

Writing Text and Revision Process : A Study of Revision in EFL Composition

Akemi Nagasaka

INTRODUCTION

In my EFL (English as a foreign language) writing classes at colleges in Japan, students are sometimes expected to take the essays which they have started in class home, and to finish and revise them as assignments. Reading their homework, I have found that many students added a few sentences or short paragraphs to complete their essays and then “revised” by simply correcting a few vocabulary, grammatical or mechanical errors in the text. I have also realized few students developed their unfinished essays well and that fewer students revised the text effectively. From my experience, many EFL students do not seem to revise their essays effectively.

Not only EFL students but ESL (English as a second language) students have been shown to have similar problems in writing. Kroll (1990) reported that there was no significant difference in the performance, either on the syntactic level or the rhetorical level, between ESL compositions written in class under time pressure and essays written at home with unlimited time.

惠泉女学園大学 人文学部紀要 第11号 pp. 81~pp. 104, 1999

Writing Text and Revision Process: A Study of
Revision in EFL Composition

Akemi Nagasaka

Bartlett (1982), Flower et al. (1986), Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) and other L1 (the first language) writing researchers state that novice and expert writers differ in the process of revision. Experienced, skilled writers make substantial changes at the global level of the text when they revise, while inexperienced, unskilled writers do not revise, or if they do they make minor changes at the surface and local level. Revisions do not always result in appreciably better text for unskilled and beginning writers. In L2 (the second language) writing research, Zamel (1983), Raimes (1985), Hall (1990) and others have reported that unskilled ESL writers have the same problems in revising texts as novice L1 writers.

Kroll indicated that one reason for the lack of improvement in essays produced at home with additional time was that ESL learners did not know enough about the writing process. Zamel emphasized “the importance of instruction that gives students direct experiences with the composing process” (1983 : 165). Raimes also recognized the importance of instruction focused on the writing process.

In order to revise text effectively, EFL students may need to come to a better understanding of the revision process. Revision is not simply proofreading or correcting errors in a text. It is considered not a separate activity conducted after writing a completed draft, but a recursive activity performed at various stages in the writing process, with the intent of improving the text in process. Murray (1978) says that writing is rewriting, and Sommers (1980) states that writing is a constant process of revision.

In the literature on revision, two models of the revision process in L1 have been proposed: one is the CDO process model by Scardamalia & Bereiter (1983), and the other is a working model of revision by Flower et al. (1986). The CDO process model consists of three steps, “Compare, Diagnose and Operate”. First, a writer compares the actual text written so

far with his or her original intention. If there is a mismatch between the current text and the intention, the writer diagnoses the trouble and then chooses tactics for making alterations in the written text, or alternatively accepts the current text as better than the original intention. This process keeps cycling while the writer is revising. Flower et al. also describe the underlying major cognitive processes that a writer utilizes in revising text: detection, diagnosis and strategic action. The process of revision starts when the reviser reads the written text and perceives that the text has problems. The reviser's work has just begun when problems are recognized. In order to proceed to the next step, the writer needs enough information to act. Diagnosing the causes of problems is important. Finally, revising requires the application of various problem-solving skills. The writer must select strategies to revise the text.

Bartlett (1982) does not present a revision model, but instead identifies three components of the revision process: detection processes, identification processes and correction strategies. Success in revising text depends on adequate awareness of text problems, identification of problems and the appropriate use of strategies for correction.

In L2 writing process, Reid (1988) states an idea of revision process which is similar to L1 revision process. In this idea, the process of revising is filled with "re" words: reread, reflect, reconsider, respond and rewrite. The writer rereads the draft, reflects whether the draft communicates successfully or not, and reconsiders the problems by asking the questions on specific considerations such as the audience, the purpose and communication. After that, the writer responds to the questions, makes decisions about changes and finally rewrites the draft. White & Arndt (1991) also show the process of revision which includes the steps of evaluating and re-viewing. In evaluating, the writer assesses the draft, checks the problems and makes a judgment on the actual amending

process.

Each of the models and components mentioned above agrees on the same basic steps in the revision process: recognizing problems in the text, searching for the causes of these problems and selecting strategies for revision. Based on these revision models and components, this study represents an attempt to examine how well EFL students are able to carry out the revision process in the learning environment. Since it is difficult to observe remarkable changes in the learners' level of linguistic ability in the limited time allotted for the experiment, the focus is placed on revision at the level of the content and organization of the text in this study. The research questions are as follows:

- 1 . What differences are observed in EFL compositions after learners have had direct instruction in and practice with the revision process? What are the differences between the original drafts and revised versions?
- 2 . How do EFL students evaluate their own revisions? Is there a gap between students' self-perceptions and teachers' assessments?
- 3 . What do EFL students think about as they are attempting to revise?

METHOD

Participants

Twenty second-year students majoring in international politics at a private four-year university in Tokyo participated in this study and completed all the requirements of this project. As to the educational background of the participants before entering college, 16 students had been educated in Japan and studied English with an emphasis on mainly reading, grammar and vocabulary for six years. Four students had attended schools abroad: one student had studied at a public elementary school in Seattle for

one year at the age of ten, and two of them had spent one year at an American senior high school, and one participant had attended an elementary school in New York for 6 years and an international school in Dusseldorf for 3 years in his senior high school days. Since these four students had ESL background, the data on them were not included in this experiment. Therefore, the results of the 16 students with EFL background were examined and analyzed.

Although the number of the subjects in this experiment was small for statistical analysis, this study would be useful as a pilot study to understand how EFL students revise their compositions following the revision process.

Setting

All of the participants attended once-a-week classes of 90 minutes each for two semesters and studied paragraph writing in “Writing I” in the first year at university. The overall objective in Writing II in the second year was to learn how to produce clear and effective expository essays. The experiment was conducted as part of the usual course work .

In the 9th week of the 13-week term of the first semester, the students were told to write a persuasive essay on the following topic: “Should we notify a terminal cancer patient of his/her disease?”. Since this topic is very controversial among Japanese people, diverse opinions seemed to be expected among the students. The audience was supposed to be college students who were interested in this topic. The subjects spent 60 minutes writing their first drafts, including time for discussing the topic with classmates and brain-storming. No reading materials or other resources were provided.

One week later in class, the students were given the task of revising the contents and organization of the original draft with the goal of making it more persuasive to the reader. In revising the essays, the students all used

the same procedures, following written directions based on the process of revision (Appendix A).

First, the students read their original draft, evaluated whether it was persuasive or not and wrote their impression of it. This is the first step of the revision process — diagnosing problems of text.

Before moving to the second step, they did two things. They read one of the chapters of the textbook, *Communication Through Writing* (Coffey, 1987), and learned about four strategies which could be used to make an essay persuasive: 1) using facts, statistics and examples; 2) using two ways of appealing to the reader — logic and emotion; 3) stating opposing arguments; and 4) gathering resource information from books, periodicals, interviews, etc. These four strategies were presented in order to help the students think about the content and organization of their text. The other thing that the students did was to read two essays that represented opposing ideas on the same topic as their assignment: “Cancer: Always Tells the Truth.” and “Cancer: Never Say ‘You’re dying!’” (McCaleb, 1992). The aim of reading the two essays was to provide the students with help in reconsidering content as well as organization from the opposite perspectives.

In the second step of revision, the students diagnosed problems in their first draft and thought about the strategies they could use to solve the problems. While doing this, the students were encouraged to use the knowledge and information they had learned from the textbook and the two essays.

The participants were told to finish all of these activities within 90 minutes, though they could freely allot time for each activity and go back and forth between them during the process. They were also required to write down what they learned and what they thought as much as possible either in English or Japanese while doing the activities. They were

permitted to ask questions or ask for help from the instructor. The students were also permitted to talk and help each other while working on the revision process.

As their homework assignment for the following week, students were required to make plans for revising their first essay and to complete their revised essay. They took home the third step of the revision process, selecting the strategies of revision.

Data Gathering

The students were asked to complete a holistic evaluation of the improvement which occurred between their original essay and the revised one. They used the evaluation sheet (Appendix B) with a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (no improvement) to 4 (great improvement). The improvement of the whole essay and the five discrete points were evaluated by the subjects themselves. After completing their self-evaluations, they wrote down, in English, their impressions and comments about the revision process. They submitted the two versions of the essay with all the memos, notes, outlines, etc. that they had written while writing and revising the essay.

Three native speakers of English who have been teaching English at college in Japan for more than three years served as evaluators. Two of them have had writing classes as well as speaking classes and seminars, and one teacher who has been teaching mainly listening and speaking has taught writing for one semester. They independently read the two essays and evaluated how much each student had improved from the original to the revised text. The same evaluation sheet with a 4-point rating scale as that for the students' self-evaluation was used. Next, the judges holistically graded the revised version on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (very poor) to 4 (very good to excellent). The scale was based on the levels and

criteria of “ESL Composition Profile” by Jacobs et al. (1981).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis and Discussion of Research Question 1

First, differences were observed in the degree of qualitative improvement in content and organization from the original to the revised essays. Each composition was read independently by the three judges, and the three never disagreed by more than one scale point.

According to the native speakers’ evaluation, the revised essays fell into three categories based on the amount of improvement shown: no/little, moderate and great improvement. Among the 16 subjects, four students showed no or little improvement and were given 1 or 2 points from more than two raters. The mean score of this group was 1.66. Seven students who made moderate improvement got 3 points from more than two raters, and the mean score was 2.95. The group of five students, who made great progress were given 4 points by more than two raters, had the mean score of 3.87. Although the number of the subjects was too small to analyze statistically, there were some differences observed among the three groups.

The qualitative improvement shown in the three groups seemed to be somewhat related to the physical quantity of the text: numbers of words, sentences and paragraphs. The quantitative differences, which were shown in Table 1, were also significant among the three groups. The students who made little improvement tended to make the least quantitative change while doing their revision. On the contrary, the students whose improvement was great showed the biggest change in quantity from the original essay to the revised version. They wrote less in their first drafts than the other students, and added a lot to their revised essay. Apparently, they were not finished when the first drafts had to be handed in. They did not

appear to be fluent writers, and it was apparent that they needed a longer time to write than the students in the other two groups. The moderate development group was between the other two groups.

TABLE 1
Mean Number of Words, Sentences and Paragraphs of the Three Groups

Groups	<u>Little (N=4)</u>		<u>Moderate (N=7)</u>		<u>Great (N=5)</u>	
	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
Word	217.5	262.8	207.1	385.0	145.0	499.0
Sentence	12.5	14.0	14.7	26.4	12.2	29.8
Paragraph	4.5	4.8	3.6	5.4	2.6	5.2

Differences were also recognizable in the overall ratings of the revised essays. The same three judges independently graded the revised versions on a 4-point scale: the maximum being 4 (excellent to very good), and the minimum being 1 (very poor). The mean scores of the groups of little improvement, moderate improvement and great improvement were 2.67, 3.00, and 3.33 respectively. Since the number of the subjects was not enough to conduct statistical analysis, it was not statistically proved that there were significant differences among the three groups. However, the subjects with little improvement got the lowest grades and the subjects who made the greatest progress received the highest grades. The students who had made greater improvement tended to receive the higher grades.

In summary, the writers who made little improvement both in quantity and quality received poor ratings for their revised essays. They wrote drafts, revised them unsuccessfully and finished with poor products. Those who progressed either moderately or greatly were more likely to receive better overall scores on their revised essays. Since there were not great differences among these groups in the grades on the revised versions,

the great quantitative development might have given the judges an impression of the greater qualitative improvement. However, the physical quantity did not seem to be the only reason for the improvement. Further examination of the students' use of revision processes is necessary.

Analysis and Discussion of Research Question 2

Table 2 shows how the teachers and the students evaluated the development from the first to the revised drafts, including overall quality of the text and in specific points of writing. Comparing the revised essay to the original, almost all of the students thought their ideas and intentions had become clearer, more supporting details had been supplied, the whole text structure had become better organized, and the thesis statement had got clearer. They also believed that the amount of information about the topic had increased. They felt, as a whole, that their essays had been improved and made more persuasive by revision.

Relating to specific points of text improvement, the students with moderate development positively evaluated their increased use of supporting details, and their evaluation coincided with that of the judges. The students with the greatest progress thought that they had significantly improved in main ideas, supporting details, information about the topic and text organization, and the teachers agreed with their evaluation. The students with the lowest improvement, however, realized that they had made no great progress in any specific point.

In general, the students' self-evaluation was more generous than that of the teachers. The students tended to give higher scores than the teachers. The gap between the students' and teachers' perceptions was the greatest in the group with least development. This means that the students in this group did not evaluate the revision as objectively as the teachers. However, the least development group's scores on the self-evaluation were

the lowest among the three groups, and so they realized that they had not done well in revising. The problem is that they recognized that their revision was unsuccessful, but did not take action to improve the essay. As for the group with the greatest improvement, their self-assessment was moderate compared to that of the other two groups. They gave lower scores in some specific points than the judges did. The gap between the students and the teachers was the smallest in this group. From these results, these students seemed to look at their own revision more objectively than the other students did.

TABLE 2
Mean Scores of Teachers' Assessments and
Students' Self-perceptions of the Improvement

	<u>Little (N=4)</u>		<u>Moderate (N=7)</u>		<u>Great (N=5)</u>	
	teacher	student	teacher	student	teacher	student
Overall quality	1.66	2.00	2.95	3.00	3.87	3.40
Main idea	1.83	2.75	2.57	3.00	3.47	3.20
Supporting details	1.67	2.75	3.24	3.29	3.93	3.80
Information	1.58	1.50	2.86	3.14	3.73	3.40
Organization	1.58	2.00	2.76	3.14	3.67	3.40
Thesis statement	2.08	1.75	2.29	2.57	3.00	3.20

Analysis and Discussion of Research Question 3

The memorandums, outlines, comments and other notes that the students wrote in class and at home provided some information about what they thought and did while they were working on this project. These notes showed that the students followed the three steps in the process of revision: detection of problems, diagnosis of the causes and implementation of revision strategies. There were, however, some differences observed

between the group with little improvement and the groups with moderate and great improvement.

First, the comments on the original drafts revealed that the students did attempt the first step of revision process: detection. There were, however, some differences between the groups in terms of success in detecting problems. The lowest development group identified fewer problems than the other two groups. Two out of the four students in the lowest group said that they had written a persuasive essay, and one student thought that he had expressed his opinion well. The rest wrote no evaluation. On the contrary, no student in the moderate and great development groups thought the first version was persuasive. One participant wrote, "I made haste and so I couldn't make myself understood well in the first draft, and so I really want to rewrite my essay as soon as possible". Another subject wrote that she expressed herself fairly well but that she felt that her first draft left room for improvement. Many students in these two groups vaguely felt something was wrong with the main ideas, organization and contents of the original essay, but they could not specify or locate the problems.

The overall impressions and comments on revision that the students wrote in English after revising the essay also provided some insight into what they were thinking during the process of detection. The students in the little progress group found difficulties in the first stage of the revision process, and they did not know what to do to revise the text. One student who made little progress wrote as follows:

When I try to reexamine my own writing, I think and consider it very hard. I found it difficult to find faults in my own writing. Because even in my first writing, I think there is no mistakes and I have a kind of confidence, but I have to find some points to improve.

The students in the moderate and great progress groups also had trouble

with detection. However, they did not ignore the problem but rather attacked it head-on. Two students commented as follows:

I thought that it was difficult for me to revise myself. Because I can't read my essay objectively very much. But I recognize that it is very important to revise and read again my essay objectively.

I think it is hard to search bad points from the sentences that are written by myself. Because I wrote draft version by all my power, so at the first time I thought my sentences were perfect enough. But, read the draft time after time, I could find many points that I should correct. I could find the bad points and at the same time I realize the point that I have to be careful when I write an essay.

The results of this study with EFL students coincided with findings in L1 writing research. Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) conducted an experiment on children at grade 4, 6, and 8 and they reported that children detected problems more appropriately as they grew older and developed their writing. Flower et al. (1986) suggested that the ability to detect problems has an influence on the success of revision. Therefore, in teaching novice L1 writers and ESL/EFL writers, teachers need to let them understand the importance of detecting problems of their draft. Asking students to write their impressions and comments on their draft would be helpful for students to understand the first step of revision. Sharing these impressions and comments in class would be more helpful. Furthermore, students should detect their own problems by themselves and think why they have thought them problematic. When students have trouble in detecting problems of their draft, they need the teacher's help and advice.

In the stages of diagnosing and selecting strategies for revision, greater differences between the group with little improvement and the groups with moderate and great improvement were observed than in the stage of

detecting. It appeared that those who were poor in detecting problems did not do well in diagnosing and selecting revision strategies. After studying the four strategies presented in the textbook and reading the two essays which presented opposite view points, the students understood their problems more clearly than when they read and wrote their impressions about the original draft for the first time.

Many of the students in the groups with moderate and great improvement diagnosed one of the causes of their content problems as lack of information and knowledge about the topic. They said that the information in the two essays they read in class was helpful but not enough, and they adopted the strategy of searching for more information outside the classroom. Some students went to the library and gathered resource material from books and periodicals. Five students out of twelve added statistics in their revised versions, four students used new cases of cancer patients and AIDS patients as examples, and one student quoted sentences from a book. In the comments written after revision, some of them stated that information and knowledge about a topic is important in writing an essay: "Since there were not facts, statistics, examples, an opposing point of view in my essay, it was not persuasive." "I should collect as much information as I can in order to persuade others." "To know about the problem is very important. Because if I don't know about the thing, I can't say why I recommend the way I support." "If I don't have information or background of the problem it's difficult to compose the opinion." "I think my essay became much organized, especially the body. I added much information and maybe this was very good." "I read some books about cancer and tried to use the information."

The students in the group with lowest development, on the contrary, were not aware that they had insufficient information, and they had no intention of looking for further information. No students in this group used

statistics, although one student added the example of his uncle in his revised version. Three students said in the notes that they were not going to gather further information, and one of them stated that she did not have time to do so. One subject, however, recognized this lack and stated in her comments: "This time I didn't use information nor examples well, so next I want to use them effectively."

Another difference in the ability to follow the revision process is seen in the ability to organize ideas. The students with moderate and great development found problems with their organization and used the revision strategy of reorganizing text structure. Before writing the second draft, the students made revised outlines. Compared with the original outlines, revised plans made by the students in the moderate and great development groups were more elaborate and better organized. The students used various strategies such as eliminating some ideas, adding new ideas, focusing on important ideas, changing the order of ideas, etc. The strategy that the students paid most attention to was stating opposing arguments. Ten students in these two groups planned to state opposing arguments, and eight of them realized their plan in their revised essays. In this way, deliberate or conscious application of knowledge produced changes in the organization of the writers' products. In their comments about revision, some students realized the importance of organization and wrote as follows:

To make clear statements, we must have the knowledge about the theme. Moreover, we are required to organize our own opinion. For example, bringing the opinion first will bring strong impact to readers. On the other hand, bringing the opinion last will be persuasive. I think it is difficult for me.

Until now, I have not paid attention to write construction of essay very much.

So I have written the papers which have no introduction or conclusion like “draft version”. And I think it has been difficult to readers to understand my opinion.

I could learn two ways of thinking from the two sample essays. It is very important to know the opposite opinion.

To persuade readers, we have to write papers logically. We have to care about coherence and which words we’d better use. To write my opinions, these ways are very convenient, because I can organize some ideas of my idea logically and put them in order. These ways make me express my opinions faster than usual.

The students with little improvement, on the other hand, hardly noticed the problems in their organization while they were following the revision process in class. Their revised plans written were very brief and almost the same as the first plans. One student said, “I will use the same outline in the revised essay”. The students in this group said that they were going to use examples and statistics, but they never mentioned specific plans regarding what examples and statistics they were going to use or in which part of the essay they are going to use them. Concerning the strategy of stating opposing arguments, all of the four students in this group planned to use them, but only one student actually stated opposing ideas in the revised draft.

In diagnosing problems and selecting revision strategies, the differences between the little improvement group and the moderate and great improvement groups seemed to be those of “knowledge telling and knowledge transforming” (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987). Unskilled and beginning writers engage in knowledge telling; they just write what they already know about the topic, and they do not search for further information or reconsider the overall plan, goal, organization of the text or the reader.

Therefore, their text is “writer-based prose” (Flower, 1984): text that reflects the writer’s train of thoughts, in which the ideas are not reorganized according to readers’ needs. Skilled and expert writers, on the other hand, analyze problems and find solutions while revising their goals and reconsidering plans and reconstructing content and organization. As a part of this process, the writer’s knowledge and the meaning of text are transformed. Writers sometimes refer to this type of writing as a process of discovery. As a result, text generated through knowledge transforming is “reader-based prose” (Flower, 1984): text that is written with readers’ points of view in mind. The students who made moderate and great progress in this experiment seemed to try to engage in knowledge transforming, while the students in the little improvement group were likely to stop with knowledge telling.

In summary, it appeared that the students’ understanding of the process of revision determined how successful they were in revising the text. The students who had better understanding of the meaning of the revision process and took more appropriate action had better revisions. In research question 2, the students with moderate and great improvement received higher scores for supporting details and text organization than the students who made little progress. These results were caused by the process of revision that they followed: detecting problems in content and organization; diagnosing the problems related to lack of information and poor organization; and selecting the strategy of searching for more information and reorganizing text structure.

Although the students in the moderate and great improvement groups were very similar in their application of the revision process, there were some differences observed. Most students in the moderate improvement group expressed identical or similar main ideas and viewpoints in both the first and revised essays. They did not change the plans of the text at a

global level. However, two students with great improvement found problems in the goals and intentions of the original essay, and returned to the basic process of planning. They made drastic changes in their plans and added new ideas related to informed consent and a patient's right to know the truth. In addition to the great improvement in the number of words, the global-level changes might have given the judges an impression of great qualitative improvement from the original draft to the revised version. These students, however, could not develop or organize the plan effectively enough to make the revised essay persuasive. Therefore, it seemed difficult for EFL students to revise at the global level. Most experienced writers make revision at a whole-text level: they detect global text problems, make more global diagnoses and choose effective strategies for global revision which transforms the meaning of the text (Flower et al., 1986). The students with moderate and great improvement in this experiment could not revise at the whole-text level. Zamel (1983) and Raimes (1985) also reported that their unskilled ESL writers revised local problems and made few changes that affected the meaning of the text.

It was the first time for the students to rewrite text following the revision process. Many students found it difficult but useful to have direct experience in revising texts. One student wrote in her comment:

It is sure that to rewrite is hard and laborious work because I have to think about again and again. In addition, it takes much time. But I'm not used to writing something logically yet. So these process was very useful for me.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that some of the EFL writers could revise and make his or her essay more persuasive by following the revision

process, and others could not. The students who made moderate and great progress in the revised essay in this experiment devoted time to understanding the revision process, monitoring their own work and solving problems in their writing by themselves. As Kroll (1990), Raimes (1985), Zamel (1983) and other L2 researchers suggest, understanding and experiencing the writing process may help L2 learners write better.

Many students in this study made improvement in the content and organization of their revised essays. Some of the students, however, showed little development. Although these students knew that they revised their drafts ineffectively, they did not know what to do in their revision or have any intention to make their drafts more persuasive. They did not ask any questions or any help of the instructor in class even though they had opportunities. It is these students who the instructor should pay attention to and understand their needs in classroom activities. If the students are given some help or advice, they may detect problems, diagnose causes and select appropriate strategies for revision. The students who made moderate and great improvement may need some help revising text at a global level. Without understanding or experiencing global revision, they may not become skilled L2 writers. The instructor should attempt to observe each student and find out which student needs what kind of help.

The aim of this study was to examine how EFL students rewrite text by following the revision process. This study, however, dealt with only a small number of subjects. In order to prove the treatment of following the revision process is effective for L2 writing, more subjects must be added, and a control group who write and revise without being led through the revision process must be added. Furthermore, the students revised the essay only once. What will EFL students do if they revise text more than once, twice or three times? How much will their essays improve by the second and third revision? What will they think and do while making

further revisions? Another question for future studies is which research methods are suitable. The students' self-evaluation and written comments are valuable. However, a more direct process approach using think-aloud protocols analysis may give us more information about EFL writing. These are questions that future research will need to address. The findings of this study also suggest that further studies are necessary for better understanding of EFL writing and more effective EFL composition instruction.

REFERENCES

- Bartlett, E. J. (1982). Learning to revise: Some component processes. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *What writers know* (pp. 345 - 364). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Coffey, M. P. (1987). *Communication through writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Cumming, A. & So, S. (1996). Tutoring second language text revision: Does the approach to instruction or the language of communication make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 197 - 226.
- Flower, L. (1984). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. In S. MaKasy (Ed.), *Composing in a second language*. (pp. 16 - 42). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Flower, L., Hayes, J. R., Carey, L., Schriver, K. & Stratman, J. (1986). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. *College Composition and Communication*, 37, 16 - 55.
- Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 43 - 60.

- Hayes, J. R., Flower, L. & Schriver, K. A. (1987). Cognitive process in revision. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics, Vol.2: Reading, writing and language learning*. (pp.176 - 240). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Kroll, B. (1990). What does time buy? ESL student performance on home versus class compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing*. (pp.140 - 154). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- McCaleb, J. (1992). Cancer: Always tells the truth. Cancer: Never say 'You're dying!' In J. McCaleb *That's your opinion*. (pp.50 - 53). Tokyo: Asahi Press.
- Murray, D. (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing: Points of departure*. (pp. 85 - 103). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229 - 258.
- Reid, J. M., (1988) *The process of composition: Second edition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- 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: Development and educational perspectives*. (pp.67 - 95). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 657 - 677.
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 3, 378 - 388.

White, R. & Arndt, V. (1991) *Process writing*. New York: Longman
Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students:
Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-187.

APPENDIX A

Revision process: A way to make your essay persuasive

1 . Read your first draft. Is your essay is persuasive to your readers?
Write your impressions of your first draft. Before moving to the second
step, do the two things below:

- Read the textbook and study the four strategies to make an essay persuasive.
- Read the two essays with opposing ideas on the topic.

2 . Answer the questions below, which focus on the specific points to
write a persuasive essay. While answering the questions, write as much as
possible about problems of your first draft, the causes of your problems
and the strategies to solve the problems.

About the contents:

- a . Do you have clear main ideas in your essay?
- b . Do you support your ideas? Do you use facts, statistics, examples,
etc.?
- c . Do you have enough knowledge and information on the topic?
- a' . What is the main idea of your essay?
- b' . What supporting details and where are you going to use?
- c' . Where and how are you going to gather information?

About the organization

- a . Does your draft have a good organization—introduction, body and conclusion?
 - b . Do you have the thesis statement in your introduction?
 - c . Do you use any ways to appeal to the reader?
 - d . Do you have opposing arguments in your essay?
 - a' . Make the three parts of your essay: introduction, body and conclusion.
 - b' . Write the thesis statement in your introduction.
 - c' . Which way are you going to use—logic or emotion?
 - d' . Are you going to state opposing views? What? Where?
- 3 . After making plans to revise, rewrite your first draft and make your essay more persuasive.

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Sheet

The evaluation sheet was written both in English and Japanese. The evaluator of native speakers used the English version, and the students used the Japanese version.

- 1 . How much do you think the revised essay as a whole has improved and become persuasive? Circle one of the four scales. The criteria for each scale are shown below.

1 2 3 4

2 . How much do you think the revised essay has improved in the specific points? Circle one of the four scales. The criteria are the same as the first question.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a . The main ideas of the essay have become clearer. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b . More reasons, explanations, examples, etc.
have been supplied to support the ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c . Information and knowledge of the topic has increased. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d . The whole text structure is reorganized, and
introduction, body and conclusions have become clearer. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e . The thesis statement has become clearer. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

<The criteria of evaluation of original and revised essays >

- 1 No improvement: The revised version is almost the same as the draft.
Only very minor or irrelevant revisions are done.
- 2 Little improvement: The essay has become little improved and persuasive, but most revisions are not so effective.
- 3 Moderate improvement: The revised version has become better and more persuasive, but some parts need further rewriting.
- 4 Great improvement: The essay has become much better and very persuasive because of appropriate revisions.