

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The awareness of 'free/continuous essays' came about in the mid-sixties where there was an increasing awareness of ESL students' needs with regard to producing extended written discourse (Tony Silva in Kroll – Second Language Writing, Research Insights for the Classrooms, 1993) than that of controlled compositions (guided compositions). According to T.Silva, there was more to writing than just building grammatical sentences. Thus came about the 'current-traditional rhetoric' which is an approach in combining the basic principles of the current-traditional paradigm based on Kaplan's theory of contrastive rhetoric. Kaplan, in Kroll's Second Language Writing, 1993, defined this as 'the method of organizing syntactic units into larger patterns'.

At present, the objectives of teaching English in schools in Malaysia, draw upon the aims and are stated under four language skills, which are reading, listening, writing and speaking (Ministry of Education, Sukatan Pelajaran Sekolah Menengah, 1998). All the four skills are equally important and should be the focus of teaching the English Language. A student learning a language should be taught and be exposed to all the four skills. Writing is one aspect of language that cannot be avoided. There should not be any doubt that students have to 'write' in the process of learning a

language. The only difference is that, the purpose of writing may differ from one person to the other. According to David Cross (in V.James, A Practical Handbook of Language Teaching, 1992), ‘whatever teaching method we use in class, it is probable that many students can and do internalize vocabulary and structural patterns through writing’. Therefore, he said that most would regard writing as a skill, which is to be neither ‘overvalued nor ignored’.

The existing English Language Syllabus for the Forms four and five assume that each student is able to communicate in the English Language at some level. Once this level is achieved, he or she can be taught to increase on the skills already acquired in order for the student to improve or to advance in his ‘products’.(English Language Syllabus, Ministry of Education Malaysia). ‘Products’ according to the Syllabus, is defined as a ‘piece of comprehensible information, written or spoken or presented in a non-linguistic form’. The teacher’s role is thus, to set a target, which is appropriate to the level of the students or the class. It is also mentioned that ‘effectiveness of any student’s product depends on the quality of the teacher’ (English Language Syllabus, Ministry of Education).

According to the Syllabus by the Ministry of Education Malaysia 1975, by the Curriculum Development Center, two teaching strategies are suggested in relation to the communicational approach. The approaches are:

- 1) The Direct Form – in which the target is non-changing. Here, the teacher persists in getting nothing less than that pre-determined level of mastery. Therefore, intensive teaching is emphasized. The teacher tends to set high expectations from the students and tend to give more attention to the weaker students. There may

also be a tendency to neglect the good students as they feel that these students have reached the mastery level. This approach then, places great emphasis on 'products' and is quite rigid.

- 2) The Oblique Form – in this approach the target may change according to how the lesson develops in class. The teacher does not wait for the full mastery of one skill before moving on to the next skill. The focus is on maintaining the interest of the students through various stimuli and opportunities or practices to enable them to participate. The teacher will move to another skill even if the previous skill was not yet mastered as long as he feels that the students have learned something. In this way, the learned skills can be reinforced later on in other lessons.

The Oblique Form then, would be more appropriate and suitable to 'Process Writing', thus making way or giving language teachers the opportunity to practise 'process writing' in class. In this approach, the teacher does not need to ensure that all the students have mastered each step before moving on to the next step. In addition, these steps can be reinforced and repeated when doing other essay topics. As a result, it becomes an on-going process in the writing class.

The Syllabus clearly shows that teachers have the opportunities to be more flexible and able to practice 'process writing'. By adopting 'process writing' does not mean that a lot of time is spent just writing on one topic. The teacher can use his/her discretion on the time spent on each step and when he thinks that the students are able to move on to the next step. However, according to Dr. Moses Samuel, in one of his graduate seminar entitled, "The Challenge of Diversity: Culture and the Recontextualization of Process Writing Pedagogy", recent studies

in Malaysian classrooms (Mahaletchumy, 1992; Bajan Kaur, 1993; Chuand, 1994, Marohaini, 1996) showed that process writing implemented in the late 1980's and 1990's had not taken off successfully. There seemed to be a mismatch between pedagogical rhetoric and pedagogical research. The reasons given for this not being successful were:

- (a) Malaysian classrooms tend to be more examination oriented.
- (b) Large classes or number of students per class.

There are many theories and philosophies on writing and why people should learn how to write. What it means by 'writing' according to John T. Gage in his article "Why Write" in the book by Petrovsky & Bartholomew, 'Teaching Writing: The Major Theories', it is not just merely learning the scripts and alphabets and putting them together. Here, it is more on how one can learn how to write well. There are many skills that can be learnt and taught in order to be a good writer and these skills should be mastered and applied in practice. The theories in teaching writing are important especially to language teachers as they can help teaching. Zebronski, 1986 (quoted by Ann M. Johns, 'L1 Composition Theories Implications for developing theories of L2 compositions' in the book by Kroll, Second Language Writing, 1993) wrote that:

"Theory has helped me to excavate and uncover my own assumptions about writing. It has aided me in crafting a more coherent and unified course structure. It has encouraged me to try out some new methods of teaching writing. It has helped relinquish control and to emphasize classroom community. (pg.58)"

Among the theories discussed on the teaching of writing, the three main ones are those introduced by the Sophists, Socrates and Aristotle. It is clear that the

theories on writing did not emerge recently but they went back to years ago during the times of Aristotle and Socrates. According to Socrates, it was important for one to be able to write as ‘knowing and practicing the art of writing persuasively were dangerous to the soul as this art depended on knowing how to write well on any idea indiscriminately’ (Petrovsky and Bartholomew, ‘Teaching Writing: The Major Theories’, pg.10). To him, by being able to write well, one could at the same time, tell the truth or even tell lies. He also saw writing ‘as an obstacle to knowledge of the truth’ because through writing a person can deceive others and can also be very manipulative with the words used.

Aristotle (in Petrovsky and Bartholomew, ‘Teaching Writing: The Major theories’) on the other hand, had a different view from that of Socrates. To Aristotle, writing is a kind of self-defense. He tried to show the relationship between the art of persuasion (by Socrates) to the discovery of knowledge. Therefore, from his theory, it is important to be able to understand ‘how skilled writers attempt to manipulate readers and how people can be less manipulative’. Readers or the audience then, should be taught how to understand good writing and be made aware of the rhetoric writing and be able to differentiate between honest and dishonest writing. This is what Aristotle referred to as the ‘art of defense’ against persuasive writing. There are two premises which underlie his defense of writing (quoted by John T.Gage in “Why Write” in the book by Petrovsky and Bartholomew, ‘Teaching Writing: The Major Theories’). The two are:

- a) “Contingent, probable truth” – which was rejected by Socrates as false.

- b) “The non – existence of anything like a systematic” – which referred to a set of rules that could lead to knowledge.

The third ideology was introduced by the Sophists which said that ‘writing was a source of power’ because through writing, the writer can manipulate other people’s beliefs (John Gage, ‘Why Write’ in Petrovsky and Bartholomew, ‘Teaching Writing: The Major Theories’). According to the Sophists, writing skills are important in order to enable one to get ahead especially in the world of politics and economy.

Berlin (1982,1987,1988) as quoted by Ann M.Johns in Kroll, ‘Second Language Writing, 1993’, pointed out that the teaching of compositions must take into account four factors which are:

- a) The student or writer.
- b) The audience or reader.
- c) The reality and truth.
- d) The sources of language in written texts.

These four factors become the basic principles in Berlin’s composition theory and can be divided into:

- 1) The Process Approaches – which can be further divided into:
 - a) Expressivism
 - b) Cognitivist.

- 2) The Interactive Views – where both the writer and reader take responsibilities for coherent text. The written product is also seen as a social act that can take place within and for a specific context and audience (Coe, 1987).
- 3) The Social Constructionist View.

In Berlin's Process Approach, there were two groups. The first is the expressivism which saw 'writing as an art, a creative art in which the process i.e. the discovery of the true – self is as important as the product – the self discovered and expressed' (in Ann M. Johns, Kroll, B, Second Language Writing, Pg.25). Here, writing was used to promote fluency and self-discovery for example through journal writing and personal essays. The other group which was the cognitivist, saw 'writing as problem-solving'. Two key words here were 'thinking' and 'process'. The students needed to 'plan extensively including defining the rhetorical problem, try to make it operational, explore it, generate alternatives and solutions' (in Ann M. Johns, Kroll, B, Second Language Writing). This process involved the planning, translating plans and thoughts into words, reviewing, revising and editing. Hence, mental process was important. The aim here was to encourage prewriting activities, writing several drafts and editing the drafts.

Bizell, 1987 (in Ann M. Johns, Kroll, B, Second Language Writing) who wrote about the social constructionist view, suggested two approaches which were:

- a) Students should not be forced to acquire academic literacy and become part of the academic discourse community but the academic must change and adapt to the many cultures of the students.

- b) Teachers must understand the academy literacy means and see how best it can be introduced into the academic English classes.

J.Gage in his article “Why Write” (Petrovsky and Bartholomae, The Teaching of Writing, Eighty – Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) argued that in order to facilitate the practice of writing skills, language teachers should adopt ‘Process Writing’ in their classes. In this method, teachers will need to teach students the processes involved in writing from the beginning stage right through to the end, that is, the product. These processes include the choosing of a topic, gathering information, brain – storming ideas, organizing thoughts, composing, revising, editing and writing of several drafts. Writing then, cannot be seen just as an exercise in ‘drilling’. According to Gage, as teachers, we should be aware of some of the superstitions that people or students have about writing in schools. Many of these superstitions came about as a result of the person’s own previous experience on how she/he was taught. In order to change students’ attitudes, we need to “unteach” these superstitions or at least be prepared for them. Among the superstitions that Gage discussed in his article “Why Write” (in Petrovsky and Bartholomae, The Teaching of Writing – Eighty – Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) are:

- 1) Many students complained that they have problems with grammar. Therefore, this deter them from writing because most teachers paid attention to the structural forms of their essays and not to their ideas.

- 2) Some people believe that you are either born as writers or not. This belief is also related to culture and thus can affect students' motivation especially when they face difficulties in writing.
- 3) Students' attitude towards writing. Many feel that writing is not important and not related to their education.

Gage, in the same article ("Why Write") also stated that there was a difference between teaching writing as a 'technical skill' and teaching writing as the exercise of independent thought. According to him, the ability to reason was in the question of "Is it possible to succeed fully in the writing task without having a good idea of one's own?"(J.Gage, "Why Write" in Petrovsky and Bartholomae, 'The teaching of Writing' Eighty – Fifth Yearbook). If the answer to this was 'yes', then the writing task would exercise students' competency but not judgement. It showed then that, the task required students to have their own ideas and be responsible for them. Students, should therefore be taught to come-up with their own ideas as this will make them take more responsibility of their own writing and feel more committed. Simultaneously, the teaching of writing goes hand in hand with the thinking process. However, writing should not be taught in isolation as this can reduce students' sense of commitment to the thought. Students then should learn to think in situations that demand ideas from them. The difference between writing and thinking is that, writing is tangible while thinking is not. Therefore, students learn to communicate their ideas and thoughts through writing. It is also important to remember that 'Process Writing' should be done for all essay topics if we want the students to master all the skills involved. This is

so because each topic or task provides different challenges and situations, thus by going through this process repeatedly, can only they become better writers. Not only that, Gage also mentioned that from these numerous practices, the students will realize that 'writing is not only searching for the right words in the right order, but also for the right reasons. It is rather a discovery of what to think as well as why'. (J.Gage, "Why Write", in Petrovsky and Bartholomae, The Teaching of Writing, Eighty-fifth Yearbook of The National Society of the Study of education).

William Irmischer (as quoted by Gage in "Why Write" in Petrovsky and Bartholomae 'The Teaching of Writing) talks about the various advantages of writing among which he said that,

"Writing is often thinking about our own thoughts; that is, it permits us to distance ourselves from our thoughts, to separate the thought from the thinker – a kind of analyzing and assessing, a revolving of differences, and a final structuring. Perhaps, most important of all, writing permits us not just to say what we have to say but to see what we have to say. Thus we have a new concern for the how as well as the what, the manner as well as the substance".(pg.26)

The learning environment or classroom also plays an important role in the teaching of writing. There are certain features that need to be taken into considerations in order to create a more conducive and better environment for learning to take place. Some of the features pointed out by Gage in "Why Write" are:

- 1) The class should be a place where students feel comfortable and free to respond to the given task honestly and critically. In order for them to do this,

students should also be critical in their readings. Thus, reading skill also plays a role here.

- 2) It is important for the students to write for an 'audience' besides solely for the teacher. By having an 'audience' in mind, they would be able to imagine what should be communicated to the audience. Students should also be encouraged to involve themselves in discussions with the members of their class and to read each other's writing so that they can be critical of each other's work. Here, teacher's role should not be as 'judge' to students' work but they should also respond to the ideas in the products. By this way, 'technical matter' or structural forms will not be the only aspect that matters. The teacher should not be an authoritarian figure in the class but as 'knowledgeable collaborator' and should try and protect students from the academy's oppressive requirement. What is important is to give students the freedom to write and help them develop their own individual style. However, this can bring rise to a conflict in school politics between the institution and the individual creative talents. In other words, the requirement of the institution or the system versus personal needs.
- 3) Students should be taught to revise and edit their work. This can be done after the discussion with their peers and teachers. Here, they will be taught to take responsibility of their own work.

Another view of the teaching of writing is the pedagogy brought forward by William Woods. In his article as quoted by Anne Ruggles Gere in 'Teaching

Writing: The Major Theories', in the book by Petrovsky and Bartholomae, The Teaching of Writing, he saw two general pedagogical theories which were:

(a) Student – centred.

(b) Discipline – centred or Language based approach which can be divided into rhetoric, logic and language.

According to Woods, it was up to the individual teacher to decide what approach to take in order to teach writing because different textbooks contained different approach. Richard Young (in the same article), however, emphasized more on the 'product' rather than the 'process' in his current – traditional paradigm'. Young talked about the problem where there was a lack of attention to invention in the teaching of rhetoric. He looked at his 'current – traditional paradigm' as a tacit theory dominating composition pedagogy. His paradigm described this as,

"emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentence, and paragraphs, the classification of discourse into description, narration, exposition and argument; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style (economy, clarity, emphasis); and preoccupation with the informal essay and the research paper". (pg. 31)

John Dewey, (as quoted by Anne Ruggles Gere in 'Teaching Writing: The Major Theories') a researcher in the progressive movement, on the other hand, pointed out the importance of learner's prior knowledge, interest and motivation. All these geared more towards the approach on 'student – centred' rather than on the discipline. Besides all these approaches, another theory termed 'mimetic' was also introduced by Fulkerson (R. Fulkerson, "Four Philosophies of Composing", College Compositions and Communication, 1979). The theory emphasized on the relation of writing to reality. This view looked at the role of teaching reasoning and logic as the foundation of good writing.

According to this theory, there are certain things that should be incorporated in the teaching of writing because most students do not know enough in order to write i.e. students lack the knowledge needed, hence, they cannot write. Reading should then be a part of the writing class. This can be done through class or oral discussion. The mimetic solutions then suggested:

- (a) Doing more research in the early stages of the writing process.
- (b) Emphasis on the discovery procedures.
- (c) Make students read authors who take different views on the same topic.

“Process Writing” then should not be taught in isolation but should be integrated with other skills such as reading and also some grammatical instructions. In order to do this, more time needed to be put aside to teach writing but the question is, do we have time for all these besides preparing students for the examinations? James Britton and Janet Emig (as quoted by Patricia Bizzell in “Composing Process:An Overview” in the book by Petrovsky and Bartholomae, ‘Teaching of Writing’) said that students should be given more time and opportunities to develop their writing but how much time or opportunity do we give them remain unanswered.

Many other researchers have also looked at the idea of ‘Process Writing’. Linda Flower and John R.Hayes (Flower and Hayes, “A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing”, *College Composition and Communication* 32, Dec1981) introduced a model called “The Flower - Hayes Model” which divided composing into three parts which were:

Task Environment.

This refers to the immediate context of a composing situation or the assignment. This can be further classified into the 'rhetorical problem' and the 'text produced so far'.

(a) Writing Process.

This refers to the activity that took place in the writer's head. This can be divided into reviewing, translating and planning.

(b) Writer's long – term memory.

This is the larger social context for composing.

What was found interesting in this model was that, one did not need to follow it in the given order. It was a recursive order, thus allowing one to switch from one process to another in any way one felt more comfortable with. In the stage where revising took place, many drafts could be done and there should not be a limit to the number required. It is important also to understand the purpose of revising the drafts. Here, it meant not just polishing on the writing style but at the same time trying to develop new ideas. Donald Graves in his book, Writing: teachers and Children at Work, 1983, said that it was important that students be given the freedom to choose their own topics to write on so that they would be able to take control of their own writing. However, this is often not possible in class as teachers are also bounded by certain units/topics to be dealt with for the examination purposes. On the other hand, in the SPM examination, students do get the chance to choose their own topic from a choice of five topics given. Here then, is

some 'leeway' for students to really express their freedom in writing. Even though students are given a range of topics to choose from, many may find it a problem to decide which topic to choose. This could be due to their lack of prior knowledge in certain topics. Writing then, is also greatly influenced by students' prior knowledge such as their reading habits, exposure to books, general knowledge and their social and cultural background. Home environment, family background as well as social status do play a part in making up students' prior knowledge too (Shirley Brice Heath, David Olson, in Bizzell P, "Composing Process: An Overview" in Petrovsky and Bartholomae, *The Teaching of Writing*). One way how this can be solved is through discussion with friends as what Kenneth Bruffee (Kenneth A Bruffee, "Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind, *College English*, November 1984) called as 'a method of training students to tutor their peers' (pg.65). This can be taken not only as teaching their friends but more of exchanging and learning ideas with each other. Stotsky (1983) in his study (as quoted by Kenneth), found the 'correlations between reading achievement and writing ability and thus concludes that better writers are also better readers'. In addition, they also produce more syntactical mature writing. It can be said that reading does influence writing.

AppleBee is also interested in the idea of 'Process Writing' but according to him, if we were to adopt this in class, teachers should be made aware of some of the problems that might arise. In his article on 'Problems in Process Writing' written in the book by Petrovsky and Bartholomae, *The Teaching of Writing*, Eighty – Fifth yearbook of the National Society for the study of Education, AppleBee addressed the issues of three

criterion that will determine the success of the approach. He raised three questions that one needs to ask in adopting this approach. They are:

- (a) How widely have they been adopted? (The Process Writing Approach)
- (b) When adopted, how successfully are they implemented?
- (c) When implemented, do they lead to noticeable improvement in students' writing?

These questions will also be discussed at length in the discussion on the findings later on. One interesting issue that he brought up, is the issue of 'time' used in writing. Many students start their work in class but most of the time more than half of the writing is completed at home. How then, do we actually put this 'process' into practice? The types of writing task given in schools also give little chance for personal and imaginative writing to take place. Therefore, there is little freedom in writing and many students barely manage to go beyond the first draft in class. It is also argued then that, 'process writing' should be adopted for a particular purpose depending on the type of writing undertaken. L.S.Vygotsky (Vygotsky, Thought and Language, 1978), suggested that this approach be the 'scaffolding' to enable the students to complete a given task using the process as a strategy to achieve the solution. As long as the strategy is appropriate for a given task, then it can be used as 'scaffolding' to the task.

As mentioned earlier, one of the skills involved in 'process writing' is the prewriting stage'. Before a student can take on this stage, it is important that he/she has some prior knowledge such as the formal and substantive knowledge. According to G. Hillocks, (G.Hillocks, Jr, 'The Writer's Knowledge: Theory, research and Implications for

Practice' in Petrovsky and Bartholomae, *The Teaching of Writing*), 'substantive knowledge refers to the knowledge of facts, opinions, beliefs etc.(pg.72)' while formal knowledge refers to the 'knowledge of lexical, syntactic, rhetorical and discourse forms used to express substantive knowledge'. In other words, he categorized these into :

- (a) Declarative Knowledge – knowledge of the 'what' or to identify the forms.
- (b) Procedural Knowledge – knowledge of the 'how' or the process of recalling and then producing.

According to him, both were crucial in order to produce a good piece of writing.

G.Hillocks (in the same article), in his study found that the approach using instructions which emphasized grammar, showed no improvement in the students' essays. This according to his explanation, might be due to the students trying to avoid making mistakes or to avoid criticisms. As a result, they wrote fewer simple and shorter sentences resulting in less developed ideas in terms of content. Thus, he concluded that instructions on grammar were only relevant to the syntactic level and not to content. What might cause problem to the writing class was that, students were often told what to do before they started writing but not how to do it. One of the ways suggested to solve this problem then, was by getting the students read certain topics, then have an open discussion in class before the writing process begins. Another suggestion given according to Scardamalia and Bereita (as quoted by Hillocks in his article 'The Writer's Knowledge: Theory, research and Implications for Practice'), was that, students could be given exercises in sentence combining in order to help them develop the syntactic structures. In addition, teachers can help students by asking or prompting questions that

will generate more ideas or details as well as elaborate on the existing points. From his study then, Hillocks suggested the need for what he called as the 'natural process instruction' (pg.88) which was based on the assumptions that students already had or would develop the appropriate knowledge if only teachers gave them the chance to write. Teachers should only become facilitators. As facilitators, their roles are to give support to students to enable them to grow towards independent, which is the natural development of the individual. In order for this to work, students should share ideas and discuss among themselves before they start to write on the given topic.

According to Zebronski, 1986, (as quoted in Ann M. Johns, 'L1 Composition Theories: Implications for Developing Theories of L2 Compositions' in B. Kroll, Second Language Writing), we should bear in mind the objective of the writing class that is,

“ to encourage students through a variety of experiences and by means of writing assignments that require reflection upon these experiences, to arrive at a more explicit and conscious ‘theory’ of writing that can guide them and help them to better understand and control their own behaviour”.(Zebronski 1986:58 – 59).

Even though teachers act as facilitators, according to V. Zamel (V.Zamel, Writing: The Process of Discovery Meaning, TESOL Quarterly, Vol.16, No.2, June, 1982), the teachers should intervene throughout the process so that 'revision could be done and students can learn to view their own writing as someone else's reading' (pg.195). Thus, they can learn to reflect upon their mistakes and even develop their ideas further while writing the drafts. Sommers, (1980) also stressed on the importance of revision and writing drafts because weak students especially, will tend to get distracted by paying more attention on the grammatical structures. Zamel (TESOL Quarterly, 1982), also

studied the strategies students used in writing i.e. using the outline. Some students feel that the outline gave them a sense of control while others feel that they did not follow the outline as their ideas fly back and forth while they write. Even though there is emphasis on drafts, how many drafts are adequate did not seem to be pointed out. Therefore, the problems which might arise is the issue of 'time' spent writing the drafts and how many drafts can be considered sufficient. AppleBee also discussed the same problems in his article on process approaches. Murray, D, (1978) pointed out that teachers should give students ample time to write and rewrite, so that they learn that several drafts may be necessary before intention and expression become one (Murray,D, Internal Revision, 'A Process of Discovery' in C.Cooper and L.Odell .eds.Research on Composing).

Some researchers also found the correlation between the teaching of writing in the first language (L1) and the second language (L2). Arndt (1987) found that the strategies used in writing L1 and L2 were the same. Many researchers also argued that students used the skills they learned in L1 writing class and then transferred or adopted them in L2. Not only did they use the same skills, some even switched back and forth between L1 and L2 (Chelala, 1982, in Alexandra Rowe Krapels: An Overview of Second Language Writing Process, in Kroll,B, Second Language Writing). Chelala found that what students found to be effective in L1 were thus applied in L2. Some of the similarities between L1 and L2 writing strategies were also pointed out by V. Zamel (1983).It was found that unskilled L2 writers revised less and spent less time writing compared to the skilled writers. This was the same finding in Sommers's (1980) report of her L1 study on the writing process. Even though there were similarities in the skills

between writing in L1 and L2, it is important, according to Zamel that students were made to understand and experience composing as a process in order for the product to improve. Murray, D.M (in an article by Stephen P.Witte, "Revising, Composing Theory and Research Design") a Pulitzer Prize winner brought attention to what he called as the 'professional view of revising'. In his textbook on 'How-to-teach and Writings on Composing', he suggested the 'professional' model of revising and the 'amateur' model which were:

" All effective writers know that writing is rewriting. The inexperienced writer feels that a revision is a failure. The amateur believes the writer is the person who can sit and rip off an essay or a report. The professional writer knows better. Rewriting is what you do when you are a writer, for it is an essential part of the process writing. It is the way in which you fit ideas into language". (Murray, 1968, pg.11).

According to Stephen P.Witte, from his study on the theoretical ground and the empirical ground, if composing is a hierarchical process, then revising can be embedded into sub-process of planning.

Raimes (in Alexandra Rowe Krapels' article), however, did not agree with Zamel who claimed that L1 and L2 writers used the same strategies in writing. According to Raimes, the strategies used in L1 only influence the strategies used in L2. Thus, students would adapt the theories to suit their needs. Transfer or interference from L1 to L2 was unavoidable because it was said that if one did not have the writing skills in L1, he then could not apply them to L2. It was also possible that some students may use L1 in getting their ideas or in the planning stage. After that, they would transfer it to L2 and it was found in Edelsky's study (1982) "Writing in a bilingual program: The relationship of L1 and L2 texts", that this can enhance and not hinder writing especially

among the advance learners. According to her study, ‘knowledge of L2 writing forms the basis of new hypothesis rather than interferes with writing in another language’. This can be seen as a positive use of L1 but teachers would need to understand that this works best if the topic is culturally – bound to L1. However, if the topic was related to the L2 culture, then the chances would be that students would be better off using L2 instead of translating. In other words, according to Alexander Friedlander in the article “Composing in English: First Language Effects”, students would benefit the most when they know when to match the language to the topic given. This was found in the result of his study on 28 Chinese – speaking subjects at Carnegie Mellon University. The only problem with the transfer of L1, according to Edelsky was that, the act of translation i.e. retrieving information about a topic from memory and translating into L2, could lead to an overloading of their short-term memory and a diminishment in the quality of the essay content.

Contradictory to what Zamel said about the need for teachers to intervene during the writing process, Jones (1985) who adopted Krashen’s Monitor Theory, found that ‘monitoring does not lead to improved writing’ (1985:112) and that monitoring was only a ‘factor constraining the L2 writing process’. It seemed that when writers were aware of the existence of the readers, they became more focus on the correctness of syntactical rather than the content.

Another important issue discussed earlier is about ‘time’ factor. According to Mclaughlin in an article by Kroll, “What does time buy? ESL students performance on home versus class compositions” (1987:133 – 142), ‘extending the amount of time allotted to producing an essay might affect the level of mastery exhibited on any or all

of the levels'. Therefore, in applying Krashen's Monitor Model (Krashen, S.D, 1977), time was used as one of the variables. Teachers of writing should also look at the different abilities in writing skills and the role of time. Barbara Kroll in her study of ESL students' performance, analyzed the products under two groups which are:

- a) Those produced in class under the pressure of time.
- b) Those produced at home with 10 – 14 days of preparation time.

She found that giving students additional time did not lead to an improved essay that showed statistically significance between the two groups. In fact, she said that it could be because students who wrote at home would end-up spending less time writing than those who did the work in class.

Besides looking at the theories and time factor, teachers' feedback on students' work in class is also important to be looked at. When and what type of feedback given to them can also affect the final product to a certain extent. Some students feel that feedback given on their drafts may not be clear, thus, did not help improve their end-products. Zamel (1985) as quoted in an article by A. K. Fathman and E. Whalley, "Teachers response to students' writing", also found that ESL teachers are just like L1 teachers in that their comments on content are vague and contradictory. She also found that students responded more to the comments on form rather than those on the content. Some teachers also tend to focus more on the negative points of the product, thus the comments given did not help students to develop their ideas further. In fact, there were disagreement as to 'when' should feedback be given i.e. in the first draft or the final draft. Comments on ideas and content for example may be very subjective as learners

and teachers need not share the common skills, prior knowledge and values. Fathman and Whalley pointed out that, whenever feedback was given on grammar and content, whether given alone or simultaneously, did affect writing. According to Andrew D.Cohen and Marilda C.Cavalcanti (as quoted by Kroll in "Feedback on compositions: teacher and student verbal reports"), part of the problem of feedback 'lies in the nature of the feedback itself which is unclear, inaccurate and unbalanced'. Also, most of the time, students are not bothered with the feedback they got but their main concern is the grade they receive on their compositions (Freedman, 1987).