher concludes that if students misunderstand their own text and related purposes, they may not be able to make revisions other than surface level changes. The revision process continues to generate questions as to what it includes and how it fits into composition.

Much interest in revision has resulted in the past two decades. One of the more recent factors adding to the information on revision is the research related to the field of technology with special attention given to the computer and the multiple opportunities that this technology offers. One of areas to which research in

writing has directed its attention is to the possibilities that the computer has for improving writing, possibly by assisting with the work of research and possibly by informing researchers about writing, especially revision processes.

There seems to be a level of agreement on the contention that revision is a difficult and complicated process for writers even though there is much disagreement as to just how the revision process becomes operational for writers (Bartlett, 1981; Bartlett, 1982; Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver & Stratman, 1986). In an attempt to add tools to the process, the use of technology has been considered in the form of computers and word processing programs (Collier, 1983; Daiute, 1983; Sommers, 1980). Some controversy seems to have developed as to the value of computers and word processing programs especially for revision activities.

One general observation is that although the technology has been available for some time, it has not produced dramatic or real, significant changes in writing instruction (Bridwell, Nancarrow, & Ross, 1984). It is also suggested that without revision and comprehensive composition instruction, along with the use of the text processing system, mechanical editing could lead to difficulties in the coherence of the text produced by

students. Additionally, text coherence may be negatively affected by the size of the screen displaying the text. For some writers who create sentence by sentence error-free drafts, the word processor's immediate text change features could also become a problem and, in fact, the writing process could be slowed down by the use of a tool whose one major contribution involves the claim of saving the writer's time.

Bean (1983) proposes that the use of word processing technology has advantages for editing and possibly revision, but the computer does not resolve directly the problem of psychological and cognitive blocks that students may experience during revision. Diem (1986) suggests that because of the traditional models of instruction most teachers have, they view any deviation from these methods and activities as diminishing the type and amount of information that students should necessarily receive. Daiute (1985) contends that word processing remains only as a potential aid if writers do not review, evaluate and work to improve their writing.

It is reported that revision of surface features and format of text is easier for writers using word processing (Bridwell, Nancarrow, & Ross, 1984). Some more elaborate computer programs and systems, such as Writer's Workbench developed at Bell Laboratories and adapted for use at Colorado State University as part of a project to

encourage thorough and accurate revision and editing, may provide additional data about the revision process (Kiefer & Smith, 1984). According to Bridwell and Ross (1984), in addition to the advantages of helping writers produce texts and manipulate words within texts, computer programs can also give information, produce feedback on entered texts and provide prompts to a writer to do certain things in a linear sequence of steps or in complex branching and looping patterns.

In order to study writers' reactions to word processors and possible implications for including the computer technology in composition classrooms, the University of Minnesota conducted various research projects that focus on those elements (Bridwell, Nancarrow, & Ross, 1984). The first study from the projects investigated the effects of composing with a word processing system on the products and processes of experienced writers. The results indicate that the writer's own style was a more significant indicator of how the computer was utilized than the computer alone (Bridwell, Johnson, & Brehe, 1985). The studies of the computer word processing programs and revision still produce questions and no definitive answers to the complexities of revision.

Early Revision Research

Early research studies on revision concentrated on the mechanical elements of writing. In a study by Fellows (1936) with ninth graders, those students who revised their writing after teacher correction made fewer errors in grammar and punctuation than did students in a control group. A study by Lyman (1931) indicated that one method of revision, practice in self-appraisal before turning in papers, resulted in a reduction of mechanical and grammatical errors from pretest to posttest.

Lange (1948) evaluated writing errors in essay tests administered in a course other than English. In freshman classes of Human Growth and Development, Lange notes among other findings that given time, students are capable of mechanical revision to some degree as evidenced by student correction of slightly over one-third of their total misspellings and over half of their punctuation errors.

Fortunately, a study by Buxton (1959) went beyond previous experiments in its attention to revision. The "revision" experimental group spent from thirty-five to fifty minutes per essay in class discussion and in actual correction of errors with the instructor available for individual assistance. The results of the study indicated that the "revision" group was superior on several measures of writing improvement to

both the control group and the less-structured "freedom from restraint" experimental group. The effect of revision and its relationship to other study variables was not definitive. In reviewing the studies of Buxton, Fellows, and Lyman, Braddock, et al. (1963) reported no conclusive evidence about the value of revision or the particular aspects of composition learned through its practice.

Revision that went beyond proofreading was an important element of the study by McColly (1963). It was reported that increased writing in itself failed to produce better writing, but groups that participated in "functional activities" such as discussion, practical explanation, peer evaluation, and revision obtained better results. The study recommended that English teachers "should not assign or elicit any writing for the purpose of developing composition ability unless this writing becomes the vehicle for functional instruction" (p. 64). Interestingly, this study also did not attempt to calculate the exact effect of revision on writing improvement.

In an examination of secondary English instruction, Squire and Applebee (1968) noted a lack of empirical knowledge about revision but believed that "those students who are forced to think back through their first writing and then rework the original into

something better must gain in fluency and precision" (p. 122). Additionally, they noted that most high school composition was fragmentary, devoting too little time to composition instruction (15.7% of class time) and too much time to instruction after writing.

Emig (1971), in a study of the composing process of twelfth-graders, used the word "reformulation" to include correcting, revising and rewriting - three distinct tasks differing according to quantity of change. The study indicates that she discovered that teachers often emphasized the correction of trivia as reformulation and, as a result, gave students a distorted notion of this important part of the composing process. Emig also notes that students voluntarily revised their self-sponsored writings but did not so with those assigned by teachers.

Effros (1973) conducted a study on the effects of teacher guided revision with ten sections of students at a Connecticut college. Experimental group members received no grades until revisions had been completed. On the essays, terminal statements praising and giving directions for specific revision were offered in addition to marginal comments covering mechanics, sentence structure, and organization of theme and paragraphs. Control group members received immediate grades and only incidental treatment for any voluntary

revision. Effros (1973) reported that students whose revisions were guided by the teachers and whose work was not graded until such revisions were completed achieved no better than students whose work was immediately graded and revisions treated incidentally.

In a study of the writing processes of Virginia high school seniors, Stallard (1974) defined revision as "corrections,, changes, additions to, or deletions from what was originally written" (p. 212). The results of the study indicated that not only did good writers revise significantly more than writers from a random sample but that they also demonstrated significantly more use of three types of revision: single word, multiple word, and paragraph changes.

With twenty-six preservice English teachers at the University of Minnesota, Beach (1976) conducted an informal, exploratory investigation of the strategies employed by extensive revisers and by non-extensive revisers. Using free-written first drafts and taped comments, Beach determined that extensive revisers perceived more major changes in revision, viewed revision more holistically, considered first drafts to be tentative writings, predicted developmental changes from one draft to another, and tended to be less egocentric and more self-critical. In a response to Beach's findings, Dieterich (1976) maintained that

thorough revisions of papers may not be necessary for some good writers. He contends that even good writers often only change words and make mechanical alterations when revising.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress report of 1977 concentrated on revision and reaffirmed some previous findings. As expected, the writing and organization of the 2500 subjects - aged nine, thirteen, and seventeen - improved with maturity, but holistic, organizational, and transitional revisions were infrequent at all ages. Specific improvements such as stylistic, informational, and mechanical changes were more common and became more pronounced with maturity. Applebee (1978) surveyed one group of good writers and the results indicated that teachers were involved in the process of writing and rewriting with students. Students reported that they had discussed 26% of their papers with their teachers while writing and 45% of the papers with their teachers after writing. Only 14% of the papers were rewritten after being handed in a first time. When rewriting did occur, it was more strongly associated with discussions with the teacher than with written comments and corrections.

In a continuing case study of the composing process, Calkins (1980) reported four kinds of rewriting practiced by third-graders. First, random

drafting was haphazard, undirected writing that was not re-read or reconsidered. Refining involved only superficial changes because the first draft had determined the paper's subject and voice. Next, the writers engaged in the transition stage were less likely to be content with their first drafts and would abandon them to begin new ones. Finally, interacting involved the writer with the draft, the audience, and the evolving subject: "There is a constant vying between intended meaning and discovered meaning, between the forward motion of making and the backward motion of assessing" (Calkins, 1980, p. 334).

Studies of Revision Instruction

In reviewing the studies that address issues related to the cause or effect of the revision process, many theories and conclusions are proposed. An additional area related to the revision studies is revision instruction, especially instructional formats for instruction in revision. This includes the manner in which revision is facilitated in the classroom. Since the manner in which revision is presented, encouraged or facilitated may have an influence on the writer's revision process and therefore on the quality of the written product, it seems important to consider the instructional format of revision activities.

Studies indicating reasons for students' failure to make substantial revisions have been joined by extensive research on writing quality as it relates to global instructional methods which often revealed no significant differences in writing quality due to the instructional intervention (Beach & Eaton, 1984). According to Witte, Meyer, Miller, and Faigley (1981), among the most successful college writing instructional activities are collaborative learning, peer tutoring and peer editing.

These three methods are based on the assumption that students have abilities to revise or suggest revisions in papers other than their own (Witte, 1983). In a study of three modes of instruction in freshman English classes, Hillocks (1981) used interviews and observations to classify instructors as presentational, nondirectional, environmental, or individual. Student attitudes were reported to be most positive for the environmental mode and least positive for the nondirectional mode of instruction for the English classes.

The presentational mode has several characteristics such as having relatively clear and specific objectives, a combination of lecture and teacher-led discussion dealing with concepts to be

learned and applied, additional materials to explain and illustrate concepts, specific assignments, and feedback. The natural process mode is illustrated by generalized objectives, free writing, writing for audiences of peers, feedback from peers, opportunities to revise and rework compositions, and high interaction level among students. The environmental mode is characterized by offering clear and specific objectives, select materials and problems to engage students with each other in specifiable processes important to some particular aspect of writing, and specific task peer interaction. The individualized mode provides instruction to students through some kind of tutorials, programmed materials or a combination of the two with the focus of instruction varying from mechanics to researching, planning, and writing papers. These modes of instruction reportedly set the stage for the format of instruction in writing and for the revision process (Hillocks, 1986).

The value of strategies of careful revision, the "re-seeing" of the composition as a whole, has long been emphasized by teachers and writers alike. Nold (1979) objected to revision as a one-time process and suggested that in experimental studies, researchers need to consider task difficulty and behaviors beyond a student's writing

sample. Sommers (1979) noted that perceiving revision as part of a series of temporal stages misrepresents the composing process and that indeed the correct perspective is seeing "the entire composing process as a process of revision" (p. 48).

Direct Instruction

The term direct instruction has been used to describe a fairly common pattern of teaching in which a teacher explains a new concept to the students in the large group, has them practice under teacher direction and encourages continued practice individually at the students' seats (Joyce & Weil, 1986). It is characterized by strong teacher direction and control of the learning tasks with academic focus having priority. Several studies indicate that strong academic focus may result in higher "on task" behaviors and, as a result, higher academic achievement (Fisher et al., 1980; Rosenshine, 1978).

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning emphasizes a cognitive approach to learning in which students discover and help direct their own learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Slavin, 1980). Much writing research has focused on the cognitive aspects of composition and somewhat less on the usefulness of specific instructional activities to improve

the quality of student writing (O'Donnell, Dansereau, Rocklin, Larson, Hythecker, Young & Lambiotte, 1987).

Certain types of cooperative learning have evolved to include careful selection of groups, heterogeneous participation, specific activities, group and individual goals, and group and individual rewards (Slavin, 1980). Cooperation among students in their own learning is not new, but it does continue to evolve.

O'Donnell et al. (1987) state that "While the potential of cooperation among students as an instructional tool in the teaching of writing has been recognized, there has been little systematic research directed at the identification of those aspects of writing that are improved as a result of cooperation" (p. 91). A form of cooperative learning, small-group peer generated response activity, utilizes the cooperative techniques in order to improve student performance and cooperative activities.

Summary of Purpose

In reviewing the research, there is general agreement that revision is relatively important. That process of continual striving for meaning in what is written means continual revision. Conclusions from research seem to indicate that revision is a recursive process but may be linear for some people some of the

time, that revision is a very complex skill, and that revision needs additional study. The need for additional study seems especially important in order to help determine how revision instruction might assist and possibly promote appropriate, improved writing.

A review of the literature on revision seems to indicate that revision instruction research is somewhat limited (Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987). Consequently, there continues to be a need to extend research efforts that address the delivery of revision instruction as a possible means to improve student writing.

Present Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of teacher directed revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. This research focused on the following questions related to Direct Revision Instruction, Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction, Regular Revision Instruction, and Relationships Between Levels of Revision, Stages of Revision, and Rated Quality.

1. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

2. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders's' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

3. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

4. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

5. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

6. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

7. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive

essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

8. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

9. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

10. What are the relationships between levels of revision and the rated quality (holistic score) of the essays?

11. Are there initial group differences in writing quality among the direct revision instruction, the small-group peer generated revision instruction, and the regular revision instruction groups?

Summary

In this chapter, I have identified and discussed the literature related to revision including an introduction to revision, related composition research, research critical to this study, and related revision instruction research. In Chapter III, I present the methodology.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. In this chapter, I describe the subjects, teachers, materials, procedures, design and analyses, dependent measures, training of raters, and the scoring procedures.

Subjects

The subjects of the study were 152 eighth grade students from three middle schools in a semi-suburban, generally middle to upper middle class, community in a rapidly growing school district in Maryland. The three schools represented in the study were middle schools and included only sixth, seventh and eighth grade students. The schools were not randomly selected but were assigned by the county Director of Testing and Measurement and the reading/language arts supervisor based on school interest in participating in the study. Subjects were not randomly assigned to treatments. Instead, treatments were randomly assigned to intact classes. Groups included in the study were designated as Research Group A, Research Group B,

and Control Group C (see Figure 1).

Three teachers, one each from three different middle schools, participated in the study. In order to control for treatment diffusion, three different schools were used in this study. Teachers were randomly assigned to either Research Group A, Research Group B, or to the Control Group C. The average student enrollment in the three schools included in the study was 852.

Eighth grade students were selected for this study because they had received middle school instruction for three years, were familiar with middle school procedures, were preparing to exit the middle level program to enter high school, were receiving writing instruction as part of the reading/language arts classes and would be required to take the Maryland Writing Test, a state graduation requirement, as they moved into the ninth grade.

Students from two intact, average (as determined by county guidelines, California Achievement Test scores and teacher recommendations) reading/language arts classes from each of three schools served as subjects for the study. County guidelines allowed for only three levels of grouping (below grade level, on grade level, and above grade level) for reading/language arts classes.

The organization of middle schools in this district provided for each reading/language arts class to have two class periods per day or approximately 100 minutes of

Figure 1. Research and control groups with treatment procedures.

Research Group A Teacher A - School A		
<u>Day</u>	DIRECT INSTRUCTION Class A1	SMALL-GROUP PEER RESPONSE Class A2
1	Introduction/1st Draft	Introduction/1st Draft
2	Direct Instruction	Small-Group Peer Response
3	Review/ Write Final Draft	Review/ Write Final Draft
Research Group B Teacher B - School B		
	DIRECT INSTRUCTION Class B1	SMALL-GROUP PEER RESPONSE Class B2
1	Introduction/1st Draft	Introduction/1st Draft
2	Direct Instruction	Small-Group Peer Response
3	Review/ Write Final Draft	Review/ Write Final Draft
Control Group C Teacher C - School C		
	CONTROL Class C1	CONTROL Class C2
1	Introduction/1st Draft	Introduction/1st Draft
2	Return Draft With Directions To Revise	Return Draft With Directions To Revise
3	Review/ Write Final Draft	Review/ Write Final Draft

instructional time per day. Some classes met during consecutive periods and some did not.

Of the 152 subjects in the study, the dependent measures of 134 subjects were selected for analysis. Any subject who was absent for two or more days during the study or who failed to submit a second draft of a persuasive essay was eliminated during the analysis of the data.

Although 152 students participated at some level in the study, 134 students met participation requirements. Participation requirements included being in the selected classes, receiving the intervention instructional activities, and handing in a final draft of the persuasive essay. Thirty-one students were black, 101 were white, and two were classified as "other". Of the 134 students, 66 were female and 68 were male.

A majority of the students came from middle to upper-middle income families with a smaller percentage included in the upper income and lower income categories. Free and reduced price lunch statistics indicate 4% of the students were eligible to receive a free lunch while 8% of the students qualified for a reduced price lunch. Unemployment rates in the district were approximately 4 to 5 percent.

Design

This study utilized a pretest, posttest, control group design. Pretest and posttest measures included a modified form of the Holistic Scoring Rubric from the 1988 Maryland Writing Test Scoring Guide adapted for this study to assess overall writing quality (see Appendix B). Posttest measures also included a revision scoring guide to assess the number and type of revisions made in the final draft of the persuasive essay (see Appendix C). The pretest was the students' first draft. The posttest was the students' final draft.

There were three treatment groups: direct instruction, small-group peer response, and control. The study included six, intact, average class groups, utilizing a pretest/posttest design. The main intervention variables were teacher directed revision instruction and small-group, peer generated revision instruction. A control group only received directions to revise or to make changes that would improve the essay and to write a final draft (Bridwell, 1980).

There were scores for each of the two dependent measures: a holistic score for quality of the persuasive essay; and a revision score to assess the number and type of revisions made in the final draft of the essays. Statistical calculations were made using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC) (Norusis, 1984).

Initial analysis included the standard descriptive statistical methods. Posttest writing scores were analyzed utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures. Where significant group differences were indicated, the Tukey-HSD procedure was used to identify the nature of the significant differences.

Additional analysis, using holistic scores for quality, examined the relationships between quality ratings and the number and type of identifiable revisions using the Bridwell (1980) classification (Surface Level, Lexical Level, Phrase Level, Clause Level, Sentence Level, Multi-sentence Level, and Text Level) (see Appendix C). Analysis compared pre and posttest scores from the two treatment groups and then comparisons were made with control group results. The effect of number of revisions made was also included as a part of the analysis, and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized in the analysis to help determine if a relationship existed between the number of revisions made and the rated quality of the essays.

Teachers

Teachers selected to participate in the study were experienced (one or more years in the system), reading/language arts instructors teaching eighth grade students. Teachers were selected based on rated quality

of teaching, interest in participating in the research project, suggestions by the district reading/language arts supervisor and final approval by the building principal.

Training of Teachers

After selection of the three teachers to participate in the study, Research Group A (Class A1-Direct Instruction Group and Class A2-Small-Group), Research Group B (Class B1-Direct Instruction Group and Class B2-Small-Group), and the Control Group C (Class C1-Directions to Revise and Class C2-Directions to Revise) were randomly assigned to the teachers. Teachers selected were trained by the researcher using the scripted lesson design. Training was presented to the teachers during a three day, approximately one hour per day training session held at the end of the regular school days. Aproximately one week prior to the training sessions, all scripted lessons and materials were provided to the teachers for familiarization. After all materials and procedures were thoroughly discussed, questions were answered, and each teacher indicated confidence in being able to deliver the instruction, plans were made to begin the activities.

Materials

In order to increase the interest and involvement of the subjects in the writing topic used for the study, the

researcher selected one with high interest appeal and one that had at least some possibility of being influenced by the student essays. The topic was about extending the lunch period. The task involved writing a persuasive essay that would help convince the school principal whether or not to increase the length of the existing lunch period. A writing prompt was developed by the researcher and two writing specialists trained in the holistic scoring procedures by the Maryland State Department of Education. Additionally, the writing prompt was modeled in a similar format used by the Maryland State Department of Education (1988) for administering the Maryland Writing Test (see Appendix G).

Lesson materials also included additional instructional items that were used with the scripted lessons (see Appendixes D, E, and F). These items were:

1. A Teacher Direction and Information Sheet developed as a recordkeeping device to record student identification numbers, insure subject anonymity, and provide last minute reminders to the participating teachers (see Appendix N).

2. A student Introduction sheet explaining the scope and expectations for participation (see Appendix L).

3. Elements of a Persuasive Essay by Glatthorn (1981) was utilized for the instruction of all groups in the elements of persuasive writing (see Appendix H).

4. Examples of Well-Organized Persuasive Essays were used during the persuasive writing instruction for all groups (see Appendix I).

5. Persuasive Writing Revision Practice Examples that were purposely filled with mistakes and opportunities for revision activity, and they were utilized during the instruction in persuasive writing for all groups (see Appendix M).

6. A Revision Guide Sheet (Sommers, 1979) that included a description of the revision operations of addition, deletion, substitution, and rearrangement which served as the primary instruction content for the Direct Instruction Group and the Small-Group (see Appendix J)

7. A Peer Response Sheet that provided reminders, cues, and advance organizers for students in the Small-Group to use to facilitate consideration of peers' need for inclusion of arguments and other possible revisions (see Appendix K).

Procedure

In order to control for confounding variables, the following factors were equated as much as possible: (a) instructional/work time, (b) content instructional area, and (c) the format of instruction appropriate to the treatment and control groups with regard to composing and/or revision activities.

Although the eighth grade students in this study were normally required to write and had previous instruction in the explanatory or narrative genre, persuasive writing had certain positive aspects, even for eighth grade students. Persuasive writing was used by the National Assessment of Educational Progress as one form of writing for fourth, eighth and eleventh graders. Elements of argument and persuasion are known even to elementary school students. According to McCann (1989), elementary, middle and high school students possess argumentative writing knowledge and ability. Additionally, persuasion is a natural oral exercise for middle school students who repeatedly use persuasive arguments to get things or conditions they want. Finally, and maybe most important for this study, it can be motivational. It can elicit a response from middle school students who may see it as a cause, possibly a chance to argue and to get something changed. This kind of interest properly developed by teachers may generate much writing.

Instruction was conducted by regular classroom teachers of the intact groups utilizing instructional procedures prepared by the researcher (see Appendixes D, E and F). Corrections and refinements in the instructional procedures and materials used in the study were developed after a pilot study was conducted. All materials and instructional procedures were approved by

the school district's supervisor of reading/language arts, and approval to conduct the study was obtained from the district's superintendent (see Appendix A).

The study was conducted during a three day period of time. A three day time frame for the study was selected for several reasons. The three target days for the study were expected to be and in fact were a Tuesday, Wednesday and a Thursday. Mondays and Fridays seem to be high absentee days and utilizing the middle days of the week was thought to help insure higher participation and completion rates. Additionally, middle school students tend to respond well and concentrate better on shorter, high interest activities.

Since the schools in the study were organized with double periods for reading/language arts classes, the instructional time was comparable to six single-class days. The participating teacher at each school site had the two "average" reading/language arts classes identified. The California Achievement Test (1977) reading comprehension subtest scores, teacher recommendations, and student performance were used by this school system to determine the class ability match and student placement.

At two of the three school sites, the participating reading/language arts teachers were trained by the researcher to administer the direct instruction treatment

and the small-group peer generated treatment. The third school site served as the control group site, and the teacher participated in the study by presenting researcher prepared materials for the lessons (see Appendix F).

All groups received instruction in persuasive writing on the first day of the study and prior to writing a first draft, since persuasive writing was not a major genre included in middle school writing in this district. The subjects in the control group did not receive any other of the instruction provided to the subjects in the research groups. The control group subjects were asked to respond to the persuasive writing prompt (see Appendix G), revise to improve the essay, and then write a final draft of the persuasive essay. Class time was provided for revising.

The study included two reading/language arts classes (same teacher) from each school site. The teachers at the two sites where treatments were administered taught one group utilizing the direct revision instruction and taught the other group utilizing the small-group peer generated revision activities.

The Research Groups' Class A1 and Class B1 (direct instruction model) activity was a form of the Basic Practice Model of direct instruction (Becker, 1977; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987) and a form of the Scardamalia and Bereiter (1983) composing process model, CDO (Compare, Diagnose, Operate). The model includes a Compare,

Diagnose and Operate format of revision instruction in which students are expected to "compare" between intended and instantiated text, "diagnose" problems needing change, and "operate" to make the changes in their writing. These activities were facilitated by the use of a revision guide sheet for direct instruction in revision and revising methods.

Research Groups Class A2 and Class B2 (small-group peer generated revisions) utilized a peer response cooperative learning model for writing/revision instruction (Atwell, 1987; Duin, 1986; Slavin, 1980). After initial instruction in persuasive writing and types of revision, peer groups were formed within the class with specific directions to assist peer partners with suggestions for improving original writing drafts. This was facilitated by the introduction of a peer response sheet. The control group (two class groups, Class C1 and Class C2, at the third school site), after initial instruction in persuasive writing, was only given the directions to revise and to write a final draft after responding to the prompt.

The teacher at school Site 1 presented the direct instruction treatment to one of two average groups and presented the small-group peer generated treatment to the other. The teacher at school Site 2 presented the direct instruction treatment to one of two average groups and

presented the small-group peer generated treatment to the other. The teacher at school Site 3 presented the researcher prepared materials to both control groups.

In order to control for teacher effect, each teacher of the experimental groups presented the direct instruction treatment to one group and the small-group peer generated revision treatment to the other. The control group teacher presented the same directions to both groups.

All students were asked to respond to a persuasive writing prompt (see Appendix G) that was based on the Maryland State Department of Education (1988) form and format for a writing prompt on the first day of the study following a lesson on persuasive writing. All students' persuasive essays were collected after the first draft session, and photocopies of all papers were made. The copies of the first drafts were returned to the students on the second and third day to be used during revision. The original drafts were retained for use in the post-test rating procedures. The intervention variables were then introduced to the groups. As a final step in the data collection, students were asked to revise their first drafts and present a final draft.

Although writing is not naturally a timed activity, subjects in this study were given 30 minutes to respond to the writing prompt. Setting such a time limit is done in

order to equate time for all subjects, and because current state testing includes a timed writing activity.

Quality scores and total number/types of revisions were analyzed for all groups. Each essay, pre and post-treatment was scored by two trained raters certified by the Maryland State Board of Education to be trainers in the holistic scoring process. Each paper was scored by two raters. If scores differed by two or more score points, a third trained rater scored the paper. If two of three scores were then the same, that score point was recorded. If none of the three were the same, the middle score point was recorded. If scores differed by only one point, the paper was assigned a midpoint score such as .5, 1.5, 2.5, or 3.5.

Although the raters were Maryland State Department of Education trained in the holistic scoring procedure, additional training was provided by the researcher to facilitate their work with this study and to promote strong interrater reliability.

Training of Raters

Since this study required raters for the holistic scoring and for the revision scoring for number and type of revisions, training of the raters for each of these scoring measures proceeded differently. The following sections examine the training of the raters.

Holistic Score Training Sessions

The three raters trained for the holistic scoring procedure were all trained by the Maryland State Board of Education in the holistic scoring process. The two main raters were also trainers of raters and were high school writing specialists. Improved interrater reliability is reported to result when raters are from similar backgrounds (Cooper, 1977).

The two primary raters participated with the researcher in the development of the writing prompt prior to the regular training sessions. The third rater was given a copy of the prompt prior to the regular training sessions. Since the raters were previously trained in the process of holistic scoring, the procedures recommended by White (1985) were addressed as needed for this study.

1. Arrangements were made for the raters to be together to read at the same time in an appropriate surrounding.

2. A scoring guide was established, and training using the guide for scoring was provided (see Appendix B).

3. Sample papers were scored in order to improve the interrater reliability.

4. Periodic checking of the raters to avoid a drift away from the scoring criteria, discussions of score point differences, and frequent opportunities for breaks were provided.

5. Multiple independent scoring with opportunities to have a third rater score two point differences was utilized.

6. Recordkeeping and evaluation in order to be able to determine interrater reliabilities were emphasized.

The actual rating of the papers occurred over a period of three days. During the first day, a period of six hours was used for training. This included a review of the writing prompt, a review of the criteria for each score point of the scoring rubric, selection of anchor papers (papers representative of each score point) from the entire sample, extensive discussion of each score point and how the anchor papers met the criteria or varied from it. Randomly selected individual sample papers were scored by all three raters with extensive discussion of score points and criteria following each scoring.

When the raters indicated that they were confident with the rubric, sample packets of ten papers were then prepared for independent scoring practice. After each packet was completed, scores were compared and discussed with any score point differences clarified and resolved.

As the raters continued to score the papers, score point differences decreased. An interrater reliability rating of .90 was obtained for two sets of ten papers during independent scoring by the three raters. At that time it was determined by the researcher that reliability

was acceptable, and that the scoring of the entire set of papers from the study began.

Scoring continued for the remainder of the day and continued for two additional days. All papers had been coded by the researcher as to group, treatment, and first or final draft. The papers were then randomly placed in packets of ten for scoring. As an additional check on interrater reliability, ten papers scored during the reliability check prior to starting the general scoring, were placed with the other papers to be scored again so that their scores could be compared with the earlier scores. This procedure produced an interrater reliability factor of .80 which seemed to indicate reliability in the scoring process. The scoring of the 268 papers occurred over a period of three days due to the training and time constraints of the raters on the second day of rating.

Revision Scoring Training Sessions

A second scoring measure, the revision scoring guide from Bridwell (1980) was used to determine the number and type of revisions made in the final draft of the persuasive essays. The raters for this phase of the study were two former classmates in the doctoral program who were familiar with the nature of my study and who were employed by a neighboring school system. One was in a county supervisory role, and the other was working in an

administrative and teaching role in a school. Both had previously participated in the scoring of writing samples and both had active classroom teaching experience.

Since the revision scoring guide was a detailed and lengthy instrument (see Appendix C), the researcher used the guide to initially score all papers in the sample in order to become more expert in its use and potential problems. Having accomplished that task, it was noticed that as the scoring progressed, the variety of types of revisions seemed much easier to identify and record. The more important step was to train the two raters in order to obtain interrater reliability.

The training of raters included providing copies of the scoring guide, discussions of each level (Surface, Lexical, Phrase, Clause, Sentence, Multi-Sentence, and Text), and discussions about the 49 subcategories. Additionally, multiple examples for each level and subcategory were identified in sample papers, analyzed and discussed. Initial attempts at scoring papers resulted in low interrater reliability scores.

Additional training was provided, but due to many individual conflicts the training was not regular and consistent. It was obvious that this training could not be given over a long period of time, due to the numerous variables involved in the scoring that lent themselves to very short retention rates. A two week period of time

was set as a goal to initiate retraining, provide consistent practice, test for interrater reliability, and conduct the scoring. When this was plan was completed and a randomly selected set of 10 papers were scored, the reliability for levels and subcategories between the researcher scored papers and rater one was .88, between the researcher scored papers and rater two was .79, and between the two raters was .82. With this acceptable reliability of scoring, the researcher then rescored all papers again and recorded those values for number and type of revisions for statistical analysis.

Instructional Procedures and Treatments

After teacher training was complete, and teachers indicated they understood and felt confident in being able to teach the scripted lessons, the instruction started. Several instructional conditions applied to all groups.

1. Instruction was scheduled and held on a Tuesday, Wednesday, and a Thursday in order to maximize participation and help avoid the Monday/Friday absence and activity problems.
2. The study was conducted very near the end of the school year in order to minimize interference with the regular classroom instruction.
3. During the three consecutive days of the study, each class met with the teacher for two class periods each

day. Many routine activities were part of the lessons for all groups for each class period.

4. All materials related to the study were supplied by the researcher for student use, and they were collected at the end of each class period. Appropriate items were redistributed during the next class period.

5. No homework was issued as part of this study, but in order for the participating teachers to continue with the regular curriculum, assignments and directions related to those assignments were occasionally issued as homework for the students of the intact classes.

Those procedures were used in addition to or as part of the scripted lessons (see Appendixes D, E, and F). A brief description of the scripted lessons will follow.

Day One: All Classes

The teachers distributed packets to each student that included an introduction, examples of persuasive essays, and a writing prompt. A definition of revision was presented and discussed. Transparencies of the persuasive essays, the writing prompt, and a Tap/Count strategy (a mnemonic device used by the county system to help students respond to the Maryland Writing Test prompt - Task-Audience-Purpose) were used by the teachers to present the lessons. Instruction in persuasive writing continued to the second class period. During the last 30 minutes, students were given paper and pencils and asked to write

in response to the prompt. At the end of the period, all materials were collected.

Day Two: Direct Instruction

Teachers presented the lesson using direct instruction (teacher input, structured practice, modeling, guided practice, and checks for understanding). The instruction included revision elements of additions, deletions, substitutions, and rearrangements and continued for both class periods.

Day Two: Small-Group Instruction

Students were organized in a small-group cooperative learning group (groups of two or possibly three, if needed) by the teacher. Instruction in peer response activities for revision was provided, and students were provided an individual peer-response sheet to assist them as they worked in their groups. A revision guide sheet with types of revisions was provided for student use as they considered revisions in their groups. Students were asked to read and make suggestions for improvements in their peer partner's essays.

Day Two: Control Group

Teachers reviewed the persuasive essays used as examples in previous lessons, and they then provided time for students to work individually to improve their essays. Teachers provided guided practice assistance to the students as needed.

Day Three: Direct Instruction

Direct instruction in the use of the Compare, Diagnose, Operate (CDO) procedure for revising was provided by the teachers. Time for revising first draft essays using the procedure was part of the lesson. During the last 30 minutes of the second class period, students write a final draft of their persuasive essays. All essays and other materials were collected.

Day Three: Small-Group Instruction

Work in the small-group organization continued after a review of previous lessons. During the second class period of the day, students were given time to review all suggestions from peer partners or other information they had gained about revising. Students were then given 30 minutes to write a final draft of their persuasive essays. All materials were then collected by the teacher

Day Three: Control Group

Students were reminded to revise or make changes to improve their essays. During the last 30 minutes of the second class period, students were asked to write a final draft of their persuasive essays. The teacher collected all materials.

Rating Procedures

Although indirect assessments of writing achievement, such as standardized multiple-choice tests and fill-in-

the-blank tests have been used to measure students' writing performance, direct assessment of writing ability has gained some level of acceptance over the last two decades (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1989). Direct assessment is based on actual samples of students' writing. A writing sample completed at the end of the treatments seemed to be the most logical dependent measure to assess overall quality of the persuasive essays of the eighth grade students. The writing sample was also used to assess the inclusion of persuasive elements in the students' essays and to determine the number and type of revisions that were made.

Reliability/Validity of the Holistic Score Measure

The direct assessment holistic score measure was used as a primary dependent measure for overall quality of the students' final persuasive essays. The reliability of general impression or holistic evaluation has been in question since it was first developed by Paul Diederich and his colleagues at the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Early research had 53 professionals grade and evaluate 300 writing samples using a scale of one to nine. Results were so divergent that a third of the papers received all nine scores and all papers received at least five different scores (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1989; White, 1985). Therefore, the system was not reliable.

As a result of this and additional research, "Diederich developed a scale that focused readers' attention on each feature separately and assigned consistent weights in moving from the individual features to a more global judgment of writing quality" (Applebee et al., 1989, p. 10). The scale continued to evolve, additional procedures were developed, and the reliability of the holistic scoring measure improved.

High reliability and validity has been reported using the holistic scoring measure when certain conditions are present. They include:

1. Using a writing prompt.
2. Reader training processes utilizing...
3. Anchor papers.
4. Checking the reading as it progresses.
5. Multiple independent scoring.
6. Evaluation and recordkeeping (Applebee et al., 1989, p. 10; White, 1985, pp. 23-27).

In order to carry out the multiple independent scoring, it is recommended that a scoring rubric be prepared so that all papers will be scored according to the same criteria (White, 1985). Since a review of existing scoring guides produced no satisfactory instrument to be utilized for this study, the researcher developed a scoring guide (see Appendix B). The issues of validity and reliability of the scoring guide were

considered.

When certain procedures are utilized in the development of a scoring guide the validity and level of reliability can be expected to be at acceptable levels. According to Cooper (1977), "When raters are from similar backgrounds and when they are trained with a holistic scoring guide - either one they borrow or devise for themselves on the spot - they can achieve nearly perfect agreement in choosing the better of a pair of essays..." (p. 19). These procedures were followed in the development of the holistic scoring guide that was used for this study.

In order to increase the validity and reliability of the scoring rubric, each score point criteria was developed by the expert raters using the typical, recommended holistic format:

1. Description of each score level by considering the degree to which the writer was able to manage the tasks of the assignment.
2. Levels of development and logical thinking...
3. Paragraph and sentence structure...
4. Control over language (White, 1985, pp. 137-138).

The process included reviewing/revising the persuasive prompt to insure compatibility with the scoring rubric, rigorous application of the holistic format, and a

commitment of time in excess of six hours. Since the researcher and expert raters developed the guide specifically to respond to the elements of the prompt, the face validity of the instrument is increased.

A second measure, a revision scoring guide, was used to assess the number and type of revisions made in the final draft of the persuasive essays (see Appendix C). Reliability and validity factors were considered for this measure. This classification scheme reports mean reliability factors of .84 for levels and .79 for subclassifications (Bridwell, 1980). The validity of the measure is increased since it was developed according to the linguistic structure involved and reflects a pattern of smaller to larger linguistic units (Bridwell, 1980).

Limitations

There are several limitations in the present study.

1. Subjects were not randomly assigned to treatment groups due to the use of intact classes.
2. Since access to the public school system was limited, this was a short-term study.
3. Revision is but one stage in the writing process and as such, other elements may affect the final quality of a student's writing.

Assumptions

1. The researcher assumes that the subjects have had some level of previous experience with writing.
2. The researcher assumes that adult participants did so willingly and did not purposely contrive to create flawed results.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. In this chapter, I have described the subjects, teachers, materials, procedures, design and analyses, dependent measures, and the scoring procedures.

In Chapter IV, I will present the results of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. In addition, this study examined the relationships between the quality of students' persuasive essays and the number and type of revisions identified in the final drafts of the essays. This chapter presents the results of the study.

Analysis of holistic score data was conducted using the scores obtained from the trained raters. Single point differences were averaged and recorded (White, 1985). Two or more point differences were rescored by a third trained rater, and any matched score was used.

Data concerning number and type of revisions were analyzed after acceptable interrater reliability measures were obtained between the researcher and two trained raters on a sample of papers. The researcher then scored all remaining papers (Bridwell, 1980).

Direct Revision Instruction

Research Question #1

What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when

compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

Data analysis of the holistic score measure for quality was conducted using the scores obtained from the trained raters. Single point differences were averaged. Two or more point differences were rescored by a third trained rater, and that score was used for data analysis.

Analysis of Holistic Scores

The ANOVA results are presented in Table 1. A significant treatment effect is indicated.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance Among Groups for the Holistic Score Measure of Quality

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	4.852	2.426	6.804*
Within Groups	131	46.708	.357	
Total	133	51.560		

* $p < .0015$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2. As indicated in Table 2, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the holistic scores for the

Direct Instruction Group were 2.93 (SD=.58); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction Group (hereafter referred to as Small-Group) were 2.91 (SD=.51); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group (Only Directions to Revise) were 2.51 (SD=.69).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for the Holistic Score Measure

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	3 - 48	2.93	.58
Small-Group	47	7 - 39	2.91	.51
Control Group	41	0 - 36	2.51	.69

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD Procedure was used. As presented in Table 3, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direction Instruction Group and the Control Group and also a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group and the Control Group. Other pairwise comparisons were not significantly different.

Table 3

Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Holistic Scores

Group	Mean
Direct Instruction	2.935*
Small-Group	2.915*
Control Group	2.512

* $p < .05$ Research Question #2

What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction? For the purposes of this study, quantity of revisions means the total number of researcher identified changes made between the subjects' first drafts and their second (final) drafts using Bridwell's Revision Scoring Guide.

The ANOVA results are presented in Table 4. These results indicate that there is a significant treatment effect.

Table 4
Analysis of Variance Among Treatment Groups for Quantity
of Revisions

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	1983.595	991.798	12.555*
Within Groups	131	10348.554	78.997	
Total	133	12332.149		

* $p < .000$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 5. As indicated in Table 5, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of revisions for research group one (Direct Instruction) were 20.72 (SD=9.13); the mean and standard deviation for research group two (Small-Group) were 20.81 (SD=7.88); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group (Only Directions to Revise) were 12.41 (SD=9.68).

The minimum number of revisions by a subject in the Direct Instruction Group was three, and the maximum number of revisions by a subject in that group was 48. The total number of revisions by the Direct Instruction Group subjects was 953.

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for the Quantity of Revision

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	3 - 48	20.72	9.13
Small-Group	47	7 - 39	20.81	7.86
Control Group	41	0 - 36	12.41	9.68

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD Procedure was conducted. As presented in Table 5, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direct Instruction Group and the Control Group and also indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group and the Control Group. Other pairwise comparisons did not indicate significant differences.

Table 6
Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Quantity of
Revisions

Group	Mean
Direct Instruction	20.72*
Small-Group	20.81*
Control Group	12.41

* $p < .05$

Research Question #3

What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

Types of revisions were classified in seven main levels with a total of 49 sub-categories. The levels were arranged in a hierarchal order from simple surface level changes to more complex linguistic structures.

As shown in Table 6 ANOVA results for Level 1 (Surface) revisions indicate a significant ($p < .002$) treatment effect. Tukey-HSD analyses indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direct

Instruction Group and the Control Group and between the Small-Group and the Control Group.

In Table 7 through Table 24, ANOVA and Tukey results for Level 1 (Surface) revisions, Level 2 (Lexical) revisions, Level 3 (Phrase) revisions, Level 4 (Clause) revisions, Level 5 (Sentence) revisions, Level 6 (Multi-Sentence) revisions, and Level 7 (Text) revisions are shown. Significant differences are indicated by (*).

The ANOVA results among groups for surface level revisions are presented in Table 7. These results indicate that there is a significant treatment effect.

Table 7
Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Surface Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	165.284	82.642	6.613*
Within Groups	131	1637.172	12.498	
Total	133	1802.455		

* $p < .0018$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 8. As indicated in table 8, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of surface level

revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were 6.00 (SD=3.33); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 6.09 (SD=3.81); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 3.63 (SD=3.43).

The minimum number of surface level revisions for a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of revisions for a subject was 14 for the Direct Instruction Group, 15 for the Small-Group, and 13 for the Control Group.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for the Surface Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 - 14	6.00	3.33
Small-Group	47	0 - 15	6.09	3.81
Control	41	0 - 13	3.63	3.43

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD procedure was conducted. As presented in Table 8, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direct Instruction Group and the Control Group and also indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group

and the Control Group. Other pairwise comparisons did not indicate significant differences.

Table 9

Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Surface Level

Group	Mean
Direct Instruction	6.000*
Small-Group	6.085*
Control	3.634

* $p < .05$

The ANOVA results among groups for quantity of lexical level revisions are presented in Table 10. These results indicate that there is a significant treatment effect.

Table 10
Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Lexical Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	94.673	47.336	6.571*
Within Groups	131	943.753	7.204	
Total	133	1038.425		

* $p < .0019$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 11. As indicated in Table 11, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of lexical level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were 3.913 (SD=2.731); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 4.021 (SD=2.952); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 2.146 (SD=2.276).

The minimum number of lexical level revisions by a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of lexical revisions by a subject was 11 for the Direct Instruction Group, 11 for the Small-Group, and 8 for the Control Group.

Table 11
Means and Standard Deviations for the Lexical Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 - 11	3.913	2.731
Small-Group	47	0 - 11	4.021	2.952
Control	41	0 - 8	2.146	2.276

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD procedure was conducted. As presented in Table 12, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direct Instruction Group and the Control Group and also indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group and the Control Group. Other pairwise comparisons did not indicate significant differences.

Table 12
Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Lexical Level

Group	Mean
Direct Instruction	3.913*
Small-Group	4.021*
Control	2.146

* $p < .05$

The ANOVA results among groups for phrase level revisions are presented in Table 13. These results indicate that there is a significant treatment effect.

Table 13
Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Phrase Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	48.923	24.462	3.319*
Within Groups	131	965.413	7.370	
Total	133	1014.336		

* $p < .0392$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 14. As indicated in Table 14, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of phrase level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were 3.37 (SD=3.09); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 3.04 (SD=2.65); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 1.93 (SD=2.31).

The minimum number of phrase level revisions for a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of phrase level revisions for a subject was 12 for the Direct Instruction Group, 10 for the Small-Group, and 8 for the Control Group.

Table 14
Means and Standard Deviations for the Phrase Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 - 12	3.37	3.09
Small-Group	47	0 - 10	3.04	2.65
Control	41	0 - 8	1.93	2.31

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD procedure was conducted. As presented in Table 15, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direct Instruction Group and the Control Group only. Other pairwise comparisons did not indicate significant differences.

Table 15

Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Phrase Level

Group	Mean
Direct Instruction	3.370*
Small-Group	3.043
Control	1.927

* $p < .05$

The ANOVA results among groups for clause level revisions are presented in Table 16. These results indicate that no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 16
Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Clause Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	22.182	11.091	2.279
Within Groups	131	637.520	4.867	
Total	133	659.702		

$p < .1064$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 17. As indicated in Table 17, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of clause level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were 2.37 (SD=2.90); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 1.64 (SD=1.45).

The minimum number of clause level revisions for a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of clause level revisions for a subject was 12 for the Direct Instruction Group, 5 for the Small-Group, and 8 for the Control Group.

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for the Clause Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 -12	2.37	2.90
Small-Group	47	0 - 5	1.64	1.45
Control	41	0 - 8	1.42	2.01

* No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The ANOVA results among groups for sentence level revisions are presented in table 18. These results indicate that there is a significant treatment effect.

Table 18

Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Sentence Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	48.408	24.204	7.988*
Within Groups	131	396.935	3.030	
Total	133	445.343		

* $p < .0005$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 19. As indicated in Table 19, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of sentence level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were 1.91 (SD=1.96); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 2.13 (SD=1.93); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were .73 (SD=1.14).

The minimum number of sentence level revisions for a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of sentence level revisions for a subject was 9 for the Direct Instruction Group, 8 for the Small-Group, and 4 for the Control Group.

Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations for the Sentence Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 - 9	1.91	1.96
Small-Group	47	0 - 8	2.13	1.93
Control	41	0 - 4	.73	1.14

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD procedure was conducted. As presented in Table 20, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Direct Instruction Group and the Control Group and also indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group and the Control Group. Other pairwise comparisons did not indicate significant differences.

Table 20

Tukey-HSD Procedure for Comparisons of Sentence Level

Group	Mean
Direct Instruction	1.913*
Small-Group	2.128*
Control	.732

* $p < .05$

The ANOVA results among groups for multi-sentence level revisions are presented in Table 21. These results indicate that no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 21
Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Multi-Sentence Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	46.693	23.347	1.877
Within Groups	131	1629.404	12.438	
Total	133	1676.097		

$p < .1571$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 22. As indicated in Table 22, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of multi-sentence level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were 2.78 (SD=3.33); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 3.66 (SD=3.95); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 2.22 (SD=3.21).

The minimum number of multi-sentence level revisions by a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of multi-sentence level revisions by a subject was 11 for the Direct Instruction Group, 15 for the Small-Group, and 12 for the Control Group.

Table 22

Means and Standard Deviations for the Multi-Sentence Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 - 11	2.78	3.33
Small-Group	47	0 - 15	3.66	3.95
Control	41	0 - 12	2.22	3.21

*No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The ANOVA results among groups for text level revisions are presented in Table 23. These results indicate that no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 23

Analysis of Variance Among Groups for Text Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	.293	.147	.090
Within Groups	131	213.856	1.633	
Total	133	214.149		

$p < .914$

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 24. As indicated in Table 24, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the quantity of text level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group were .15 (SD=1.03); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were .21 (SD=1.02); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were .27 (SD=1.72).

The minimum number of text level revisions by a subject in any group was zero (0). The maximum number of text level revisions by a subject was 7 for the Direct Instruction Group, 5 for the Small-Group, and 11 for the Control Group.

Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations for the Text Level

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	0 - 7	.15	1.03
Small-Group	47	0 - 5	.21	1.02
Control	41	0 - 11	.27	1.72

*No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Tables 7 thru 24 present results of ANOVA and, when significant group differences were indicated, Tukey-HSD to determine nature of the differences. These results indicated that there were significant differences between the treatment groups (Direct Instruction Group and Small-Group) and the Control Group for surface, lexical, and sentence level revisions. Additionally, there was an indication of a significant difference between the Direct Instruction Group and the Control Group for phrase level revisions. There were no other groups that indicated a significant difference at the .05 level.

Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction

Research Question #4

What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

ANOVA results are presented in Table 1. A significant ($p < .0015$) treatment effect is indicated. As presented in Table 2, the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 2.91 ($SD = .51$).

In order to determine which pairwise comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD Procedure was used. As displayed in Table 3, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Group and the Control Group.

Research Question #5

What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

The ANOVA is displayed in Table 4. The results presented in Table 4 indicate that there is a significant treatment effect.

Mean and standard deviation results are displayed in Table 5. As indicated in Table 5, results show that the

mean and standard deviation for the quantity of revisions for the Small-Group were 20.81 (SD=7.88).

The minimum number of revisions by a subject in the Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Group was seven, and the maximum number of revisions by a subject in that group was 39. The total number of revisions by the Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Group subjects was 1,323.

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD Procedure was conducted. As presented in Table 5, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Group and the Control Group.

Research Question #6

What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

In Table 7 through Table 24, ANOVA and Tukey results for Level 1 (Surface) revisions, Level 2 (Lexical) revisions, Level 3 (Phrase) revisions, Level 4 (Clause) revisions, Level 5 (Sentence) revisions, Level 6 (Multi-Sentence) revisions, and Level 7 (Text) revisions are shown. Significant differences are indicated by (*).

Regular Revision Instruction

Research Question #7

What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

ANOVA results are presented in Table 1. A significant ($p < .0015$) treatment effect is indicated. As presented in Table 2, the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 2.51 ($SD = .69$).

In order to determine which comparisons were significantly different, the Tukey-HSD Procedure was conducted. The results indicated that the quality rating for the essays from the Control Group were significantly lower than the quality rating for the essays from the Direct Instruction Group and from the Small-Group. As displayed in Table 3, the results indicate a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the Control Group and the Direct Instruction Group and between the Control Group and the Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Group.

Research Question #8

What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision

instruction?

The ANOVA is displayed in Table 4. The results presented in Table 4 indicate that there is a significant ($p < .000$) treatment effect.

Mean and standard deviation results are displayed in Table 5. As indicated in Table 5, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 12.41 (SD=9.68).

The minimum number of revisions by a subject in the Control Group was zero, and the maximum number of revisions by a Control Group subject was 36. The total number of revisions by Control Group subjects was 509.

Research Question #9

What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

In Table 7 through 24, ANOVA and Tukey results for Level 1 (Surface) revisions, Level 2 (Lexical) revisions, Level 3 (Phrase) revisions, Level 4 (Clause) revisions, Level 5 (Sentence) revisions, Level 6 (Multi-Sentence) revisions, and Level 7 (Text) revisions are shown. Significant differences are indicated by the ANOVA for Direct Instruction and Small-Group for Surface Level

(.002), Lexical Level (.002), and Sentence Level (.001). Significance is indicated for Direct Instruction for Phrase Level (.039). Significant differences are indicated by (*).

Relationships Between Levels of Revision,
Stages of Revision and Rated Quality

Analyses of the relationships between levels of revision, stages of revision and rated quality were conducted using multiple correlations. The correlations are presented in Table 25.

Table 25
Correlations of Number of Revisions In Levels and Quality

Levels	Revisions	n	Quality
1	712	134	.2682**
2	457	134	.2078*
3	377	134	.1747
4	247	134	.0280
5	218	134	.2041*
6	400	134	-.0211
7	28	134	-.0177

One-tailed Significance: * = .01 ** = .001

Research Question #10

What are the relationships between levels of revision and the rated quality (holistic score) of the essays?

Analysis of the relationships between levels of revision and the rated quality (holistic score) of the essays was conducted using correlations. The correlations are presented in Table 25.

Research Question #11

Are there initial group differences in writing quality among the direct revision instruction, the small-group peer generated revision instruction, and the regular revision instruction groups?

Analysis of the difference among the groups was conducted using ANOVA. No significant differences were indicated for the holistic score for the students' first drafts. The ANOVA results for Draft One are presented in Table 26.

Table 26
Analysis of Variance Among Groups for the Holistic Score
Measure of Quality for Draft One

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Groups	2	.1986	.0993	.2422
Within Groups	131	53.6970	.4099	
Total	133	53.8955		

No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level.

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 27. As indicated in table 27, results show that the mean and standard deviation for the holistic score measure for quality for draft one for the Direct Instruction Group were 2.62 (SD=.60); the mean and standard deviation for the Small-Group were 2.53 (SD=.56); and the mean and standard deviation for the Control Group were 2.55 (SD=.76).

The results indicate that there was no significant difference in quality rating between the groups after the first draft of the persuasive essays.

Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations for the Holistic ScoreMeasure for Quality for Draft One

Treatment	n	Range	M	SD
Direct Instruction	46	1 - 3.5	2.62	.60
Small-Group	47	1 - 4.0	2.53	.56
Control	41	0 - 4.0	2.55	.76

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the study which investigated the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on eighth graders' persuasive essays. The results include the holistic measure for quality and analysis of the number and type of revisions for all treatment groups.

In Chapter V, I will present a discussion of the results. The discussion will include implications for research and recommendations for additional research.

CHAPTER V

OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays. It also examined the quantity and types of revisions made in students' essays. This chapter presents a discussion of the results of the study. Included is a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, conclusions, discussion, implications for writing instruction, and recommendations for continued research.

Summary

Statement of the Problem

One of the concerns in education is poor student writing. Student writing assessments have indicated that writing performance is not of a very high caliber, and that it is not improving (Applebee et al., 1990). Writing is a very complicated process that brings together many cognitive and production elements in a continuing recursive environment. Writing is often difficult for experienced

writers, and it certainly seems to continue to be a problem for many student writers. One possible solution to the problem is instruction in revision (Fitzgerald, 1987; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981).

Revision is considered to be an important part of the writing process, but there are mixed results in the research that informs us as to what causes writers to revise, what activates the connection between intended and actual text, or what, if any, instruction in revision affects the quality of writing (Fitzgerald, 1987). Although some research does indicate that experienced and inexperienced writers do revise, and that developmental differences are a factor, revisions do not always seem to improve the quality of writing (Bridwell, 1980; Daiute, 1985; Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987). Prior to this study, there was limited research on the effect of instruction in revision and how that instruction affected the quality of student writing (Fitzgerald, 1987).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision on the quality of eighth grade students' persuasive essays. The quality of the students' writing was assessed using a holistic score (Cooper, 1977; MSDE, 1988; White, 1985). Additionally, students' persuasive

essays were assessed for number and type of revisions made using Bridwell's seven level rating scale for types of revision (Bridwell, 1980).

Research Questions

1. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?
2. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?
3. What are the effects of direct revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to small-group peer generated revision instruction and regular revision instruction?
4. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?
5. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to

direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

6. What are the effects of small-group peer generated revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and regular revision instruction?

7. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quality of eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

8. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the quantity of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

9. What are the effects of regular revision instruction on the types of revisions made in eighth graders' persuasive essays when compared to direct revision instruction and small-group peer generated revision instruction?

10. What are the relationships between levels of revision and the rated quality (holistic score) of the essays?

11. Are there initial group differences in writing quality among the direct revision instruction, the small-

group peer generated revision instruction, and the regular revision instruction groups?

Patterns of Revision

All students made some revisions except three subjects in the Control Group. Three students returned their first drafts as their second, final draft without making any changes. The minimum and maximum raw frequencies of revision for all subjects (0 and 48) indicated some variability in the students' willingness or ability to revise. A total of 2439 revisions were recorded across the three research groups using Bridwell's seven levels of revision. The group frequencies and percentage of total revisions, Direct Instruction (953, 39.08), Small-Group (977, 40.06), and the Control Group (509, 20.86), indicate that each of the revision instruction groups produced more revisions than did the Control Group. Analyses of the specific levels of revision suggest additional emerging patterns and trends.

Surface Level. Surface level revisions accounted for 29.20% of all revisions, by far the largest amount across all levels and for all treatment groups. The percentage of surface level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group was 11.32, for the Small-Group 11.73, and for the Control Group 6.15. Additionally, there was a significant positive correlation ($p < .001$) between total surface level revisions

and the holistic score for quality.

Lexical Level. The second highest percentage of revisions (18.73%) across all levels and for all treatment groups occurred at the lexical level, although the second highest percentage for a level of revision for the Control Group was at the multi-sentence level (3.73%). The percentage of lexical level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group was 7.38, for the Small-Group 7.75, and for the Control Group 3.60. There was also a significant positive correlation ($p < .01$) between total lexical level revisions and the holistic score for quality.

Phrase Level. Phrase level revisions accounted for 15.45% of revisions across all levels and for all treatment groups with 6.35% for the Direct Instruction Group, 5.86% for the Small-Group, and 3.24% for the Control Group. Although there were many phrase level revisions recorded, there was no significant correlation between total phrase level revisions and the holistic score for quality.

Clause Level. 10.13% of the revisions identified across all levels and across all treatment groups were clause level revisions. The percentage of clause level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group was 4.51, for the Small-Group 3.16, and for the Control Group 2.46. Additionally, there was no significant correlation between total clause level revisions and the holistic score for quality.

Sentence Level. Sentence level revisions accounted for

8.94% of all revisions with the Direct Instruction Group generating 3.61%, the Small-Group 4.10%, and the Control Group 1.23%. Importantly, there was a significant correlation ($p < .01$) between total sentence level revisions and the holistic score for quality.

Multi-Sentence Level. Interestingly, the multi-sentence level revisions accounted for 16.40% of the total revisions with the Direct Instruction Group having 5.62%, the Small-Group having 7.05%, and the Control Group having 3.73%. Although there were many multi-sentence revisions, with each sentence of the multi-sentence group tallied as an additional revision, there was no significant correlation between the total multi-sentence revisions and the holistic score for quality. There was indeed a negative, although not significant, correlation identified indicating that multi-sentence revision occurred, but it seemed to have a negative effect on the quality of the persuasive essays. A possible explanation for this might be that the students were not able to manipulate the cognitive processes necessary to make these higher level revisions. When they made the changes, the changes did not necessarily smoothly integrate into the text, and therefore may have resulted in a lower holistic score by the raters.

Text Level. There were only four students with text level revisions, since this level of revision included total rewriting of the first draft or revisions that seemed to

have no one to one sentence correspondence. Most students revised their original draft rather than writing totally new text for their final draft. The percentage of text level revisions for the Direct Instruction Group was .29%, for the Small-Group .41%, and for the Control Group .45%. Due to the very limited use of this level of revision by the eighth graders, text level revisions accounted for only 1.15% of the total revisions across all levels and for all treatment groups.

Results

Based on the analyses of data, the following results were indicated. The results for each question are presented in turn.

1. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the direct instruction group receiving direct teacher instruction in revision and the control group receiving only directions to revise when the persuasive essays were rated using the holistic score measure. However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the direct instruction group and the small- group participating in peer generated revision instruction. Although there was no significant difference, the direct instruction group was rated slightly higher 2.93 (SD=.58) than the small-group 2.91 (SD=.51) using the holistic score measure for quality.

2. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the direct instruction group receiving direct instruction in revision and the control group receiving only directions to revise when students' persuasive essays were rated for quantity of revisions using Bridwell's rating scale. However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the direct instruction group and the small-group participating in small-group peer generated revision instruction. Although there were no significant differences between the direct instruction group and the small-group, the mean score of the small-group 20.81 (SD=7.86) was slightly higher than the direct instruction group 20.72 (SD=9.13) when rated using the Bridwell scale for quantity of revisions.

3. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the direct instruction group receiving direct instruction in revision and the control group, receiving only directions to revise, in four of the seven levels when students' persuasive essays were rated for types of revisions using Bridwell's rating scale. The number of Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence level revisions were significantly higher for the direct instruction group than for the control group. The number of Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions for the direct instruction group was not significantly different

from the number for the control group.

4. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the small-group, receiving peer generated revision instruction, and the control group receiving only directions to revise when the students' persuasive essays were rated using the holistic score measure. However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the small-group and the direct instruction group. Although there was no significant difference, the small-group was rated slightly lower 2.91 (SD=.51) than the direct instruction group 2.93 (SD=.58) using the holistic score measure for quality.

5. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the small-group receiving peer generated revision instruction and the control group receiving only directions to revise when students' persuasive essays were rated for quantity of revisions using Bridwell's rating scale. However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the small-group and the direct instruction group. Although there were no significant differences between the small-group and the direct instruction group, the mean score of the small-group (20.81) was slightly higher than the direct instruction group (20.72) when rated using the Bridwell scale for quantity of revisions.

6. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the small-group receiving peer generated revision

instruction and the control group, receiving only directions to revise, for three of the seven levels when students' persuasive essays were rated for types of revisions using Bridwell's rating scale. The number of Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions were significantly higher for the small-group than for the control group. The number of Phrase, Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions for the small-group was not significantly different from the number for the control group.

7. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the control group (Regular writing instruction/Only directions to revise) and both the direct instruction group and the small-group when the persuasive essays were rated using the holistic score measure. The mean scores of both the direct instruction group 2.93 (SD=.58) and the small-group 2.91 (SD=.51) were significantly higher than the mean score for the control group 2.51 (SD=.69) using the holistic score measure for quality.
8. There was a significant difference between the mean score of the control group (Regular writing instruction/Only directions to revise) and the mean scores of both the direct instruction group and the small-group when the persuasive essays were rated for quantity of revisions using Bridwell's rating scale. The mean scores

of the direct instruction group 20.72 (SD=9.13) and the small-group 20.80 (SD=7.86) were significantly higher than the mean score for the control group 12.41 (SD=9.68) using the Bridwell scale for quantity of revisions.

9. There was a significant difference between the mean score of the control group and the mean scores of the direct instruction group for four of the seven levels and the small-group for three of the seven levels when students' persuasive essays were rated for types of revisions using Bridwell's rating scale. The number of Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence level revisions for the control group was significantly lower than the number of level revisions for the direct instruction group, but there was no significant difference between the number of Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions. The number of Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions for the control group was significantly lower than the number of level revisions for the small-group, but there was no significant difference between the number of Phrase, Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions for the control group and the small-group.
10. There were significant relationships between some, but not all, levels of revision and the rated quality of the students' persuasive essays. Correlations of quality and levels of revision with one-tailed test of significance indicated a significant positive correlation ($p < .001$)

between Surface level revisions and rated quality. There were significant positive correlations ($p < .01$) for quality and levels of revision for both Lexical and Sentence level revisions. There were negative correlations for quality and levels of revision for both Multi-Sentence and Text level revisions. There were no significant, positive correlations of quality and levels of revision for Phrase, Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions.

11. There was no significant difference between the rated quality of the first drafts of the students' persuasive essays from the direct instruction group, the small-group, and the control group. Therefore, prior to the instructional intervention treatments of this study, the rated quality of the students' persuasive essays was not significantly different.

Conclusions

The analysis of the data produced a number of results. Using the results of the study as a basis, the following conclusions are presented:

Direct Revision Instruction

1. There were significant differences between the mean scores of the direct instruction group and the control group for both quality of the second draft and for quantity of revision. The differences indicated that when teacher

directed revision instruction was used as an instructional intervention, the holistic scores and the number of revisions were significantly higher for the direct instruction group than for the control group that received regular instruction with only directions to revise. This indicates that direct instruction in revision may be one of the ways to improve the quality of students' writing. The results also tend to support previous research findings that direct intervention in revision is indeed useful in the writing classroom to help enhance students' revision efforts (Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987).

2. There were also significant differences between the mean scores of some, but not all, of the types of revision for the direct instruction group and the control group. There were significant differences for the Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence level revisions. The differences indicated that the direct instruction group produced significantly more Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence level revisions than the control group. Although surface, lexical, and often phrase level revisions dominate as forms of revisions by students in this developmental stage (eighth graders), sentence level revisions are not as common since they utilize more complicated linguistic structures and perhaps more meaning level adjustments. As students revised and clarified their thinking, the meaning level adjustments, along with the other revisions, seemed

to result in higher rated quality in the final drafts of their persuasive essays.

Small-Group Peer Generated Revision Instruction

1. There were significant differences between the mean scores of the small-group peer generated revision group and the control group for both quality of the second draft and for quantity of revision. The differences indicated that when small-group peer generated revision instruction was used as an instructional intervention, the holistic scores and the number of revisions were significantly higher for the small-group than for the control group that received regular instruction with only directions to revise. Although not significantly higher, the small-group peer generated revision instruction seems to have produced a higher quantity of revisions than the direct instruction. This seems very logical, since the peer interaction involved time to exchange and generate ideas for revision. Often students in this age group may be much more inclined to incorporate peer suggestions than those of adults (Atwell, 1987).
2. There were also significant differences between the mean scores of some, but not all, of the types of revision for the small-group and the control group. There were significant differences for the Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions. The differences indicated that

the small-group produced significantly more Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions than the control group. As with the direct instruction, the small-group peer generated instruction seemed to produce expected lower linguistic structure changes in the students' final drafts, but it also seems to have generated use of the sentence level revisions, and these changes resulted in improved ratings of quality.

Regular Writing Instruction (Control Group)

1. There were significant differences between the mean scores of the control group and both the direct instruction group and the small-group for quality of the second draft and for quantity of revision. The differences indicated that when regular writing instruction with only directions to revise was used as a control, the holistic scores and the number of revisions were significantly lower for the control group than for either the direct instruction group or for the small-group.

2. There were also significant differences between the mean scores of some, but not all, of the types of revision for the control group and both the direct instruction group and the small-group. There were significant differences between the control group and the direct instruction group for Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence level revisions. The differences indicate that

the control group, using regular writing instruction with only directions to revise, produced significantly fewer Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence level revisions than the direct instruction group. Additionally, there were significant differences between the control group and the small-group for Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions. The differences indicate that the control group produced significantly fewer Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions than the small-group.

3. There were no significant differences between the mean scores for types of revision for the control group and the direct instruction group for Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions. This indicates that, although used by some students as a method of revising, these levels did not seem to affect the rated quality of the students' essays.

4. There were no significant differences between the mean scores for types of revision for the control group and the small-group for Phrase, Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions. This indicates that, although used by some students as a method of revision, these levels did not seem to affect the rated quality of the students' essays. Although not significantly different, the mean score for Phrase level revisions for the direct instruction group was higher than the mean score for the small-group. This indicates that the direct instruction group utilized

the phrase level revision more often than did the small-group, but correlation analyses indicate no correlation between phrase level revisions and the quality rating for the final draft of the persuasive essays.

Relationships Between Levels of Revision, Stages of Revision, and Rated Quality

1. There were significant correlations between some, but not all, levels of revision and the rated quality of the students' essays. There were significant, positive correlations for Surface level revisions and quality ($p < .001$), Lexical level revisions and quality ($p < .01$), and Sentence level revisions and quality ($p < .01$). These correlations indicate that the use of Surface, Lexical, and Sentence level revisions was associated with higher quality ratings, especially so for Surface level revisions.

2. There were no significant correlations between Phrase level revisions and rated quality, Clause level revisions and rated quality, Multi-Sentence level revisions and rated quality, or Text level revisions and rated quality. Although there were no significant correlations, Multi-Sentence and Text level revisions produced negative correlations with rated quality. These correlations indicate that Phrase, Clause, Multi-Sentence, and Text level revisions were not associated with higher quality ratings.

3. There were no significant differences between the mean scores of the direct instruction group, the small-group, and the control group for rated quality of the first draft. This indicates that the holistic score differences for the students' first drafts were not significantly different, and that second draft (final draft) significant differences were associated with the instructional intervention treatments designed for this study.

Discussion

Holistic Measure

As a primary measure for quality, the holistic score has been challenged concerning its reliability. High validity and reliability can be achieved using the holistic score measure when certain procedures are utilized. These procedures include using a writing prompt and rater training processes that include the use of anchor papers, checking the reading in progress, multiple independent scoring, evaluation, and record keeping (Applebee et al., 1989; White, 1985).

Using the holistic score measure and the high reliability procedures, the means of the holistic scores of the treatment groups were compared. The mean holistic scores for quality were significantly higher for the direct instruction group and the small-group than for the control

group. Although this is not an unexpected finding, it does indicate that revision instruction and overall rated quality are somehow linked.

Bridwell's Revision Scoring Guide

There were significant differences in the mean scores between groups when Bridwell's Scoring Guide (Bridwell, 1980) was used to analyze the number and type of revisions. The differences indicated that most revisions were made in the Surface, Lexical, Phrase, and Sentence levels of revision, and that there were a significantly higher number for the direct instruction group and the small-group (except for Phrase level) than for the control group. Additionally, there was a positive correlation at the .01 level between quantity of revisions and rated quality. These findings indicate that students do revise, although such revisions appear to be generally associated with lower levels on the hierarchy of linguistic complexity, and that increased revision is associated with higher holistic ratings for quality.

As a measure for number and type of revisions, Bridwell's scoring guide is a complex, extensive, and perhaps a valuable rating scale. For this study, Bridwell's scoring guide presented several problems. First, because of the inclusive nature of the seven levels and a total of 49 sub-categories, teaching raters to use it

and become familiar with the many sub-categories proved to be an exhaustive, time consuming task. Second, the scale proved to be equally frustrating as the researcher and the raters held many training sessions before acceptable interrater reliabilities were achieved. Third, there seemed to be very subtle differences between some of the sub-categories making exact matches between the raters more difficult, and finally, the scale was generally difficult to use since the raters had to mentally organize to make sense of the text while mentally checking off the multiple types of revision that might be applicable to the text being read and then physically mark a coding number on a rating sheet. Perhaps, an analytic scale such as proposed by Cooper (1977) would prove to be equally effective and much more efficient.

Implications For Writing Instruction

This study provides additional support for the importance of specific revision instruction in the writing process (Fitzgerald & Markham, 1987). The results from the holistic score measure clearly indicate that when teacher directed revision instruction was provided, and when small-group peer generated revision instruction was provided for students that the mean scores for these groups were significantly higher than the mean scores for the control group that received regular classroom instruction with only

directions to revise the first draft.

Although not every subject in the study who received revision instruction received a higher holistic score on the second draft, and indeed some received a lower score after revising, similar to results reported by Perl (1979), there were significantly higher holistic ratings for the revision instruction groups than for the control group. These results suggest that revision instruction should be included in the writing process and perhaps individual instruction should be provided for those with writing that does not seem to improve.

Since the results do strongly indicate that specific revision instruction is associated with higher holistic score quality ratings, consideration should be given to including revision instruction as part of the writing process. Although the writing process is a recursive process according to Flower and Hayes (1980), revision provides an opportunity, sometimes the final opportunity for a writers to improve the quality of their written text prior to review by the intended audience.

Recommendations for Continued Research

This study provides strong support for including specific revision instruction in the classroom for eighth grade students. The significantly higher mean holistic scores for the revision instruction treatment groups as

compared with the control group indicate that specific revision instruction may be an important instructional technique for improving the quality of students' writing. It is highly recommended that such specific revision instruction continue where it is in place, and that it be initiated where it is not in place, possibly utilizing this model, as a means of addressing the continuing problem of poor student writing (Applebee et al., 1990).

There were no significant differences between the mean scores of the direct instruction group and the small-group for the holistic score measure for rated quality. Although not significant, the direct instruction group mean score for quality was slightly higher 2.93 (SD = .58) than the mean score for the small-group 2.91 (SD = .51). It is recommended that either or both methods of instructional delivery be used for specific revision instruction, and that this design be compared with other instructional designs to determine if similar results are reported. The results of this study indicated revision instruction to be associated with higher quality ratings. Students' prior knowledge may have been a factor, and that should be considered in subsequent research.

Since this study involved an instructional component, the scripted instruction may need some attention. Although the scripted instruction was tested and refined in a pilot study, reviewed and refined by the school district

instructional supervisor, and refined by the teachers in the study, it would seem appropriate to continue to refine this instructional element. That refinement might also include expanding the lesson format to a semester or full year component, and then replicating this study to see if using revision instruction may provide long-term benefits for improving the quality of student writing.

Replication of this study is recommended with several refinements. Longer instructional times should be included in order to more accurately duplicate regular year-long class instruction to determine what, if any, effect it has on the quality of students' persuasive writing. Since there has been recent research that indicates a strong relationship between overall quality ratings and the number of words in an essay, additional attention should possibly be given to essay length and word count analyses (Durst, Laine, Schultz & Vilter, 1990). The replication should perhaps also include an analysis of the number of revisions per one hundred words so that some baseline of quantity and revision opportunities can be determined for the essays of various lengths.

Finally, it is recommended that this study be conducted with younger, elementary grade students and with older, high school students to determine if similar, significant results can be obtained.

APPENDIX A
DISSERTATIONAL STUDY APPROVAL FORM

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF CHARLES COUNTY
LA PLATA, MARYLAND 20646-0170

0301 002-0010 0300 070-2014

JOHN H. BLOOM
SUPERINTENDENT

CONDUCTING INDEPENDENT RESEARCH IN THE CHARLES
COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Procedures and Standards

The Charles County School System is happy to cooperate in the furtherance of student academic advancement and the acquisition of knowledge through the independent research or study of school data and statistics. Such activities, however, must be guided by procedures and standards which serve to guarantee that the sequential teaching and learning processes of both teacher and pupil in our schools will not be interrupted. More important, it is our responsibility to protect the dignity and personal rights of those in our charge by maintaining final determination of the disposition of all data and information within our files. It is for these purposes that the following procedures and standards have been established:-

1. Submit a statement of research or study intentions to this office at least two weeks prior to intended date of activity initiation. Include:
 - a. This form signed by applicant (in duplicate)
 - b. Objectives of study
 - c. Instruments to be used
 - d. Specific population to be studied
 - e. Intended data analysis
 - f. Proposed activity schedule
 - g. Copies of appropriate permission forms (parent, principal, etc)
2. If applicant is not using standardized tests, submit to this office a copy of instruments to be used in the research two weeks prior to intended administration date.
3. No research or study activity is to be initiated without both the specific written approval by the Superintendent of Schools, and a site approval by the administrative head (e.g. principal) of the location of the research activities.
4. No student who is studied shall be identified by name or other means in any publication resulting from this study.
5. This research shall not require the direct services of any school personnel at times during which they are on duty for the Charles County Public Schools.
6. The Charles County School System will be free to use any analysis, information, and/or statistics resulting from applicant's research activity.

APPENDIX B
HOLISTIC SCORING RUBRIC FOR PERSUASIVE WRITING

HOLISTIC SCORE GUIDE FOR EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS'
PERSUASIVE ESSAYS

- 1 = Unsatisfactory. This score is to be used for papers that indicate the writer saw the prompt and attempted to respond to it. There is no evidence of development. These papers may or may not have appropriate paragraph structure, sentence structure, or use of conventions, but the response is such that it is inappropriate for the prompt.
- 2 = Minimal. These scores will be used for papers that demonstrate one or more of the following:
- o State no position, but give one or more arguments-
 - o Take a position, but list arguments with no supporting statements-
 - o Take a position, but only support arguments with opinions-
- These papers will not have adequate paragraph and sentence structure. These papers will have errors in conventions.
- 3 = Adequate. These scores will be used for papers that state a position and defend most arguments with supporting statements. Some statements may not go beyond the level of opinion. These papers will have adequate paragraph and sentence structure. These papers may have errors in conventions.
- 4 = Elaborated. This superior score will be used for papers that clearly take a position and defend each argument with multiple supporting statements. These arguments will go beyond merely stating opinions. These papers will have correct paragraph and sentence structure. These papers will have few, if any, errors in conventions.
- 0 = Illegible, illiterate, misunderstanding the task, I don't know or no response.

APPENDIX C
REVISION SCORING GUIDE

REVISION SCORING GUIDE

1. Surface Level
 - 1.1 Spelling
 - 1.2 Punctuation
 - 1.3 Capitalization
 - 1.4 Verb form
 - 1.5 Abbreviations vs. full form
 - 1.6 Symbols vs. full form
 - 1.7 Contractions vs. full form
 - 1.8 Singular vs. plural
 - 1.9 Morphological conditioning
 - 1.10 Interlinear and marginal notations related to any of the above

2. Lexical Level
 - 2.1 Addition
 - 2.2 Deletion
 - 2.3 Substitution (synonyms, pronouns)
 - 2.4 Order shift of single word
 - 2.5 Interlinear and marginal notations related to single words

3. Phrase Level
 - 3.1 Addition
 - 3.2 Deletion
 - 3.3 Substitution/alteration
 - 3.4 Order shift of complete phrase
 - 3.5 Expansion of word to phrase
 - 3.6 Reduction of phrase to word
 - 3.7 Interlinear and marginal notations related to phrases

4. Clause Level
(Subordinate or independent not punctuated as sentence)
 - 4.1 Addition
 - 4.2 Deletion
 - 4.3 Substitution/alteration
 - 4.4 Order shift of complete clause
 - 4.5 Expansion of word or phrase to clause
 - 4.6 Reduction of clause to word or phrase
 - 4.7 Interlinear and marginal notations related to clauses

5. Sentence Level
(as punctuated by student)
 - 5.1 Addition
 - 5.2 Deletion
 - 5.3 Substitution/alteration

- 5.4 Order shift of complete sentence
 - 5.5 Expansion of word, phrase, or clause (includes de-coordination)
 - 5.6 Reduction of sentence to word, phrase or clause (includes coordination)
 - 5.7 Transformation
 - 5.8 Interlinear and marginal notations related to sentence
6. Multi-sentence Level
(two or more consecutive sentences, categories 6.1-6.5 tallied once for each sentence involved)
- 6.1 Addition
 - 6.2 Deletion
 - 6.3 Substitution/alteration
 - 6.4 Order shift of two or more sentences
 - 6.5 Reduction of two or more sentences to single sentence (excepting those changes accounted for by category 5.6, clause, phrase, or word)
 - 6.6 Indention
 - 6.7 De-indention
 - 6.8 Interlinear and marginal notations related to multiple sentences
7. Text Level
- 7.1 Change in function category of essay
 - 7.2 Change in audience category of essay
 - 7.3 Change in overall content of the paper
 - 7.4 Total re-write of essay with few or no one-to-one correspondences between sentences

Taken from: Bridwell, L. S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 197-222.

APPENDIX D
SCRIPTED LESSONS FOR RESEARCH GROUP A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

SCRIPT FOR DAY 1
RESEARCH GROUP A (CLASSES A1 AND A2)

Materials

1. Packets that include an introduction, examples of persuasive essays, elements of a persuasive essay, and a writing prompt-
2. Overhead transparencies of elements of a persuasive essay, the writing process TAP strategy, and the writing prompt-
3. Chalkboard with revision definition displayed-
4. Paper and pencils-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity -
Teacher selected (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your three years in middle school you have learned many things about writing and you have been writing often in your language arts class. Much of your writing

has been narrative writing or explanatory writing. Almost all of you have written in your journals (raise your hand if you have or think you have done that type of writing). You have already learned many things about writing and the steps or process that you should follow in certain types of writing. One step in the process of writing is called revision. (What is revision in writing?) Write several responses on the chalkboard. Revise the responses to fit the definition in use (modeling one revision activity). Although revision may occur at various points in the writing process, we are going to concentrate on the revision that occurs after the first draft of your writing.

For the next three days, we are going to work with your writing and revision. It is very important for you to pay close attention to all directions and to think of revision as a step that will help to improve your writing. During the next three days, you will be asked to write a first draft of a persuasive essay, you will receive certain directions about revision, and then you will be asked to write a revised final draft of your work. Each of you have many good writing abilities and skills, so plan to do the best that you can.

Lesson Objective

We are going to get started right away. Today, you

are going to review some things you may already know about and learn some things that you may not know about. Most of you know the TAP and Count method of writing. Raise your hand if you think you remember what TAP and Count means (Take several responses and write appropriate responses on the chalkboard). You will continue to use this plan as you write during the next few days. Since much of your writing has been narrative or explanatory, we need to learn about a special type of writing that you will be doing for this lesson. It is called a persuasive essay. Raise your hand if you think you know what a persuasive essay is about (Take several responses). I have some things that may help you understand what this means (distribute the packets). When you get your packet, read the short introduction and look at the example of a persuasive essay.

Lesson Activities

Very soon you will get a chance to write a persuasive essay, but before you do that we will do some things that may help you. (Teacher reads the examples of persuasive essays as students read along silently) (Teacher then directs students to compare the elements of a persuasive essay with the examples and to identify the elements or as many as possible in the examples) As you see, when writing a persuasive essay you are attempting to convince or

persuade your audience to a certain way of thinking or acting or both. Review your examples, look at the elements of a persuasive essay and raise your hand if you have any questions about what persuasive essays attempt to do or what elements or parts they have.

Summary (First session/day one)

You have done a good job this period. You have reviewed some of the steps in the writing process, and you have seen and discussed a form of writing called the persuasive essay. When you return, we will review this lesson, and you will begin to write your persuasive essay.

Second Session

Warmup

For your notebooks list the elements in a persuasive writing activity and the meaning of TAP - (Task, Audience, Purpose)

Review - Previous lesson review

Review your examples, look at the elements of a persuasive essay and raise your hand if you have any questions about what persuasive essays attempt to do or what elements or parts they have.

Keep these papers on your desk to use to help you as you now begin to write a persuasive essay. Since this will be a first draft and you will have an opportunity to revise

it later, please use the pencils and paper I have included in your packet. Also it is very important that you respond to the writing prompt as you have to other prompts you have been given in class. Here is your writing assignment.

(Distribute the prompt) Read the prompt aloud as students read it silently. Are there any questions about any words in the prompt? If anyone has a question please raise your hand. For this activity everyone should work on their own essay and follow the directions included with the prompt. Do not write your name on any of the writing papers you hand in. Each of you will be assigned an identification number (ID number). Use that number on all of your papers.

Allocate 10 minutes for pre-writing.

Allocate 30 minutes for writing the persuasive essay.

Remind students of the approaching end of the class period and that we will need to collect their papers at the end of the period. Remind them that this is a first draft and that they will have an opportunity to revise it later. Remind students to write their ID number on all sheets of paper and return all papers to the packet. (Teacher collects the packets)

Summary/Closing

You have done very good work today. You have reviewed some of the steps in the writing process, you have

seen and discussed a form of writing called the persuasive essay and you have written your own persuasive essay. Next we will learn some information about revision or revising, and, finally, you will have an opportunity to write a final draft of your persuasive essay.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 2

CLASS A1 DIRECT INSTRUCTION

Materials

1. Overhead transparencies of the Lesson (Revision), elements of the revision process and examples of revisions-
2. Passages with which the teacher demonstrates revision-
3. Guided practice passages for students to use in making revisions-
4. Pencils

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (2 class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher choice (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During our last lesson you learned about writing a persuasive essay and wrote your first drafts of your persuasive essay. Today you will learn about a part of the writing process called revision. Soon you will be getting a chance to revise your first draft of your persuasive

essay.

Lesson Objectives

Today you are going to learn about revision. Revision is one of the steps in the writing process that may help you to greatly improve the quality of your writing. In this case you will be able to revise your persuasive essay that you wrote earlier. You will learn about the steps and strategies that are included in the revision process.

Lesson

Introduction

Writing is a process that has many steps. One of the steps that may be able to improve the quality of your writing even after you have written a first draft is called revision. Although revision may be accomplished at almost any stage of the writing process, we want to concentrate on the revision that may help improve your previously written first draft persuasive essays. In order to accomplish this task, we will identify, discuss, view examples of, and practice using elements of the revision procedure. When you have accomplished these activities, we will again look at your first drafts of the persuasive essay. When you get the essay back, you will be asked to consider the things

you learned, and as you reread your essays make any revisions you think are necessary. The final step will be for you to write a final draft.

Presentation

You need to now start thinking about revision. I have a definition of revision on the board under this chart, but what do you know or remember about revision? (Take several responses) (Answer: Making any change at any stage in the writing process) (Have only the word "change" on the board and revise it to fit the operational definition as students respond) (Modeling revision)

"Change" seems to be an important word in this process of revision. If you decided that your essay needed change, what operations or things could you do to it to change your writing? (Take several responses and put them into categories on the board.) (Answer: Additions, Deletions, Substitutions, Rearrangements).

Summary (Session 1)

This class period you have discussed revision and started to give examples and see examples of different kinds of revision. When we return for the second class today, you will find out important information about four categories of revision that will help you when you begin

revising your persuasive essays.

Session 2 (second meeting of the day)

Warmup

For your notebooks, write a definition of revision -

Review from the previous lesson

You need to start thinking about revision again!

"Change" seems to be an important word in this process of revision. Last period you listed some things you could do if you found that your essay needed changing. Let's look at these again and see if we need to add some to the list. (Take student responses). Let's look at four important categories in which changes may occur. (Present the four categories - explain/discuss).

Additions

During revision, additions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), words added, phrases added, sentences added and paragraphs added. (Use example, identify additions and then have students suggest additional additions.) (Students should write these on their copy and draw arrows to indicate where the additions should go.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.) Additions involve adding

something to your work, but sometimes as you revise you need to make changes in an opposite way.

Deletions

During revision, deletions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling) words deleted, phrases deleted, sentences deleted and paragraphs deleted. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts. (Use example, identify deletions and then have students suggest additional deletions.) (Students should write these on their copy and draw arrows to indicate where the deletions should be made.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.) Deletions involve taking something out of your work, but sometimes as you revise you may need to delete and add in the same operation. This can be called substitution. You substitute one thing for another.

Substitutions

During revision, substitutions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), word substitution, phrase substitution, sentence substitution and paragraph substitution. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts. (Use example, identify substitutions and then have students

suggest additional substitutions.) (Students should write these on their copy and draw arrows to indicate where the substitutions should be made.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.) Substitutions involve taking something out of your drafts and replacing it with something more appropriate or something that will improve your essay. There may be times as you revise that you do not need to add, delete or substitute. As you read your essay, possibly after you have added, deleted and substituted, it seems to have all of the facts, arguments, elaboration and TAP considerations but some things seem out of place or out of sequence. This might require rearrangement. This is writing events in the proper order.

Rearrangements

During revision rearrangements usually include word rearrangement, sentence rearrangement and paragraph rearrangement. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts. (Use example, identify rearrangements and then have students suggest additional rearrangements.) (Students should write why they think a rearrangement is necessary and draw arrows to indicate what the revision is and where it should be made.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.) Rearrangements involve reading the entire written work and

looking for a proper sequence, a logical sequence, a "does it make sense" sequence and a "does it say what I want it to say" sequence.

Summary

Let's review some of the things from today that may help you to improve your writing.

One of the steps in the writing process that involves change is called_____. Raise your hand if you think you know. (Answer: REVISION)

Today we learned about four kinds of things you can do to change or revise your writing. I will mention several terms. When you hear me say any of the four revision steps, quickly raise your hand. (Divisions, Multiplications, Additions, (write it on the board) Receptions, Deletions, (write it on the board) Replies, Disruptions, Substitutions, (write it on the board) Marks, Institutions, Alterations, Rearrangements (write it on the board). Good work!

Closing

You have done a very good job today. Tomorrow, we will review the things you have learned about revision and work on using that information to revise your essays and then write a final draft of your persuasive essay.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 2

CLASS A2 PEER RESPONSE GROUP/COOPERATIVE LEARNING

Materials

1. Group selection procedures
2. Revision Guide Sheet and Individual Peer-

Response Sheet

3. Pencils

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warm-up

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher choice (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your last lesson you learned about writing a persuasive essay and completed writing your first draft of your persuasive essay. One of the reasons for planning to write a first draft is that there may be some changes you want to make before you consider it complete and finished. Today we are going to work in some special groups where you will do certain things to help each other to improve your first drafts of your persuasive essays.

Sometimes when you write, the things you have written seem to be clear to you but may not seem clear and complete

to others as they read your compositions. One way to help improve your drafts is to have others read them and make suggestions for improvement.

Lesson

You are going to work in groups of two today to help each other improve your persuasive essay drafts. It is not always best to have a friend review your writing, so we will select groups randomly for today's activity. (Select groups randomly as much as possible - some groups of three may be necessary - adjust for personality conflict)

This cooperative activity has responsibilities and rewards. In order for your group to receive an "A", each member must complete a response sheet for other members and discuss suggested improvements to the draft essays. Each member will receive an "A" for completing a final, revised draft of their essay.

When you get with your partner, each of you need to read your partner's essay quietly and carefully and then complete a peer response sheet for your partner. Your partner is expected to do the same for you. Remember, read your partner's draft essay first and fill out a peer response sheet. (Allow 10 minutes before discussion in the group is authorized.)

In turn, discuss each essay briefly and quietly using your response sheet comments to help make suggestions for

improving the essay draft. I will come around to your groups to assist and answer your questions.

Summary (First Session - Day 2)

(Return to your regular seats quietly!) This period is almost over. By raising your hand, how many found some things that might need changing as you talked to the members of your group? When you return, we will review this lesson, and you will be able to continue to work in your groups to improve, change and revise your group's essays.

Second Session

Warm-up

Functional reading activities/teacher choice

Review - Previous lesson review

You have a "Revision Guide Sheet". Get it out on your desk, please. This sheet describes types of changes that you might make in your essay drafts. You will be able to refer to this sheet as you consider changes (revisions) you might wish to make in your essay drafts. (Discuss each item on the sheet. Answer questions students may have about any item.)

When you get in your group again, continue to review the comments on your peer response sheet. Use the revision guide sheet to help your group consider possible revisions

to the essay drafts. Also, continue to discuss quietly the possible changes that could improve group members' essays. I will again come around to your groups to assist you and to answer your questions.

Closing/Summary

(Return to your regular seats quietly!)

You have worked well today on a difficult task. Tomorrow, you will be using the information on revision and the guide sheets from today to revise your drafts and write a final draft of your persuasive essay.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 3

DIRECT INSTRUCTION (CLASS A1)

Materials

1. Copies of students' first drafts of their persuasive essays-
2. Copies of the writing prompt-
3. Pencils and paper-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warm-up

Journal writing/functional writing activities (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your last class, you learned about revision and types of revisions that could improve your writing. Today, you will put that knowledge to good use.

Objective

Today is an important day in this class! You will be able to work on improving your persuasive essay and then write a final draft to be turned in to me.

Lesson

Write "Compare, Diagnose, Operate (CDO)" on the board.

Discuss:

COMPARE - Are the words, phrases and sentences

that state your position, argue your facts and convince your audience in your persuasive essay saying what you intend to say?

DIAGNOSE - If they are not, which part(s) are wrong?

OPERATE - Using information you have learned about persuasive writing and revision, what can you possibly do to correct the problem in your essay?

After a presentation and discussion of this revision procedure, allow students to apply the procedure to their draft essays. Have students share some of their attempts if time permits.

Summary (Session 1)

This class period you have reviewed persuasive writing and revision strategies. When you return for your second class, you will work on your final persuasive essay.

Session 2 (Second meeting of the day)

Warmup

For your notebooks, explain (CDO) -

Lesson

Review the steps in the revision process.

Procedures

Distribute paper and pencils to students.

Distribute to each student a copy of her or his first draft of the persuasive essay.

Distribute the writing prompt to anyone without it.

Directions: Use the information and/or materials we have discussed during our lessons on revision as you revise your first draft of your persuasive essay. Write a final draft to hand in. Make any changes necessary to improve your final draft. You will have 30 minutes to complete your final draft. Keep your papers until I ask for them. Check for errors, and be prepared to hand in your draft and final paper.

Summary

You have done a very good job with your writing efforts during the past few days. Revising your writing drafts can possibly help you to improve your writing.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 3

SMALL-GROUP PEER RESPONSE (CLASS A2)

Materials

1. Peer response sheets-
2. Copies of the students' first draft of the persuasive essay-
3. Paper and pencils-
4. Copies of the writing prompt-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal writing/functional writing activities (3 - 5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your last class, you learned about revision and types of revisions that could improve your writing. You also worked in small groups or with partners in order to help others improve their writing by suggesting improvements. Today, you will put that knowledge to good use.

Objective

Today is an important day in this class! You will be able to work on improving your persuasive essay and then write a final draft to be turned in.

Lesson

You are going to be able to work in your groups again this period. When I tell you to get in your group or with a partner, please do so quietly and quickly. Follow the same procedure for reading and responding to the writing within the group as was utilized during the last class period.

Summary (Session 1)

This class period you have reviewed revision strategies and continued to work in peer groups to get suggestions for ways to improve your writing. When you return for your second class, you will work on your final persuasive essay.

Session 2 (Second meeting of the day)

Warmup

For your notebooks, list the categories of revision you learned about and give one example of each.

Lesson

Review the steps in the revision process.

Procedures

Distribute paper and pencils to students.

Distribute to each student a copy of her or his first draft of the persuasive essay.

Distribute the writing prompt.

Directions: Use the information and/or materials

we have discussed during our lessons on revision as you revise your first draft of your persuasive essay. Write a final draft to hand in. Make any changes necessary to improve your final draft. You will have 30 minutes to complete your final draft. Keep your papers until I ask for them. Check for errors, and be prepared to hand in your draft and final paper.

Summary

You have done a very good job with your writing efforts during the past few days. Revising your writing drafts can possibly help you to improve your writing.

APPENDIX E
SCRIPTED LESSONS FOR RESEARCH GROUP B

SCRIPT FOR DAY 1
RESEARCH GROUP B (CLASSES B1 AND B2)

Materials

1. Packets that include an introduction, samples of persuasive essays, elements of a persuasive essay and a writing prompt-
2. Overhead transparencies of elements of a persuasive essay, the writing process TAP strategy, and the writing prompt-
3. Chalkboard with revision definition displayed-
4. Paper and pencils-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher selected (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your three years in middle school you have learned many things about writing and you have been writing often in your language arts class. Much of your writing has been narrative writing or explanatory writing. Almost all of you have written in your journals (raise your hand

if you have or think you have done that type of writing). You have already learned many things about writing and the steps or process that you should follow in certain types of writing. One step in the process of writing is called revision. (What is revision in writing?) Write several responses on the chalkboard. Revise the responses to fit the definition in use (modeling one revision activity). Although revision may occur at various points in the writing process, we are going to concentrate on the revision that occurs after the first draft of your writing.

For the next three days we are going to work with your writing and revision. It is very important for you to pay close attention to all directions and to think of revision as a step that will help to improve your writing. During the next three days you will be asked to write a first draft of a persuasive essay, you will receive certain directions about revision and then you will be asked to write a revised final draft of your work. Each of you have many good writing abilities and skills, so plan to do the best that you can.

Lesson Objective

We are going to get started right away. Today, you are going to review some things you may already know about and learn some things that you may not know about. Most of

you know the TAP and Count method of writing. Raise your hand if you think you remember what TAP and Count means (Take several responses and write appropriate responses on the chalkboard). You will continue to use this plan as you write during the next few days. Since much of your writing has been narrative or explanatory, we need to learn about a special type of writing that you will be doing for this lesson. It is called a persuasive essay. Raise your hand if you think you know what a persuasive essay is about (Take several responses). I have some things that may help you understand what this means (distribute the packets). When you get your packet, read the short introduction and look at the example of a persuasive essay.

Lesson Activities

Very soon you will get a chance to write a persuasive essay, but before you do that we will do some things that may help you. (Teacher reads the examples of persuasive essays as students read along silently) (Teacher then directs students to compare the elements of a persuasive essay with the examples and to identify the elements or as many as possible in the examples) As you see, when writing a persuasive essay you are attempting to convince or persuade your audience to a certain way of thinking or acting or both. Review your examples, look at the elements

of a persuasive essay and raise your hand if you have any questions about what persuasive essays attempt to do or what elements or parts they have.

Summary (First session/day one)

You have done a good job this period. You have reviewed some of the steps in the writing process, and you have seen and discussed a form of writing called the persuasive essay. When you return, we will review this lesson, and you will begin to write your persuasive essay.

Second Session

Warmup

For notebooks list elements in a persuasive writing activity and the meaning of TAP -

Review (Previous lesson review)

Review your examples, look at the elements of a persuasive essay and raise your hand if you have any questions about what persuasive essays attempt to do or what elements or parts they have.

Keep these papers on your desk to use to help you as you now begin to write a persuasive essay. Since this will be a first draft and you will have an opportunity to revise it later, please use the pencils and paper I have included in your packet. Also it is very important that you respond to the writing prompt as you have to other prompts you have

been given in class. Here is your writing assignment.

(Distribute the prompt.) Read the prompt aloud as students read it silently. Are there any questions about any words in the prompt? If anyone has a question please raise your hand. For this activity everyone should work on their own essay and follow the directions included with the prompt. Do not write your name on any of the writing papers you hand in. Each of you will be assigned an identification number (ID number). Use that number on all of your papers.

Allocate 10 minutes for pre-writing.

Allocate 30 minutes for writing the persuasive essay.

Remind students of the approaching end of the class period and that we will need to collect the papers at the end of the period. Remind them that this is a first draft and that they will have an opportunity to revise it later. Remind students to write their ID number on all sheets of paper and return all papers to the packet. (Teacher collects the packets)

Summary/Closing

You have done very good work today. You have reviewed some of the steps in the writing process, you have seen and discussed a form of writing called the persuasive essay and you have written your own persuasive essay. Next we will learn some information about revision or revising,

and finally you will have an opportunity to write a final draft of your persuasive essay. The essay and all materials will be handed in to be checked.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 2
DIRECT INSTRUCTION (CLASS B1)

Materials

1. Overhead transparencies of the Lesson (Revision), elements of the revision process and examples of revisions-
2. Passages with which the teacher demonstrates revision-
3. Guided practice passages for students to use in making revisions-
4. Paper and pencils-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (2 class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher choice (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During our last lesson you learned about writing a persuasive essay and wrote your first drafts of your persuasive essay. Today you will learn about a part of the writing process called revision. Soon you will be getting a chance to revise your first draft of your persuasive essay.

Lesson Objectives

Today you are going to learn about revision. Revision is one of the steps in the writing process that may help you to greatly improve the quality of your writing. In this case you will be able to revise your persuasive essay that you wrote earlier. You will learn about the steps and strategies that are included in the revision process.

Lesson

Introduction

Writing is a process that has many steps. One of the steps that may be able to improve the quality of your writing even after you have written a first draft is called revision. Although revision may be accomplished at almost any stage of the writing process, we want to concentrate on the revision that may help improve your previously written first draft persuasive essays. In order to accomplish this task, we will identify, discuss, view examples of, and practice using elements of the revision procedure. When you have accomplished these activities, we will again look at your first drafts of the persuasive essay. When you get the essay back, you will be asked to consider the things you learned, and as you reread your essays make any

revisions you think are necessary. The final step will be for you to write a final draft.

Presentation

You need to now start thinking about revision. I have a definition of revision on the board under this chart, but what do you know or remember about revision? (Take several responses) (Answer: Making any change at any stage in the writing process) (Have only the word "change" on the board and revise it to fit the operational definition as students respond.) (Modeling revision)

"Change" seems to be an important word in this process of revision. If you decided that your essay needed change, what operations or things could you do to it to change your writing? (Take several responses and put them into categories on the board.) (Answer: Additions, Deletions, Substitutions, Rearrangements).

Summary (Session 1)

This class period you have discussed revision and started to give examples and see examples of different kinds of revision. When we return for the second class today, you will find out important information about four categories of revision that will help you when you begin revising your persuasive essays.

Session 2 (second meeting of the day)

Warmup

For your notebooks, write a definition of revision -

Review From The Previous Lesson

You need to start thinking about revision again!
"Change" seems to be an important word in this process of revision. Last period you listed some things you could do if you found that your essay needed changing. Let's look at these again and see if we need to add some to the list. (Take student responses). Let's look at four important categories in which changes may occur. (Present the four categories - explain/discuss).

Additions

During revision, additions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), words added, phrases added, sentences added and paragraphs added. (Use example, identify additions and then have students suggest additional additions.) (Students should write these on their copy and draw arrows to indicate where the additions should go.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.) Additions involve adding something to your work, but sometimes as you revise you need to make changes in an opposite way.

Deletions

During revision, deletions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling) words deleted, phrases deleted, sentences deleted and paragraphs deleted. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts. (Use example, identify deletions and then have students suggest additional deletions.) (Students should write these on their copy and draw arrows to indicate where the deletions should be made.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.) Deletions involve taking something out of your work, but sometimes as you revise you may need to delete and add in the same operation. This can be called substitution. You substitute one thing for another.

Substitutions

During revision, substitutions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), word substitution, phrase substitution, sentence substitution and paragraph substitution. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts. (Use example, identify substitutions and then have students suggest additional substitutions.) (Students should write these on their copy and draw arrows to indicate where the substitutions should be made.) (Get several student

responses and comment briefly on them.) Substitutions involve taking something out of your drafts and replacing it with something more appropriate or something that will improve your essay. There may be times as you revise that you do not need to add, delete or substitute. As you read your essay, possibly after you have added, deleted and substituted, it seems to have all of the facts, arguments, elaboration and TAP considerations but some things seem out of place or out of sequence. This might require rearrangement. This is writing events in the proper order.

Rearrangements

During revision rearrangements usually include word rearrangement, sentence rearrangement and paragraph rearrangement. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts. (Use example, identify rearrangements and then have students suggest additional rearrangements.) (Students should write why they think a rearrangement is necessary and draw arrows to indicate what the revision is and where it should be made.) (Get several student responses and comment briefly on them.)

Rearrangements involve reading the entire written work and looking for a proper sequence, a logical sequence, a "does it make sense" sequence and a "does it say what I want it to say" sequence.

Summary

Let's review some of the things from today that may help you to improve your writing.

One of the steps in the writing process that involves change is called _____. Raise your hand if you think you know. (Answer: REVISION)

Today we learned about four kinds of things you can do to change or revise your writing. I will mention several terms. When you hear me say any of the four revision steps, quickly raise your hand. (Divisions, Multiplications, Additions, (write it on the board) Receptions, Deletions, (write it on the board) Replies, Disruptions, Substitutions, (write it on the board) Marks, Institutions, Alterations, Rearrangements (write it on the board). Good work!

Closing

You have done a very good job today. Tomorrow, we will review the things you have learned about revision, work on using that information to revise your essays and then write a final draft of your persuasive essay.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 2

CLASS B2 PEER RESPONSE GROUP/COOPERATIVE LEARNING

Materials

1. Group selection procedures
2. Revision Guide Sheet and Individual Peer-Response Sheet
3. Pencils

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity Teacher choice (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your last lesson you learned about writing a persuasive essay and completed writing your first draft of your persuasive essay. One of the reasons for planning to write a first draft is that there may be some changes you want to make before you consider it complete and finished. Today we are going to work in some special groups where you will do certain things to help each other to improve your first drafts of your persuasive essays.

Sometimes when you write, the things you have written seem to be clear to you but may not seem clear and complete

to others as they read your compositions. One way to help improve your drafts is to have others read them and make suggestions for improvement.

Lesson

You are going to work in groups of two today to help each other improve your persuasive essay drafts. It is not always best to have a friend review your writing so we will select groups randomly for today's activity.

(Select groups randomly as much as possible - some groups of three may be necessary - adjust for personality conflict)

This cooperative activity has responsibilities and rewards. In order for your group to receive an "A", each member must complete a response sheet for other members and discuss suggested improvements to the draft essays. Each member will receive an "A" for completing a final, revised draft of their essay.

When you get with your partner, each of you need to read your partner's essay quietly and carefully and then complete a peer response sheet for your partner. Your partner is expected to do the same for you. Remember, read your partner's draft essay first and fill out a peer response sheet. (Allow 10 minutes before discussion in the group is authorized.)

In turn, discuss each essay briefly and quietly using your response sheet comments to help make suggestions for

improving the essay draft. I will come around to your groups to assist and answer your questions.

Summary (First Session - Day 2)

(Return to your regular seats quietly!)

This period is almost over. By raising your hand, how many found some things that might need changing as you talked to the members of your group? When you return, we will review this lesson, and you will be able to continue to work in your groups to improve, change and revise your group's essays.

Second Session

Warmup

Functional reading activities/teacher choice

Review - Previous Lesson Review

You have a "Revision Guide Sheet". Get it out on your desk, please. This sheet describes types of changes that you might make in your essay drafts. You will be able to refer to this sheet as you consider changes (revisions) you might wish to make in your essay drafts. (Discuss each item on the sheet. Answer questions students may have about any item.)

When you get in your group again, continue to review the comments on your peer response sheet. Use the revision

guide sheet to help your group consider possible revisions to the essay drafts. Also, continue to discuss quietly the possible changes that could improve group members' essays. I will again come around to your groups to assist you and to answer your questions.

Closing/Summary

(Return to your regular seats quietly!)

You have worked well today on a difficult task. Tomorrow, you will be using the information on revision and the guide sheets from today to revise your drafts and write a final draft of your persuasive essay.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 3

DIRECT INSTRUCTION (CLASS B1)

Materials

1. Copies of students' first drafts of their persuasive essays-
2. Copies of the writing prompt-
3. Paper and pencils -

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal writing/functional writing activities (3 - 5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your last class, you learned about revision and types of revisions that could improve your writing. Today, you will put that knowledge to good use.

Objective

Today is an important day in this class! You will be able to work on improving your persuasive essay and then write a final draft to be turned in.

Lesson

Write "Compare, Diagnose, Operate (CDO)" on the board.

Discuss:

COMPARE - Are the words, phrases and sentences that state your position, argue your facts and convince

your audience in your persuasive essay saying what you intend to say?

DIAGNOSE - If they are not, which part(s) are wrong?

OPERATE - Using information you have learned about persuasive writing and revision, what can you possibly do to correct the problem in your essay?

After a presentation and discussion of this revision procedure, allow students to apply the procedure to their draft essays. Have students share some of their attempts if time permits.

Summary (Session 1)

This class period you have reviewed persuasive writing and revision strategies. When you return for your second class, you will work on your final persuasive essay.

Session 2 (Second meeting of the day)

For your notebooks, explain (CDO) -

Lesson

Review the steps in the revision process.

Procedures

Distribute paper and pencils to students.

Distribute to each student a copy of her or his first draft of the persuasive essay.

Distribute the writing prompt.

Directions: Use the information and/or materials we have discussed during our lessons on revision as you revise your first draft of your persuasive essay. Write a final draft to hand in. Make any changes necessary to improve your final draft. You will have 30 minutes to complete your final draft. Keep your papers until I ask for them. Check for errors, and be prepared to hand in your draft and final paper.

Summary

You have done a very good job with your writing efforts during the past few days. Revising your writing drafts can possibly help you to improve your writing.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 3
SMALL-GROUP PEER RESPONSE (CLASS B2)

Materials

1. Peer response sheets-
2. Copies of the students' first draft of their persuasive essays-
3. Copies of the writing prompt-
4. Paper and pencils-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal writing/functional writing activities (3 - 5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your last class, you learned about revision and types of revisions that could improve your writing. You also worked in small groups or with partners in order to help others improve their writing by suggesting improvements. Today, you will put that knowledge to good use.

Objective

Today is an important day in this class! You will be able to work on improving your persuasive essay and then write a final draft to be turned in.

Lesson

You are going to be able to work in your groups again this period. When I tell you to get in your group or with a partner, please do so quietly and quickly. Follow the same procedure for reading and responding to the writing within the group as was utilized during the last class period.

Summary (Session 1)

This class period you have reviewed revision strategies and continued to work in peer groups to get suggestions for ways to improve your writing. When you return for your second class, you will work on your final persuasive essay.

Session 2 (Second meeting of the day)

Warmup

For your notebooks, list the categories of revision you learned about and give one example of each.

Lesson

Review the steps in the revision process.

Procedures

Distribute paper and pencils to students.

Distribute to each student a copy of her or his first draft of the persuasive essay.

Distribute the writing prompt.

Directions: Use the information and/or materials

we have discussed during our lessons on revision as you revise your first draft of your persuasive essay. Write a final draft to hand in. Make any changes necessary to improve your final draft. You will have 30 minutes to complete your final draft. Keep your papers until I ask for them. Check for errors, and be prepared to hand in your draft and final paper.

Summary

You have done a very good job with your writing efforts during the past few days. Revising your writing drafts can possibly help you to improve your writing.

APPENDIX F
SCRIPTED LESSONS FOR CONTROL GROUP C

SCRIPT FOR DAY 1
CONTROL GROUP C (CLASSES C1 AND C2)

Materials

1. Packets that include an introduction, samples of persuasive essays, elements of a persuasive essay and a writing prompt-
2. Overhead transparencies of elements of a persuasive essay, the writing process TAP strategy, and the writing prompt-
3. Chalkboard with revision definition displayed-
4. Paper and pencils-

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher selected (3-5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

During your three years in middle school you have learned many things about writing and you have been writing often in your language arts class. Much of your writing has been narrative writing or explanatory writing. Almost all of you have written in your journals (raise your hand

if you have or think you have done that type of writing). You have already learned many things about writing and the steps or process that you should follow in certain types of writing. One step in the process of writing is called revision. (What is revision in writing?) Write several responses on the chalkboard. Revise the responses to fit the definition in use (modeling one revision activity). Although revision may occur at various points in the writing process, we are going to concentrate on the revision that occurs after the first draft of your writing.

For the next three days we are going to work with your writing and revision. It is very important for you to pay close attention to all directions and to think of revision as a step that will help to improve your writing. During the next three days you will be asked to write a first draft of a persuasive essay, you will receive certain directions about revision and then you will be asked to write a revised final draft of your work. Each of you have many good writing abilities and skills, so plan to do the best that you can.

Lesson Objective

We are going to get started right away. Today, you are going to review some things you may already know about and learn some things that you may not know about. Most of

You know the TAP and Count method of writing. Raise your hand if you think you remember what TAP and Count means (Take several responses and write appropriate responses on the chalkboard). You will continue to use this plan as you write during the next few days. Since much of your writing has been narrative or explanatory, we need to learn about a special type of writing that you will be doing for this lesson. It is called a persuasive essay. Raise your hand if you think you know what a persuasive essay is about (Take several responses). I have some things that may help you understand what this means (distribute the packets). When you get your packet, read the short introduction and look at the examples of persuasive essays.

Lesson Activities

Very soon you will get a chance to write a persuasive essay, but before you do that we will do some things that may help you. (Teacher reads the examples of persuasive essays as students read along silently) (Teacher then directs students to compare the elements of a persuasive essay with the examples and to identify the elements or as many as possible in the examples) As you see, when writing a persuasive essay you are attempting to convince or persuade your audience to a certain way of thinking or acting or both. Review your examples, look at the elements

of a persuasive essay and raise your hand if you have any questions about what persuasive essays attempt to do or what elements or parts they have.

Summary (First session/day one)

You have done a good job this period. You have reviewed some of the steps in the writing process, and you have seen and discussed a form of writing called the persuasive essay. When you return, we will review this lesson, and you will begin to write your persuasive essay.

Second Session

Warmup

For your notebooks list the elements in a persuasive writing activity and the meaning of TAP -

Review (Previous Lesson Review)

Review your examples, look at the elements of a persuasive essay and raise your hand if you have any questions about what persuasive essays attempt to do or what elements or parts they have.

Keep these papers on your desk to use to help you as you now begin to write a persuasive essay. Since this will be a first draft and you will have an opportunity to revise it later, please use the pencils and paper I have included in your packet. Also it is very important that you respond to the writing prompt as you have to other prompts you have

been given in class. Here is your writing assignment.

(Distribute the prompt) Read the prompt aloud as students read it silently. Are there any questions about any words in the prompt? If anyone has a question please raise your hand. For this activity everyone should work on their own essay and follow the directions included with the prompt. Do not write your name on any of the writing papers you hand in. Each of you will be assigned an identification number (ID number). Use that number on all of your papers.

Allocate 10 minutes for pre-writing.

Allocate 30 minutes for writing the persuasive essay.

Remind students of the approaching end of the class period and that we will need to collect their papers at the end of the period. Remind them that this is a first draft and that they will have an opportunity to revise it later. Remind students to write their ID number on all sheets of paper and return all papers to the packet. (Teacher collects the packets)

Summary/Closing

You have done very good work today. You have reviewed some of the steps in the writing process, you have seen and discussed a form of writing called the persuasive essay and you have written your own persuasive essay. Next we will learn some information about revision or revising,

and, finally, you will have an opportunity to write a final draft of your persuasive essay. The paper will be collected and checked.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 2
CONTROL GROUP (CLASSES C1 AND C2)

Materials

1. Students' first draft of their persuasive essay written from the prompt-
2. Examples of persuasive essays-
3. Chalkboard for lesson objectives-
4. Paper and pencils

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher selected (3 - 5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

Yesterday you wrote a first draft of your persuasive essay. Today we will look at several examples of persuasive essays and you will then be able to spend some time working on your draft to revise it and/or to improve it.

Lesson Objective

Today you will revise your first draft of the

persuasive essay in order to improve it or make it sound and look better. You will also be able to review the persuasive essays written by other people that we used yesterday to learn about persuasive writing.

Introduction

One way to improve our writing is to review what we have written and then revise our drafts in order to make them better (easier to understand, stating exactly what we want to say, etc.)

Presentation

As you get copies of your first draft of your persuasive essay back, check to see that you have the correct paper (ID number). (Distribute the essays.) Before you start writing and revising your essays, review the examples of persuasive essays that we used yesterday. Please revise your writing to make it better.

Summary (First session/day two)

You have done some very good work this period. You have seen examples of persuasive essays, and you have started to revise your first drafts. Raise your hand if you have done these things. During the next period, you will be able to spend some additional time working to

improve your essay.

Second Session

Warmup

For your notebooks, write as many elements of a persuasive writing activity as you can-

Review (Previous lesson review)

Please use the paper and pencils on your desk to revise or make changes in your essay. Revise your essay to try to make it better.

Guided/Independent Practice

If you have any questions, please raise your hand and I will come to your area and assist you.

Summary

As you finish your revisions of your first draft, please make sure that you put your ID number on all sheets of paper that you are using and then be ready to hand in all of your work. (Collect All Student Work)

You have done a very nice job of working on your revisions today. Tomorrow we will spend some time reviewing our persuasive essays and revision. Finally, I will ask you to look at your essays a final time and then

write a final draft that you will hand in before the end of
your class period. The papers will be checked.

SCRIPT FOR DAY 3
CONTROL GROUP CLASSES (C1 AND C2)

Materials

1. Paper and pencils
2. Copy of each student's persuasive essay

Time

Approximately 100 minutes (Two class periods)

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher selected (3 - 5 minutes)

Advance Organizer

We are nearing the end of this special persuasive writing project. Today, you will be able to spend time making changes to improve your essay and prepare to write your final draft to be handed in to me.

Lesson

Review the writing prompt.

Remind students to revise or make changes to improve their essays.

Summary (First session/day three)

You have been working to make your persuasive essays better by making changes or, in other words, by revising them.

During the next class, you will review the work you have done, and you will be able to write your final draft of your persuasive essay concerning the length of the lunch period.

Second Session

Warmup

Journal entry/functional writing activity - Teacher choice (3 - 5 minutes)

Review -(Previous lesson review)

Procedures

Distribute paper and pencils to students.

Distribute to each student her or his packet with revisions they have made to the first draft of their essays.

Directions: Today, you will be writing your final draft of your persuasive essay to hand in. Make any changes in your first draft that you think will improve your writing, and then write a final draft to hand in. Be prepared to hand in your first draft with your final draft. You will

have 30 minutes to make additional changes and write a final draft.

Remind students several minutes before the end of the period that they must finish their writing.

Summary

You have done a good job with your writing and with revising your drafts.

APPENDIX G
PERSUASIVE WRITING PROMPT

PERSUASIVE WRITING PROMPT

Suppose the principal of your school is thinking about making the lunch period longer! The principal needs to decide whether a longer lunch period is needed or not. Write a paragraph or more that states your position.

Before you begin to write, think about how long your lunch period is now and decide whether it should be longer or not. Consider any advantages or problems that might come up because of the extra lunch time. Finally, consider arguments about student responsibilities in the cafeteria and how that would affect the principal's decision.

After writing some of your ideas down, write a paragraph or more that you think might convince your principal to make a good decision about the length of your lunch period.

APPENDIX H
ELEMENTS OF A PERSUASIVE ESSAY

Elements of a Persuasive Essay

1. Statement of a position (change, maintain, begin some action or activity, etc.);
2. Opening statement(s) that capture your audience and make your position clear;
3. Arguments for your position (one or two major items) with supporting facts or statements, if possible;
4. Arguments against your position with facts or arguments to refute (tell why they are not good arguments) then;
5. Your strongest argument presented last with facts to support it;
6. Conclude with a final statement of your position and why your arguments should persuade your audience to support your position.

Adapted from: Glatthorn, Allan A. (1981). Writing in the schools: Improvement through effective leadership.
Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

APPENDIX I

EXAMPLES OF WELL-ORGANIZED PERSUASIVE ESSAYS

PERSUASIVE ESSAY
(example 1)

Week-end homework should be abolished. Five days devoted to school are enough for the modern teen-ager who has many other time-consuming interests. With homework scheduled for Saturday and Sunday, when can he find the time to help around the house, take in a football or baseball game or a good movie, join in family recreation, or just relax? Because of all these other activities, week-end homework is usually put off until Sunday night. As a result, week-end homework is done so poorly that on Mondays teachers threaten to fail whole classes of students who haven't the haziest notion of what the lesson is about. If there were no homework to haunt week ends, students would go to school on Monday well rested and willing to work. Teachers, don't you agree?

Essay taken from: Tressler , J. C., & Christ, H. I.
(1960). English in action (Seventh edition). Boston MA:
D. C. Heath and Company.

PERSUASIVE ESSAY
(example 2)

At all times household work is the responsibility of women. When they are working outside the home they must somehow manage to get both outside job and housework done (or they supervise a substitute for the housework). Women, particularly married women with children, who work outside the home simply do two jobs; their participation in the labor force is only allowed if they continue to fulfill their first responsibility in the home. This is particularly evident in countries like Russia and those in Eastern Europe where expanded opportunities for women in the labor force have not brought about a corresponding expansion in their liberty. Equal access to jobs outside the home, while one of the preconditions for women's liberation, will not in itself be sufficient to have equality for women; as long as work in the home remains a matter of private production and is the responsibility of women, they will simply carry a double work-load.

-Margaret Benston

Essay taken from: Gerber, P. L., Battles, H. K., & Haider, N. L. (1979). Effective English handbook (Teacher edition). p.197. Morristown NJ: Silver Burdett Company.

PERSUASIVE ESSAY
(example 3)

Television news needs more real reporters and fewer news readers. Too many newscasters prefer to show the public what nice people they are by exchanging personal comments with the sports reporter, the weather forecaster, and the anchorperson. Precious air time is wasted in so doing. It is not bad enough that few news stories last longer than thirty seconds and practically none more than a minute, but personal comments on non-news subjects cut down news time even further. Television news personnel have become show-people, and the public's "right to know" is being shortchanged.

The hiring practices of many stations encourage this non-news approach to reporting. News directors seek out the interesting new face of the dazzling personality rather than the experienced reporter who could do a better, though less flashy, job.

TV news should be regarded solely as a public service, not just another hepped up and star-studded show to win the war of the TV ratings.

APPENDIX J
REVISION GUIDE SHEET

REVISION GUIDE SHEET

Directions: Use this guide sheet as you consider changes you might make during the revision of your drafts. Remember, as you revise you are always trying to improve your writing.

Additions:

During revision, additions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), words added, phrases added, sentences added and paragraphs added.

Deletions:

During revision, deletions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), words deleted, phrases deleted, sentences deleted and paragraphs deleted. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts.

Substitutions:

During revision, substitutions usually include editing changes (capitalization, punctuation, spelling), word substitution, phrase substitution, sentence substitution and paragraph substitution. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts.

Rearrangements:

During revision, rearrangements usually include word rearrangement, sentence rearrangement and paragraph rearrangement. Some or all of these may be necessary as you revise your writing drafts.

Adapted from: Sommers, N. I. (1978). Revision in the composing process: A case study of college freshmen and experienced adult writers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

APPENDIX K
PEER RESPONSE SHEET

PEER RESPONSE SHEET

Small- Group Peer Revision Worksheet

PERSUASIVE

Directions: Read your partner's essay carefully and then fill in this worksheet. Remember, you are trying to help your partner improve and your partner will also be helping you. You will exchange worksheets, discuss possible changes and then prepare to write a final revised draft.

1. What did you think was best about the essay? (Your opinion)

2. Rate each section or part of the essay from 0 to 4. 0 is for missing parts. 4 is the best score (excellent).

Statement of a position or needed change	_____
Opening statement(s)	_____
Arguments (For) with supporting facts	_____
Arguments (Against) with rebuttal	_____
Strongest argument with supporting facts	_____
Conclusion supporting/restating the position	_____

3. Make a suggestion for improvement for each section rated less than a "4".

4. Are the points made in the essay good arguments? _____

5. Does the essay seem to be persuading enough to cause change? _____

6. Are all sentences complete sentences? (Look again) _____

7. Are there any spelling errors? (Look again) _____

From: Board of Education of Charles County. (1988).
Developmental writing lessons for grades 5-8. La Plata,
MD: Author.

APPENDIX L
INTRODUCTION
(STUDENT)

INTRODUCTION

For the next three days we are going to work with your writing, especially revision. It is very important for you to pay close attention to all directions and to think of revision as a step that will help to improve your writing. During the next three days, you will be asked to write a first draft of a persuasive essay, you will receive certain directions about revision, and then you will be asked to write a revised final draft of your work. Each of you have many good writing abilities and skills, so plan to do the best you can!

APPENDIX M
PERSUASIVE WRITING REVISION PRACTICE EXAMPLE

PERSUASIVE WRITING

REVISION PRACTICE EXAMPLE

PROMPT: Take a position or view about whether or not funding for the space program should be reduced, and write a letter to a senator supporting that position.

(How can we revise this example?)

Dear Senator,

I think we should give funds to the Space program, but I do feel we have many problems already that we need to look out.

I dont think we should leave unfinished problems behind.

I think the space program should work toward colonies but we shouldnt goahead until we are ok here on ourown planet.

PROMPT: Write a letter to your principal to persuade her/him of one thing you think should be changed, how to bring about the change, and how the school will be improved by it.

(How can we revise this example?)

Jack Johnsson

Have more activities like more clubs
 more space for the playground better
 food and bigger rooms. That might
 help a little. You should have sales
 to raise more money for school
 More field trips. Have a school meeting.

APPENDIX N
TEACHER DIRECTION AND INFORMATION SHEET

TEACHER DIRECTION AND INFORMATION SHEET

I. Please assign each student an identification number:

For the Direct Instruction class _____

For the Small Group Peer Response class _____

For the Control Group class _____

Please keep this information in your grade/attendance book or on a separate sheet so that you may identify students. Student names must not be on any student materials or work. ID numbers should be on all student work.

II. Please try to give grade rewards for participation in this activity.

III. Tell students that all papers will be read, although they may not be returned.

IV. Some adjustments may be needed as you follow the scripted lessons, but please follow the script as closely as possible.

V. First drafts will be copied and the copies returned to the students to revise.

VI. Call if any problems come up - (H) 743-7043

(W) 645-1334

Thank you for even considering to help with this project, and thanks for all of your time.

References

- Applebee, A. N. (1978). Teaching high achieving students: A survey of the winners of the 1977 NCTE achievement awards in writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 12, 339-348.
- Applebee, A. N. (1986a). Writing: Trends across the decade, 1974-84. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Applebee, A. N. (1986b). The writing report card: Writing achievement in American schools. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Applebee, A. N. (1987a). Learning to be literate in America: Reading, writing, and reasoning. The nation's report card. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Applebee, A. N. (1987b). Grammar, punctuation, and spelling: Controlling the conventions of written English at ages 9, 13, and 17. The nation's report card. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service: National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J.A., Mullis, V.S. (1989). Understanding direct writing assessments. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J.A., Mullis, V.S., & Jenkins, L. B. (1990). The writing report card, 1984-88: Findings

- from the nation's report card. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service; National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Ash, B.H. (1983). Selected effects of elapsed time and grade level on the revisions in eighth, tenth and twelfth graders' writing. Dissertation Abstracts, 43, 3830-A.
- Atwell, N. (1987). In the middle: Writing, reading, and learning with adolescents. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Bamberg, B. (1978). Composition instruction does make a difference: A comparison of college freshmen in regular and remedial English courses. Research in the Teaching of English, 12, 47-59.
- Bartlett, E.J. (1981). Learning to write: Some cognitive and linguistic components. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Bartlett, E.J. (1982). Learning to revise: Some component processes. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), What writers know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse (pp. 345-363). New York: Academic Press.
- Beach, R. (1976). Self-evaluation strategies of extensive revisers and nonrevisers. College Composition and Communication, 27, 160-164.
- Beach, R. (1979). The effects of between-draft teacher evaluation versus student self-evaluation on high school

- students' revising of rough drafts. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 111-119.
- Beach, R. (1986). Demonstrating techniques of assessing writing in the writing conference. College Composition and Communication, 37, 56-65.
- Beach, R., & Eaton, S. (1984). Factors influencing self-assessing and revising by college freshmen. In R. Beach & L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New directions in composition research (pp. 149-170). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bean, J.C. (1983). Computerized word-processing as an aid to revision. College Composition and Communication, 34, 146-155.
- Becker, W.C. (1977). Classroom management. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Berkenkotter, C. (1983). Decisions and revisions: The planning strategies of a publishing writer. College Composition and Communication, 34, 156-169.
- Board of Education of Charles County. (1988). Developmental writing lessons for grades 5-8. LaPlata, MD: Author.
- Bracewell, R., Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1978). The development of audience awareness in writing. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Toronto.

- Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963).
Research in written composition. Urbana: NCTE.
- Bridwell, L.S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 197-222.
- Bridwell, L.S., Johnson, P., & Brehe, S. (1985).
Composing and computers: Case studies of experienced writers. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Bridwell, L.S., Nancarrow, P.R., & Ross, D. (1984). The writing process and the writing machine: Current research on word processors relevant to the teaching of composition. In R. Beach & L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New Directions in Composition Research (pp. 381-398). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bridwell, L.S., & Ross, D. (1984). Integrating computers into a writing curriculum; or, buying, begging, and building. In W. Wresch (Ed.), The computer in composition instruction (pp. 107-119). Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Buxton, E.W. (1959). An experiment to test the effects of writing frequency and guided practice upon students' skill in writing expression. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 5, 91-99.
- Calkins, L.M. (1980). Children's rewriting strategies. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 331-341.
- Cohen, E., & Scardamalia, M. (1983, April). The effects of

- instructional intervention in the revision of essays by grade six children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Collier, R.M. (1983). The word processor and revision strategies. College Composition and Communication, 34, 149-155.
- Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation. At Risk. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Cooper, C. (1977). Holistic evaluation of writing. In C. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds.), Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging (pp. 3-31). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cooper, K.T. (1990, January 10). Tests of students show little progress. The Washington Post. pp.A1, A5.
- Crowhurst, M., & Piche, G.L. (1979). Audience and mode of discourse effects on syntactic complexity in writing at two grade levels. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 101-109.
- Dahl, K.L. (1988). Writers teaching writers: What children learn in peer conferences. English Quarterly, 21, 164-173.
- Daiute, C. (1983). The computer as stylus and audience. College Composition and Communication, 34, 134-145.
- Daiute, C. (1985). Writing and computers. Reading, MA:

- Addison-Wesley.
- Daly, J. (1979). Writing apprehension in the classroom: Teacher role expectancies of the apprehensive writer. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 37-44.
- Daly, J. & Miller, M. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 242-249.
- Diem, R.A. (1986). Computers in a school environment: Preliminary report of the social consequences. Theory and Research In Social Education, 14, 163-170.
- Dieterich, P.B. (1976). Response to Richard Beach. College Composition and Communication, 27, 301-302.
- DiPardo, A. & Freedman, S.W. (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretic foundations and new directions. Review of Educational Research, 58, 119-149.
- Dudley, M. (1989). The writing workshop: Structuring for success. English Journal, 78, 28-32.
- Duin, A.H. (1986). Implementing cooperative learning groups in the writing curriculum. Journal of Teaching Writing, 5, 315-324.
- Durst, R., Laine, C., Schultz, L.M. & Vilter, W. (1990). Appealing texts: The persuasive writing of high school students. Written Communication, 7(2), 232-255.
- Education Commission of the States. (1981). Procedural handbook: 1978-1979 writing assessment. Denver, CO:

- National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Effros, C. (1973). An experimental study of the effects of guided revision and delayed grades on writing proficiency of college freshmen. Final report. West Haven, Connecticut: New Haven University.
- Elbow, P. (1981). Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth graders. N.C.T.E. Research Report No. 13, Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Faigley, L. & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revisions. College Composition and Communication, 32, 400-414.
- Faigley, L. & Witte, S. (1984). Measuring the effects of revisions on text structure. In R. Beach & L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), New directions in composition research (pp. 95-108). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fellows, J.E. (1936). The influence of theme reading and theme correction on eliminating technical errors in written compositions of ninth grade pupils. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Fisher, C.W., Berliner, D.C., Filby, N.N., Marliave, R., Cahen, L.S., & Dishaw, M.M. (1980). Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham, & A. Liberman (Eds.), Time to

- learn (pp. 7-32). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Fitzgerald, J. (1987). Research on revision in writing. Review of Educational Research, 57, 481-506.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Markham, L.R. (1987). Teaching children about revision in writing. Cognition and Instruction, 4(1), 3-24.
- Flower, L.S., & Hayes, J.R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. College Composition and Communication, 31, 21-32.
- Flower, L.S., & Hayes, J.R. (1981). The pregnant pause: An inquiry into the nature of planning. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 229-243.
- Flower, L.S., Hayes, J.R., Carey L., Schriver, K. & Stratman, J. (1986). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. College Composition and Communication, 37, 16-55.
- Freedman, S.W., Dyson, A.H., Flower, L. & Chafe, W. (1987). Research in writing: Past, present and future (Tech. Rep. No 1). Berkeley: University of California, Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University, Center for The Study of Writing.
- Gordon, C.J. (1990). A study of students' text structure revisions. English Quarterly, 23, 7-29.
- Graves, D.H. (1975). An examination of the writing processes of seven year old children. Research in the

- Teaching of English, 9, 227-241.
- Graves, D.H., & Murray, D.M. (1980). Revision: In the writer's workshop and in the classroom. Journal of Education, 162, 38-56.
- Hillocks, G. (1981). The responses of college freshmen to three modes of instruction. American Journal of Education, 89, 373-395.
- Hillocks, G. (1986). Research on written composition. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R. (1975). Learning together and alone: Cooperation, competition, and individualization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1986). Models of teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kiefer, K., & Smith, C. (1984). Improving student's revising and editing: The Writer's Workbench system at Colorado State University. In W. Wresch (Ed.), A writer's tool: The computer in composition instruction (pp. 65-82). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kroll, B.M. (1978). Cognitive egocentrism and the problem of audience awareness in written discourse. Research in the Teaching of English, 12, 269-281.
- Lange, P.C. (1948). A sampling of composition errors of college freshmen in a course other than English. Journal of Educational Research, 42, 191-200.

- Lyman, R.L. (1931). A co-operative experiment in junior high school composition. School Review, 39, 748-757.
- Macrorie, K. (1980). Telling writing. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book Company.
- Maryland State Department of Education. (1988). 1988 Maryland writing test scoring guide. Baltimore, MD: Author.
- McCann, T. M. (1989). Student argumentative writing knowledge and ability at three grade levels. Research in the Teaching of English, 23, 62-77.
- McColly, W. (1963). Comparative effectiveness of composition skills learning activities in the secondary school. United States Office of Education. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Mohr, M.M. (1984). Revision the rhythm of meaning. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Muller, H. J. (1967). The uses of English: Guidelines for the teaching of English from the Anglo-American conference at Dartmouth College. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Murray, D. (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In C.R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Research on composing: Points of departure (pp. 85-103). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1977). Write/rewrite: An assessment of revision skills:

- Selected results from the second national assessment of writing (Report No. 05-W-04). Denver: Educational Commission of the States.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1986). Writing: Trends across the decade, 1974-84 (Report No. ETS-15-W-01). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (1987). Writing objectives: 1988 assessment. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.
- Nold, E. (1979). Alternatives of mad-hatterism. In D. Mcquade (Ed.), Linguistics, stylistics, and the teaching of composition (pp. 103-117). Akron, OH: University of Akron.
- Norusis, N. J. (1984). SPSS/PC Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.
- O'Donnell, A. M., Dansereau, D. F., Rocklin, T. R., Larson, C. O., Hythecker, V. I., Young, M. D., & Lambiotte, J. G. (1987). Effects of cooperative and individual rewriting on an instruction writing task. Written Communication, 4, 90-99.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing process of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.
- Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. Research in the

- Teaching of English, 13, 5-22.
- Rackman, J. (1984). From sight to insight: Steps in the writing process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rohman, D.G. (1965). Pre-writing: The stage of discovery in the writing process. College Composition and Communication, 16, 106-112.
- Rohman, D.G., & Welcke, A.O. (1964). Pre-writing: The construction and applications of models for concept formation in writing. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Rosenshine, B. (1978). Academic engaged time, content covered, and direct instruction. Journal of Education, 160, 38-66.
- Rosenshine, B. (1985). Direct instruction. In T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), International Encyclopedia Education (pp. 1395-1400), Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rubin, D.L., & Piche, G.L. (1979). Development in syntactic aspects of audience adaptation skills in written persuasive communication. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 293-316.
- Scardamalia, M. (1981). How children cope with the cognitive demands of writing. In C. H. Frederiksen & J. F. Dominic (Eds.), Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication. Vol. 2. Writing: Process, development, and communication (pp. 81-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Associates, Inc.

- Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1983). The development of evaluative, diagnostic, and remedial capabilities in children's composing. In M. Martlew (Ed.), The psychology of written language: A developmental approach (pp. 67-95). London: Wiley.
- Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 778-803). New York: Macmillan.
- Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., Gartschore, S., & Cattani, C. (1980, April). Locating the source of children's revision difficulties. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- Shiels, M. (1975, December). Why Johnny can't write. Newsweek. pp. 58-63.
- Shrofel, S. (1991). Developing writing teachers. English Education, 23, 160-177.
- Slavin, R.E. (1980). Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 50, 315-342.
- Slavin, R.E. (1987). Cooperative Learning. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Sommers, N. (1978). Revision in the composing process: A case study of college freshmen and experienced adult writers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston

University.

- Sommers, N. (1979). The need for theory in composition research. College Composition and Communication, 30, 46-49.
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication, 31, 378-388.
- Squire, J.R., & Applebee, R.K. (1968). High school English instruction today. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Stallard, C.K. (1974). An analysis of the writing behavior of good student writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 8, 206-218.
- Sun, L.C.H. (1989, March). Re-viewing and teaching revision. English Journal, 78, 87-88.
- Walkup, T.S. (1982). A study of the effectiveness of revision practice and rewriting on the overall writing quality of eleventh grade students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina.
- White, E.M. (1985). Teaching and assessing writing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Witte, S.P. (1983). Topical structure and revision: An exploratory study. College Composition and Communication, 34, 313-341.

Witte, S.P., Meyer, P., Miller, T.P., & Faigley, L.

1981). A national survey of college and university writing program directors. Austin, TX: University of Texas.