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Abstract

This case study focuses on the revision practices of seven first year composition students at a U.S./Mexico border community college. The analysis of revision practices is framed by the negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention. Three types of data were collected: screen captured writing sessions, instructor comments, and participant interviews. The data was analyzed through a grid based on Faigley and Witte’s taxonomy grid of revision changes. This included three major categories: surface level, meaning preserving, and text base level changes. As in past studies on revision, the participants in this case study followed a similar trend. A majority of the changes were surface level changes, and the second most common change was meaning preserving substitutions. Out of 889 changes, only one change was made at the text base macro level. The participant interviews showed that students had a tacit understanding of the negotiation of meaning and used the knowledge they had acquired to revise, but expressed a frustration in not knowing how to resolve the dissonance other than through surface level changes. This research shows that the negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention at various levels of revision can provide a meta-cognitive framework for novice writers to articulate and execute meaning preserving and text base changes.
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Introduction

The shift to a process paradigm from a current traditional paradigm that began in the 1960s seized on the hope that the writing practices of novice writers would improve. The focus on process broke up the strict algorithmic procedures of the current-traditional paradigm and became attentive to the recursive and intersubjective nature of writing. In the 1980s, the emphasis of theory and research in Rhetoric and Composition was framed by writing processes (pre-writing, writing, revision, editing), thinking processes, and communication processes. During this time, Flower and Hayes developed a cognitive theory of process that grounded many of the empirical studies on writing and revision. At the same time that these cognitive studies were conducted, Sommers conducted studies on revision to critique the traditional rhetorical models whose foundations were oratory discourse rather than written discourse and which included invention, disposition or arrangement, style and presentation, memory, and delivery as outlined by Quintilian. Sommers paralleled the linear writing process to traditional rhetorical models which emphasize the “spoken art of oratory” (378). She also observed that students were willing to revise, but economized as many revision moves as possible. The teaching of writing expanded to include writer, audience, and discourse which broadened the definition of the nature of writing to include hierarchical cognitive processes and reflected the intersubjective nature of writing. Faigley and Witte along with others compared the writing practices of novice writers and expert writers with the idea that if we understood what expert writers did, we could teach this to novice writers and close the gap between good and bad writing. The results of the studies in the 1980s showed that novice writers relied more on
current traditional strategies to include grammaticality and format while expert writers moved beyond surface level changes to revise text using recursive strategies that reflected process oriented changes to include the negotiation of meaning. A number of the studies also pointed out that novice writers were willing to revise and used the knowledge they had about writing to revise. This knowledge reflected what they had learned from past writing experiences.

In the move from a product orientation to a process orientation, the assumption was that students would acquire the intersubjective nature of these strategies to revise in ways that negotiated the dissonance between gist and intention at multiple levels of discourse. Gist is the actual idea communicated in the text. Intention is the writer’s goal or intent for the text and dissonance is the distance between the gist of the text and the intention of the writer. Dissonance is negotiated at several levels in a discourse. The process of negotiating meaning is not static, but dynamic within the constructs of what the writer wrote (gist) and what the writer intended (intention) as well as the knowledges that a writer brings to the act of writing.

Since the 1980s, few studies have been conducted on the writing and revising behaviors of students. Research shifted toward analyzing the rhetorical meaning making moves in writing that affirmed or resisted dominate structures of power. A few revision studies were conducted between 2001 and 2007. The results of these studies showed a similar trend as the studies completed in the eighties: A majority of changes were surface level changes which closely leans toward current-traditional revision strategies.

The focus of this case study is on the types of changes novice writers make in their writing. Do these changes reflect the intersubjective nature of writing in which negotiation is a key characteristic? The participants were seven first year composition students who placed into
a first year composition course as college ready or who entered the course from a
developmental English course or an ESL course. All students attend a community college on the
U.S./Mexico border. Including second language learners in the study complicates and takes into
account the underrepresented populations of students in revision studies. The research
questions for this dissertation were

1. How do first year composition students negotiate dissonance between gist and
intention?

2. Do students bring other knowledges which create or resolve the gap between gist
and intention?

3. Since the move from a product orientation to a process orientation in teaching
writing, do students in the 21st century exhibit this change in their writing practices?

A significant feature of this case study was the three types of participants. The
participants in past revision studies were mostly monolingual English speaking students in a
first year composition course. This case study distinguished three groups of students who were
enrolled in a first year writing course which represents the diverse student populations in many
first year writing courses in the 21st century. One group placed into the composition course as
college ready, another group moved into course after taking a developmental English course
and the third group of students had taken an ESL course(s) prior to enrolling in the class.

In addition to the three distinct populations, three types of data were gathered to form
a triangulated analysis. Screen capture technology was used to record the participants’ writing
sessions for two assignments. The second type of data was the instructor’s comments on the
students’ drafts. Then, two interviews were conducted with three of the participants. The first
interview was a general interview that covered the student’s overall perceptions and attitudes
about writing and revising. The second interview focused on specific changes made during the recorded writing sessions. The sessions had been transcribed and coded before the second interview. These three types of data provided material evidence of the different knowledges and behaviors that the participants used in the writing process. Writers used previous knowledge they had learned, their perceptions of what good writing was and feedback or comments from others. In a narrow sense, the data presented a partial view of the rhetorical situation that novice writers face. Almost fourteen hours of writing was recorded by the seven participants. Some participants recorded their writing sessions at home and some did it in a computer lab at the college.

To facilitate the storage of the screen captured data, Blackboard, an online management tool, was used. Each participant was assigned a virtual classroom within a Blackboard shell. A set of archival and screen capture WIMBA tools could be activated by the participant inside the virtual classroom. Since the archival tool automatically saved the sessions in two minute segments, the participants only had to activate and deactivate the tool. Training was provided on how to use the WIMBA tools for all the participants.

Once the writing sessions were completed, the sessions were transcribed and the changes were hand tabulated and categorized by type. The types of changes were coded based on Faigley and Witte’s 1981 study on revision. The three major categories were surface changes, meaning preserving changes and text base changes. The following subcategories were used to further analyze the different types of changes made within each category.

Surface Changes: spelling, tense, number, modal, punctuation, format

Meaning Preserving Changes: addition, deletion, substitution
Text Base Changes: Micro additions, deletions, substitutions and Macro additions, deletions, substitutions. (A text base change is a change that alters the meaning of a sentence, paragraph or text.)

Using these categories, the changes were documented in EXCEL files. The screen captured video writing sessions were hyperlinked into the EXCEL file to coincide with the coded data for each two minute clip.

The other two types of data were analyzed by a similar set of characteristics. The instructor comments were divided into the major categories used in the screen captured data: surface changes, meaning preserving changes or a text base changes. For the first assignment, the instructor wrote the comments on the drafts. I made copies of the drafts after the instructor had written his comments. For the second recorded assignment, the instructor sent his comments to the student by email. Both sets of comments were placed into a table divided by the major categories of change. For the interview data with the participants, I transcribed each interview and divided the participants’ comments by topics instead of categories. These topics included participants’ comments related to gist and intention, assignment requirements, general writing practices, writing conventions, and evidence of resistance.

The results of this case study showed similar findings than previous studies on revision. A majority of changes during the writing sessions were surface level changes which included spelling, tense, number, modal, punctuation, and formatting. The second most common type of change was meaning preserving substitutions. The least number of changes was made at the text base level with mostly micro level changes and only one macro level change among all the participants. The instructor’s comments followed a similar pattern in that most of the
comments were tied to surface level changes. The surface level comments included written comments and codes. The participant interviews provided a different perspective on revision. Instead of looking at textual changes or instructor feedback, participants were asked about their perceptions of writing and revision. The three students who participated in the interviews stated that grammar played a part in their revising practices and definitions of good writing. When asked specifically about the changes they had made during the recorded writing sessions, their comments indicated that the participants had an understanding of the negotiation of meaning, but also a frustration of not knowing what to do to reduce the dissonance they saw in their writing. An understanding of the negotiation of meaning was seen in comments like

“I don’t like the way it sounds…”

“I don’t like the way it sounds...thanks to somebody dying... So, it kind of sounded wrong. I'm not sure why I added that was, but I did.”

“Like actually get into detail and make the reader understand what you are trying to say and what you are trying to get across.”

“Just how things click…”

“I got all the ideas it's just a matter of putting them all together in a way that they will make sense.

“...what I find the hardest just making sure that the right sentence goes with the next sentence and that they all make sense.”

When the students were asked how they “fix” the dissonance that was described in making sure the reader understands or that things make sense, most of the participants relied on surface or meaning preserving changes, particularly grammar or sentence structure changes.
As far as evidence of the negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention during the writing sessions, this did occur at multiple levels—surface level as well as at meaning preserving or text base level. However, negotiating the gist and intention of one word is different than negotiating the gist and intention of ideas within a paragraph or across an entire discourse. Negotiation of meaning i.e., the negotiation between gist and intention to reduce dissonance is the essence of revision, but the participants in this study did not demonstrate this beyond surface changes. Again, this close attention to surface changes leans more closely towards current-traditional strategies than process oriented strategies. The process movement introduced peer review, feedback, conferencing and collaboration that reflected the social nature of writing, and the language of the classroom shifted from correctness to discovering meaning through the writing process (pre-writing, writing, revision, editing). Even though these social strategies have become part of the writing classroom practices, the feedback the students received in this study focused more on surface level changes which were useful, but did not reproduce the broader revision strategies that reflected the theoretical turn towards an intersubjective view of writing. Instead, particular attention was paid to stylistic features of grammar and syntax as the means for negotiating the dissonance between gist and intention.

The move from a product oriented view to a process oriented view has created a classroom environment that uses the language of process, but continues to be focused on the product of writing. We expect students to understand the rhetorical situation, respond to the needs of different audiences, and use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking and communicating, all of which exhibits an intersubjective epistemology with the assumption that student writing behaviors have become aleatory in nature rather than relying solely on
algorithmic strategies tied to the current-traditional model. However, negotiating meaning continues to elude students when they are asked to “revise.” They often do not know what to do other than correct surface errors or respond to the comments that an instructor or peer has written in the margin. The intersubjective nature of writing that involves the negotiation of meaning has been limited as students continue to use current-tradition strategies to negotiated meaning.

The heart of revision is the negotiation of meaning, specifically the negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention. The negotiation of meaning involves mediating between gist and intention to narrow dissonance. Although theory recognizes the intersubjective nature of writing, the participants in this study demonstrated revision strategies that were more closely tied to current traditional strategies than process oriented strategies. Participants understood the writing process as a set of steps. Peer review, feedback and conferencing with the instructor were part of the class activities and represent key aspects of the writing process. However, the majority of the feedback and the changes that the participants made during the writing sessions were surface level changes rather than changes that close the gap of dissonance in the text.

The lack of revision strategies that go beyond surface level changes can also been seen in the textbooks for first year composition courses. Much attention is paid to pre-writing and organizing, but very little attention is given to the meaning making moves in revision that negotiate the dissonance between gist and intention. The number one seller on Amazon as a writing handbook is *The Elements of Style* 4th Edition, which is also ranked 242 among all the books sold on Amazon. This paperback book focuses mostly on sentence structure and devotes
one paragraph to revision which states that revising is important and that word processing has
helped revision. No specific revising strategies are mentioned.

Although instructors and students are aware of the writing process and can use
vocabulary associated with a process orientation, the participants relied on the conventions of
writing as a strategy for revision. If a sentence did not “sound right” or did not “fit,” the case
study participants used grammar or syntax to close the dissonance between gist and intention.
Meaning preserving and text base changes remained elusive to students partly because
students lacked a meta-cognitive language to discuss and apply revision changes at levels
beyond surface change to reduce the dissonance between gist and intention. The concept of
negotiating dissonance between gist and intention at various levels of revision can provide a
meta-cognitive framework from which novice writers can articulate and execute meaning
preserving and text base changes that would better leverage the intersubjective nature of
revision.

This dissertation begins with a literature review of previous studies in revision to include
monolingual and ESL studies. The methods section provides the details of how the three types
of data was gathered and how the data was rendered and used in documenting evidence of the
negotiation of dissonance. The results section is organized around the three types of
participants for this study and presents the different types of changes evident in the writing
sessions, instructor feedback and interview sessions. The discussion section triangulates the
three types of data for the analysis of revision practices. The last section presents the
implications of this case study.
Literature Review

The focus of this dissertation is to look at the negotiation of dissonance through gist and intention as part of the writing and revising process. These terms are defined as:

- **Intention**: the writer’s intention or goal in writing which can include meaning.
- **Gist**: the actually ideas used to communicate the intention.
- **Writing Conventions**: formatting, grammaticality, sentence structure, punctuation.
- **Dissonance**: conflict between intent and the words chosen to represent the intent of the writer.

To ground the design of the case study and the analysis of the data, a review of the literature of previous studies follows.

**2.1 Gist and Intention in Revision**

The negotiation between gist and intention has been noted in a number of revision and writing studies. Donald Murray identified two types of revision: internal and external. Internal revision is “when the writer goes through the process of discovery,” and external revision is when “the writer alters his/her text to accommodate an audience” (57). It is between the internal ideas of the gist that the writer wants to convey and the intentions, goals or purpose of the writing, that create a dissonance that is negotiated throughout the writing process. Faigley and Witte defined gist as the summary or topic of the text which would be the overall notion of what the drafted text is about (404). Gist can also represent the meaning of the discourse to the writer which involves prior knowledge and situational context (404). This definition acknowledged a hierarchy of revision and also the negotiation that takes place in the process of
revision. Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, and Stratmans’ definition of intention was “... one’s goals and plans for the current text as well as the criteria and models for texts in general that one brings to the task” (28). The writing and re-writing process is a buffer zone where the writer continues to compare and contrast the gist of the text and the intentions of the text. It is within this buffer zone that dissonance operates to create meaning that closes the gap between gist and intention. To borrow a term from phonetics- resonance is established as the dissonance between gist and intention is negotiated. In the field of phonetics, resonance refers to the “amplification of the range of audibility of any source of speech sounds...” (Dictionary.com). The movement between dissonance or resonance is determined by whether a re-viewing/ re-writing of the text is needed based on the gap between the gist and intention of the text. Revision of the text is guided by intention, which Flower, Hayes, Schriver, Carey and Stratman based on a template that included “a unique network of goals and intentions built up during the planning, and a vast set of standard and genre-specific tests and criteria for good writing already stored in the writer’s long term memory” (29). This template assumed a standard. They concluded that “… the reviser’s ability to detect problems depends on her ability to provide an accurate representation of the text itself [intention], separate from her own internal representation of meaning” or gist (32). “The standard and genre-specific tests and criteria for good writing” is assumed knowledge which novice writers have not acquired. In addition to learning how to negotiate the ground between gist and intention, students are bound by the conventions of writing. However, students often have not acquired the conventions of writing required to be successful of negotiating the dissonance between gist and intention. Figure 1 captures these relationships.
The interaction between gist and intention creates dissonance or resonance which is negotiated through the revision process and articulated through the conventions of writing. The negotiation between gist and intention is situated within the broader context of the nature of writing. To understand the role of gist and intention within the process of revision, an understanding of the views of the nature of writing is necessary along with a review of the major studies of revision.

2.2 Nature of Writing

The understanding of the nature of writing over the past century is tied to the shifts in the views of reality. In Brummett’s 1976 article *Some Implications of “Process” or...*
“Intersubjectivity”: Postmodern Rhetoric, he clearly outlines the move from a Newtonian view of reality to a process or intersubjective view of reality. He states that there are two assumptions of a mechanical epistemology.

1. ...reason and formal logic were considered most appropriate for the apprehension of an essentially mathematical reality.

2. ...objectivity was required for the observer.
   a. ...removed personal bias
   b. ...removed social and moral bias (23)

He goes on to define “the central tenet of intersubjectivity, or process is ambiguity: the idea that there is no objective reality (or considerations of one are excluded)” (28). These definitions are important because they have been the basis of the different theoretical approaches to research in writing. Brummett states,

Humans are necessarily involved in sharing and manipulating messages to give and gain meanings about experience. But what experience means is not by any means agreed upon. This ambiguity is a feature of the essential rhetorical nature of reality. Ambiguity generates conflict and disagreement about meaning and a constant striving to resolve these divisions. This striving is rhetoric; while rhetoric may be defined in many ways and on many levels, it is in the deepest and most fundamental sense the advocacy of reality.

(30)

Applied to revision, the movement between conflict and resolution of meaning is the negotiation between gist and intention. The mechanical epistemological view is tied to the
current-traditional view of writing and intersubjectivity or process which defines reality as a process of resolving ambiguity is tied to the process and post-process views of writing.

2.2.1 Current-Traditional

As the field of composition and writing expanded in the 1950s and 1960s, the investigative approaches to studying and understanding writing was influenced by several fields of research. In the beginning of the 20th century, the current-traditional paradigm had reduced rhetoric to the four modes of discourse (narrative, description, expository, and argument) with particular attention paid to stylistic features of grammar and syntax. This approach assumed a positivist notion of writing in that writing was a skill used to record what one already knew. This spawned many algorithmic processes. In the article “Current-Traditional Rhetoric: Paradigm and Practice,” Berlin and Inkster stated that “[f]or current-traditional rhetoric, reality is rational, regular and certain – a realm which when it is not static is at least in a predictable, harmonious, symmetrical balance. Meaning existed independent of the perceiving mind, reposing in external reality. Knowledge was readily accessible because of the consonance between the world and the faculties of the mind,” (2). Rhetoric took on a positivistic nature and the positivistic or mechanical epistemology which denied the role of the writer, reader, and language in arriving at meaning and placed truth in the external world. Methods of evaluation were based on compliance to modes of discourse which focused on the product of writing.

This reductive pedagogy relied on predictable, unitary and objective truth. In 1968, Moffett, among others, began to look beyond these discrete items of writing to the broader concept of a superstructure of discourse which is “the set of relations among speaker, listener, and subject” which is represented by first, second, and third persons (18). This semiotic
A definition of abstraction, in sum, must center on a notion of selection; but this selection, as it operates through perception, memory and generalization, implies some reorganization of features according to the nature of the apparatus doing the selecting and according to previous knowledge systems that have grown in the organism (22).

Questioning the notion of objectivity and predictability and recognizing the social role of language opened up new lines of inquiry that were tied to theories in linguistics, cognitive psychology, and eventually social constructionism. The nature of writing was conceptualized to recognize the complexity of the act of writing to include the social function of language from several fields to include linguistics. Within the field of Linguistics, the distinction between form and function of language opened up broader avenues of inquiry into the nature of writing. The recognition of the social aspect of language allowed for the analysis of the dialogic nature of language. In 1984, Britton stated that the “… distinction between participant and spectator uses of language became the basis of a set of categories classifying discourse by function” (320). Britton also stated “…that as participants we apply our value systems; as spectators we generate and refine the system itself” (326). In his study of verbal transaction and verbal object, he concluded that “the informal expressive writing is more or less outlawed in school . . . that transactional writing addressed to teachers as examiners is powerfully predominant,” and “the spectator role … has barely a foothold beyond the lower grade levels…” (327). As the theoretical discussions of the nature of writing broke out of the current-traditional role to begin
to recognize the role of the writer and the audience, the assumption that written discourse mirrored verbal discourse continued.

2.2.2 Process

As theories in linguistics developed, aspects of cognitive psychology became part of the line of inquiry in understanding the nature of writing. These lines of inquiry tried to identify cognitive processes that influenced the act of writing. In 1981, Linda Flower and John Hayes presented a theoretical model with the intent to “capture a detailed record of what is going on in the writer’s mind during the act of composing” (365). The model utilized protocol analysis to identify cognitive processes that were active during a writing session. The cognitive process theory of writing opened up new lines of inquiry involving protocol analysis which required participants to audio record what they were doing while they were writing. This type of analysis was used to develop three major elements of the writing, which are the task environment, the writer’s long-term memory, and the writing process. According to Flower and Hayes, the task environment includes all of those things outside the writer's skin, starting with the rhetorical problem or assignment and eventually including the growing text itself. The second element is the writer's long-term memory in which the writer has stored knowledge, not only of the topic, but of the audience and of various writing plans. The third element in our model contains writing processes themselves, specifically the basic processes of Planning, Translating, and Reviewing, which are under the control of a Monitor (369). This model relied on a traditional way of defining process in psychology and linguistics which is “… to build a model of what you see” (368). For them a model is a metaphor for a process which is dynamic and not static. Their guidelines in developing the model were to
1. Define the major elements or sub-processes that make up the larger process of writing.

2. Show how these elements of the process interact in the total writing process.

3. Speak to critical questions in the discipline. (368)

Moffett focused on understanding the growth of the text whereas Flower and Hayes focused on understanding the cognitive processes a person uses while developing the text. Flower and Hayes understood the complexity of writing and developed a method that would attempt to capture the complex processes used in writing to include the intertextual relationship between the writer and the text. This went beyond a skill based model that focused on writing skills and moved toward an epistemic model that focused on the interactions that occur in the writing process. Even so, the approach was mechanical in that processes were mapped out to help understand the different components of the writing process in order to compare good and bad writers. Though the study by Flower and Hayes, which introduced think aloud protocol, linked a writer’s behavior with the cognitive processes happening at the time of writing, behavior and cognitive processing are not necessarily a parallel cause and effect relationship. The studies by Flower and Hayes broaden the understanding of the behavioral differences between professional and novice writers, but the think aloud protocols were not able to determine triggers for revision.

Communication processes, on the other hand, recognized the primacy of the rhetorical situation. In 1980, Berlin and Inkster stated the “[a] change in the way the human elements in the communication process are imagined constitutes a change in the way meaning is seen to occur and to be shared. Such a change is epistemological, but it has profound ramifications
that are ethical, social and political” (14). In 1980, Kinneavy emphasized this semiotic structure between the “author, audience and subject matter” (40) to develop lines of inquiry into the epistemic nature of writing. This expanded the domain of investigation for rhetoric beyond the written product or writing process to focus on the rhetorical situation in which meaning is contingent. In 1974, Consigny stated that the rhetorical situation is an “indeterminate context marked by troublesome disorder which the rhetor must structure so as to disclose and formulate problems” (178). When the rhetor is struggling to gain power within the rhetorical situation of an academic environment, the act of revision can be a rich site for observing this struggle.

As the nature of writing expanded to include writer, audience, and discourse, the epistemic nature of writing began to move from a methodological or mechanical view to a more sociological view. Reality was contingent on the situation rather than an absolute truth, and rhetoric discovered and created reality. But writing was still seen as an individual act that recognized audience and situation, and the writer was the agent that informed the audience.

The third shift in the epistemic nature of writing emerged with the idea that knowledge was socially constructed, which brought an interpolated characteristic to the epistemic nature of writing. In 1986, Bruffee wrote that it was Thomas Kuhn’s book *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* that “sparked” the ideas behind social construction (774). He says that “Kuhn’s understanding . . . assumes that knowledge is ‘. . . intrinsically the common property of a group or else nothing at all.’” (qtd. in Bruffee 774). The epistemological assumptions of social construction were that “reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves,” are “community generated and community-maintained linguistics entities – or, more broadly speaking, symbolic
entities – that define or “constitute” the communities that generate them. . . “(774). The assumptions were that there was no universal “foundation, ground, framework, or structure of knowledge,” and our identification of processes or frameworks did not indicate a universal truth, but “a conversation about another conversation,” (777). This aligned more closely with Brummett’s sociological view of rhetoric as epistemic and leans closely towards heuristic procedures. At the Speech Communication Association (SCA) Convention in November 1979, Brummett posited three meanings of rhetoric as epistemic: The methodological view, the sociological view, and the ontological view. The methodological view holds that ‘truth is refined through the clash of ideas,” and “rhetoric is used as a method of getting people to see truth,” (1). Assumed within this view was that truth was discovered and not created through rhetoric and that the discovery of truth came “through competing voices,” (2). The sociological view held that “rhetoric not only discovers but creates reality and knowledge about reality in the social sphere of ethics, politics, morals, religion, etc.” (3). In this view, reality was bifurcated into “material and social realms” (3). Material reality was unitary and objective as in the methodological view. Social reality, however, was contingent, and “[t]he reality of ethical, social political questions is not merely discovered, it is created in rhetoric,” (3). The third meaning of rhetoric as epistemic was the ontological view. Brummett says “that rhetoric creates all of what there is to know.” “Discourse does not merely discover truth or make it effective.” “Discourse creates realities rather than truths about realities,” and “no reality . . . exists apart from human values, perceptions, and meanings” (4).

Cognitive theory and social constructionist theory both relied on understanding processes. The social constructionist paradigm embraced the sociological view of rhetoric as
epistemic. Reality was contingent and meaning relied on the discourse community. Social construction did try to identify processes that can be codified for curriculum and instruction, but affirmed that meaning was constructed between writer, reader and discourse. Writing was a “transactive social activity,” (Kent, 25) not an individual act. Kent, however, did not offer an explanation of how novice writers learn or understand a “transactive social activity” or how this was connected to the revision process.

2.2.3 Post-Process

The next shift was the shift toward a paralogic view of rhetoric which falls under post-process and was an ontological view of rhetoric as epistemic. In 1989, Kent defined paralogic rhetoric as “an alternative to our Platonic-Aristotelian rhetorical tradition” that finds its roots in “the Sophist tradition…” which “…treats the production and the analysis of discourse as open-ended dialogic activities and not as a codifiable system,” (25). Kent believed that discourse production and discourse analysis must rely on “dialogic” which meant “…an open-ended, non-systemic, paralogic interaction between hermeneutic strategies,” (31). Hermeneutic strategies are teachable and enable members of a discourse community “to produce discourse that they believe will be comprehended by others, a process that cannot be codified or described exactly” (26). This view of epistemology did not rely on invention in creating knowledge, but “the hermeneutic act [which is an] interpretive guess we must make about our hearer’s or reader’s code that occurs even before invention becomes possible” (27). However, this view did not consider the novice writer’s need to learn a code in order to participate in the paralogic interaction.
In 1999, Dobrin believes that these strategies created structures of power and oppression, and that “if we are to accept this vision of paralogic hermeneutic theories, teaching students to become aware of oppressive discursive structures . . . is less of a liberating pedagogical agenda than is giving students the opportunity to become more skilled in their own hermeneutic guessing skills and being able to resist . . .” (144). The implications were that the dialogic nature of writing resists codification because each exchange is unique, and that hermeneutic strategies can create meaning along with power and oppressive structures within a discourse community. This paradigm recognized multiple realties, and resisted universal notions of epistemology that underscored the partial, contingent, and situated epistemic nature of rhetoric.

In 2007, Foster introduced the term “networked process,” which ties post-process to its imbricated historical roots of process. Networked process rests on a point of stasis between process and post-process theory. Foster stated

The point of stasis between process and post-process- with the mutual suspicion of the over-determined, individual and their mutual appreciation of the complex social/political/cultural/ networks that pressure writers/writing/ writing differently- marks the place of stasis and creates a new space for productive dialogue between the two positions(41).

In defining networked process, Foster posited a networked subjectivity that she said “provides a way to conceptualize the rhetorical nature of the subject and its way of being in the world, which is fundamentally a process of authoring . . . a thoroughly social, political, and ethical act” (110). She identified the rhetorical building blocks of subjectivity to be “language/ discourse,
self, other, situation/ reality” (110). Foster complicated this view of subjectivity by “straddling the notion of the writer” with “the notion of alterity” (107). She stated, “We cannot achieve consciousness without an “other” and the language or discourse that we appropriate in order to impose form on our lives issues from ‘others,’ so that the value we elicit for ourselves is also dependent on ‘others’” (107). Networked process is a theoretical framework to provide points of connection between process and post-process theory. Process theory moved the nature of writer outside the mimicry of the modes of discourse (narration, description, expository, and argument) to recognize the complex processes of writing. Post-process complicates processes in identifying the “open-ended dialogic” moves that embody power and oppression. The writing process cannot be discussed without recognizing the writer’s situatedness within the writing process. Writers bring their own perceptions or what Foster called horizon. She stated that “due to our unique place in the world, each of us is privy to a unique world context, or horizon” (107). This unique horizon “colors the meaning, value, and order we attempt to impose on our lives” (107). Alterity imposed an imbricated relationship between the reader and writer as part of the writing process in creating text. Meaning is negotiated through dissonance or alterity to reach resonance or a point of stasis between the writer, the “other” and language.

2.3 Empirical Studies in Revision

The move from a product orientation to a process orientation of writing opened up lines of inquiry on the study of revision. Numerous studies on revision were conducted in the 1980s which were influenced by the inclusion of theories in linguistics and psychology. A summary of the key revision studies is in Table 2.1. The terms for the theoretical underpinnings are general to identify the theoretical period when the studies were published. Some studies analyzed large
quantities of text for revision changes. Several other studies focused on the comparison of novice writers to expert writers. The conventional thinking at that time was to try to understand what expert writers did and compare this to what novice writer did to develop steps or strategies for novice writers to follow.

Table 2.1. Summary of Revision Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Theoretical Underpinnings</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Purpose of the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy, 1977</td>
<td>structural/social linguistics</td>
<td>4000 placement exams</td>
<td>Sample essays established a baseline or platform from which to understand the errors that basic writers make.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perl, 1979</td>
<td>cognitive/developmental</td>
<td>5 unskilled college writers</td>
<td>Four writing sessions per participant in which students composed aloud. Data includes written drafts and video tapes of the composing process. One additional interview session focused on developing a profile to include students’ perceptions and memories of writing. 1. How do unskilled writers write? 2. Can there writing processes be analyzed in a systematic replicable manner? 3. What does an increased understanding of their processes suggest about the nature of composing in general and the manner in which writing is taught in the schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Theoretical Underpinnings</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridwell, 1980</td>
<td>cognitive developmental and structural linguistics</td>
<td>100 twelfth graders</td>
<td>Fuse two lines of inquiry: Observations of writers at work and the cognitive development and theory of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sommers, 1980</td>
<td>generative linguistics</td>
<td>4000 essays</td>
<td>Created a grid with hierarchical categories of deletion, substitution, addition and reordering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981</td>
<td>structural linguistics</td>
<td>Six novice and six experienced writers</td>
<td>Taxonomy Revision- Macro and Micro levels of revision were added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, and Stratman, 1986</td>
<td>cognitive psychology</td>
<td>14 writers</td>
<td>Continued the work begun in Flower and Hayes, 1981. Created a heuristic for revision based on think aloud protocol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Flower, Schriver, Carey, Haas, Hayes, 1992 | cognitive psychology                      | Nine writers: 3 experts (English teachers), 3 students (sought help from the Writing Skills Center) 3 students (labeled “problem” writers) For a portion of the study two expert writers were added to bring the ratio 5 to 6. Five expert writers and six student writers. | “… looked at planning in order to understand more about the task demands of complex expository writing to develop a tentative, data-based theory about the strategies of constructive planning” (236). Theoretical framework for describing cognitive and strategic aspect of planning  
  - Knowledge-driven planning  
  - Script-Schema driven planning  
  - Constructive planning |
Revision studies were motivated by the move from product to process, the concern for correctness and how students learn the standard conventions of writing. In 1977, Shaughnessy published *Errors and Expectations*, the study focused on understanding the patterns developmental writers use and how to help basic writers move out from under the “trap” of academic writing which is perceived as error free. Her analysis focused on understanding that “the phenomenon of error cannot be ignored” (11). In her words, “It has to do with the writer’s relationship to his audience, with what might be called the economics of energy in the writing situation” (11). In the economy of energy in the writing situation, “the speaker or writer wants to say what he has to say with as little energy as possible and listener or reader wants to understand with as little energy as possible” (11). When errors carry meaning beyond the message of the words, the basic writer cannot afford the sidetracks of these errors because of the limited resources or experience to draw from and bring into the writing situation. *Errors and Expectations* opened the academic conversation of the role of errors and how errors in
writing represent patterns and thought processes of writers. The value of understanding errors in writing was used in the categories of knowledge-driven, script or schema driven, and constructive planning that Flower, Schriver, Carey, Haas, and Hayes identified. Novice writers economize on the writing task by doing what the knowledge they have acquired works best: check for surface errors, thesis statement, and main idea. Making changes that required constructive planning or rethinking the purpose or intent of the writing was not a good economical choice for them. Shaughnessy’s study underlined this because she stated that revision was “not a new way of sectioning off students’ problems with writing but rather a readiness to look at these problems in a way that did not ignore the linguistic sophistication of the students nor yet underestimate the complexity of the task they face as they set about learning to write for college” (13). In 1980, Bartholomae also conducted studies on error analysis. He argued that basic writing was “not writing with fewer parts of more rudimentary constituents. It is not evidence of arrested cognitive development, or unruly unpredictable language use.” But instead, basic writers were making choices and forming strategies. Although these choices and strategies were identified through the mechanical errors students made, Shaughnessy opened up a line of inquiry that recognized a much more complex series of moves than adhering to a discourse standard. Shaughnessay’s study showed that basic writers did have sophisticated linguistic knowledge although this knowledge did not always reflect what was considered standard English.

Soon after Shaughnessy’s publication of *Errors and Expectations*, research on revision began to include experimental small scale studies that incorporated interviews and recordings which allowed for a broader collection of data to include more that the text for each
participant. As noted in Table 2.1, Sondra Perl published a study of five unskilled in 1979. This study focused specifically on unskilled writers in college. In an effort to find patterns in the writing, the five participants composed aloud as they wrote. Three types of data were collected: the written products, composing tapes, and responses to interview session that focused on students’ perception and memory of writing (319). A coding system was developed to document the instances of reading, writing and talking. Two main characteristics of the process of data collection was for the “process [to be] categorical and capable of replication” (321). Based on the analysis of the data, Perl concluded that “…although [the students] produced inadequate or flawed products, they nevertheless seemed to understand and perform some of the crucial operations involved in composing with skill” (330). These skills included editing, rereading the text, changing, rephrasing, and adding. The interesting aspect of this study was that the data for capturing the composing process included reading and writing.

Another study, in 1980, was conducted by Bridwell who focused on the writing of one hundred twelfth grade students. Her goal was to fuse two lines of inquiry: studies that focus on observations of writers at work and cognitive/development theory of writing (197). Several studies that followed, as noted in Table 2.1, used the results of this study to continue the lines of inquiry on revision. Bridwell stated that “One of the purposes of the study was to develop an exhaustive and mutually exclusive scheme for classifying revisions” (203-204). Based on structural linguistics, Bridwell created seven initial categories that were characterized “from small to larger linguistics units” (203). She collected first and second drafts and “...examined qualitative and total word count differences through t-tests for related means, and determined descriptive values (means, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum values) on qualitative
ratings, overall word counts a total number of revisions” (206). Students most often focused on words and the phrasal level when making changes to the text (209). Not many changes were made at the sentence level and “…writers revised substantially more during the in-process stage” (210). Bridwell noted that “…the longer the student had to explore his or her ideas, the more likely he or she was to add, delete, or substitute extended segments of discourse” (210). The findings in her study show that students made more changes at the surface and word level and that “[t]he data further support the notion that there are developmental difference in both the tendency to revise and the ability to revise successfully” (218). Studies in revision did not have an accepted framework from which to gauge what students do in the revision process. Bridwell’s findings, along with the categories, were used to further develop taxonomy grids for revision studies. This study also highlighted the material evidence of negotiation between gist and intention as students’ additions, deletions, and substitutions.

Also in 1980, Rose conducted studies of writing which focused on writer’s block through a cognitive framework (2006). These studies are not included in the table of revision studies because the focus was not on revision specifically; however, the studies helped to set the stage for further studies of writing from a cognitive framework which focus on theories of problem solving which “… share certain basic assumptions and characteristics” (17). The problem solving theories involved an introductory period, a processing period, and solution period. He used this framework to understand the “problem solving behavior of the students” (17). In his analysis of writer’s block, he stated that the problem with writer’s block was that “… rules seem to be followed as though they [were] algorithms, absolute dicta, rather than the loose heuristics that they were intended to be” (24). This tied in closely with a mechanical epistemic
view of writing. A second outcome of the study was that students bring different operational sets to the writing process. That is, students had some type of knowledge system in place when they entered the classroom. Different disciplines focused on different methodological orientations and students brought these to the writing task reinforcing an established methodology. This methodology showed that our strategic knowledge influenced what we did in the writing process (25). Strategic knowledge referred to the knowledge students bring to the writing task. To reference Flower, Schriver, Carey, Haas, and Hayes (1992), the knowledge, schemas and constructive planning necessary to accomplish the writing task can differ across disciplines. Through the experience of writing, students developed strategies to complete the task. Disciplines from the sciences did not necessarily approach the writing process as the disciplines in the humanities. The purpose, audience and exigency differed. These examples assumed some level of knowledge or expertise in a field, but even novice writers had had some experience with writing and had developed a strategy or behavior that they perceived as effective for getting the task of writing done. These strategies or “folk” remedies for writing were brought into the writing class of first year college students.

In 1984, a study was conducted by Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, and Stratman which incorporated the cognitive model presented in 1981 by Flower and Hayes, and extended it to capture not only the process but try to identify peripheral variables that cue revision. They state that “teachers assert that the practice of multiple drafts is the key to good writing...” (16). They add in the publication of their study in 1986, however, that according to a 1977 report entitled Write/Rewrite: an Assessment of Writing Skills published by the U.S. Department of Education for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEPC), students did not
revise, and “when they do, the text gets worse” (16). In the findings of the NAEPC, revising was, “not a generative practice, but appears to be a set of rule-governed actions for proofreading and correcting” (16). Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, and Stratman found this at odds with what teachers perceived and initiated a study to capture a complex process “with many variables” and to be able to identify “a necessarily limited set of heuristics” hoping to discover a heuristic with “far-reaching effects” (17). The key variables to them were not “how many or what kind of changes writers make, but how well they adopt the text they have to the goals they want to achieve” (19). Revision in their view drew on the writer’s knowledge and the generation of new knowledge. The two processes involved were evaluation and strategy selection that were “in active interplay with three kinds of knowledge” (21). The three kinds of knowledge were “goals a writer has, problem representation the writer creates during revision, and the strategies he/she can bring to bear” (21). They identified three obstacles that writers must overcome in the revision process: detecting problems in the text, diagnosing those problems, and selecting a strategy (21). In recognizing these, writers relied heavily on gist and intention. It is at this point, that dissonance or resonance can be used by the writer to determine the changes needed. They concluded that “a cognitive process model by itself cannot tell us how different writers, with different levels of skills or experience, would carve out strategic paths through these processes” (52). They also posed four questions that remain unanswered.

1. What part of this process creates the greatest difficulty for inexperienced writers?

2. What does a writer really know when she says, “wordy” or “I’m coming on too strong”?
3. Is there a “best strategic path” through the review process? Is the Diagnose/Revise strategy more desirable to use and to teach than a Detect/ Rewrite strategy?

4. Can an understanding of reviser’s underlying cognitive processes give more direction to teaching?

A second study published in 1992 and conducted by Flower, Schriver, Carey, Hass, and Hayes, focused on the different types of planning and goals writers use to write. They identified three executive levels of planning:

1. Knowledge-driven planning
2. Script or schema – driven planning
3. Constructive planning (181)

Knowledge-driven planning relied on the writer’s acquired knowledge and is manifest in a summary or informational report on a topic. For knowledge-driven strategies, “[t]he writer has the necessary topic knowledge” in order to create text on the topic and “the structure of the knowledge fits the task” (188). Script/ schema-driven planning utilized established formats to guide the writing process such as forms or organizational patterns. Script or schema driven strategies demonstrated that “[t]he writer knows a script or schema appropriate to the task” and [t]he schema is specified in adequate detail to guide the drafting of text” (188).

Constructive-driven planning is “… a process that reflects the planning demanded by the ill-defined nature of rhetorical problems” (236). Constructive-driven strategies shifted the planning from summary or modeling a known text structure to demonstrating that the writer can build or create “his or her own representation of the task and hope to specify those critical elements of the situation that will affect success” (188). In addition, “… the writer must be able
to generate a body of supporting goals, sub goals, and plans to solve the problem” and integrate the goals and plans and “instantiate” these plans and goals with appropriate discourse conventions (188). And lastly, constructive-driven strategies were evident when a writer resolved conflict (188). This resolution of conflict was an example of the negotiation between gist and intention with a process or intersubjective point of view. The types of conflict a writer could encounter were divided into two categories: generic text-based conflicts (correctness, convention and style) and task specific text-based conflicts which are more elaborate and include “some aspect of the writer’s emerging text” in “conflict with some goals or constraints” (225). These constraints could include “…the assignment,” “writer’s conception of the audience,” “… the writer’s own unique goals for the text” (225). It was at the level of constructive planning that the expert writers “… treated their goals as much more fluid and open to revision and change”; however, “[t]he students …often treated their goals as static and nonnegotiable demands – the sort of rigid constraints that force a writer choose among conflicting elements ore generate new text” (229). Willingness to negotiate the conflicts was greater among the experienced writers.

A third study published in 1994 by Flower and Hayes focused on the strategies student used in peer review sessions which were recorded in 1994. Strategic knowledge and logic were identified through the recorded conversations. This study relied on the analysis of cognitive processes employed to accomplish a writing task. They wanted to move beyond the stage description of the writing process, which modeled “the growth of the written product” to a model that could identify “the inner process of the person” doing the writing (367). Flower and Hayes proposed cognitive model moved the study of writing away from the stage model to a
more complex model to include how writers set goals, plan and resolve conflict during the writing process. This reflected the shift toward a process view of reality that negotiates meaning through rhetoric, the experience of the writer and the context of the writing.

The components of analysis were the task environment, the writer’s long term memory, and the writing process. Their analysis shifted a linear approach to the writing process to a hierarchical system “in which large working systems such as composing can subsume other inclusive systems” (367), which resembled Moffett’s concept of abstract hierarchies which could be subsumed and embedded. The collection of multiple drafts and the analysis of changes between the drafts identified a hierarchy of changes writers make; however, it was limiting in that although the idea of recursion was assumed in the process model, the system of a process was codified into linear steps.

These empirical studies allowed the line of inquiry in writing studies to expand beyond the current traditional framework to a process/ intersubjective framework and offered a more complex understanding of what students do when they write. Even so, the studies continued to use a comparative model by looking at the writing practices of novice and expert writers. This methodology is tied to the current-traditional model in that even though the thinking processes of participants became part of the analysis, comparisons were made between novice and expert writers maintaining a dichotomous framework which is a key characteristic of a mechanical epistemology.

At the same time that these cognitive studies were conducted, in 1980, Sommers conducted studies on revision to critique the traditional rhetorical models whose foundations were oratory discourse rather than written discourse and which included invention, disposition
or arrangement, style and presentation, memory, and delivery as outlined by Quintilian.

Sommers paralleled the linear writing process to traditional rhetorical models which emphasize the “spoken art of oratory” (378). She stated that this model is imbued with the nature of speech which is irreversible and views revision as an afterthought (379). Sommers redefined revision “as a sequence of changes in a composition—changes which are initiated by cues and occur continually throughout the writing of a work” (380). Flower and Hayes also acknowledged the existence of a stage model, which they define as “…the major units of analysis are stages of completion which reflect the growth of a written product and these stages are organized in a linear sequence or structure” (367). In 1981, Faigley and Witte concluded that like Sommers, their two studies comparing student writing to expert writing showed that expert writers revise in different ways than inexperienced writers (410). However, for them, this did not answer the question, “What causes writers to revise?”(411). They proposed that what was needed then was “more observational studies of writers revising in non-experimental situations,” an understanding of “how textual cues lead writers to revise,” and studies that employed more than one methodology that examine the complexity of revision in a variety of texts across a variety of situations” (412).

Sommers stated in her 1980 study that there is evidence that the issue was not that students are unwilling to revise, “but rather that they do what they have been taught to do in a consistently narrow predictable way” (382). The assumption was that revision was always good. In some cases, however, revision for novice writers made a piece of writing worse. She stated that students were “…governed by Occam’s razor that prohibits logically needless repetition: redundancy and superfluity” (381). The principle of Occam’s razor refers to “a scientific and
philosophic rule that entities should not be multiplied unnecessarily which is interpreted as requiring that the simplest of competing theories be preferred to the more complex of that explanations of unknown phenomena be sought first in terms of known quantities” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary online). In her study, she collected over 4000 essays and analyzed four revision operations: deletion, substitution, addition, and reordering. Changes in these operations were identified at four different levels: word, phrase, sentence, and theme. The students understood “the revision process as requiring lexical changes but not semantic changes” (382). In other words, it was much easier to change out a word or phrase than reconstruct a larger section of text. This, in fact, was easier because there were rules that governed word choice and syntax, but no rules that governed the overarching content. When revision was focused on the word or phrase level only, revision can limit improvement and sometimes produce a need for even more revision. Writing could not be molded into a predictable modal at the text level. No specific global patterns of revision were found.

In 1981, Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte also conducted studies in revision. Flower and Hayes (1981), and Sommers (1980) brought a greater understanding of the recursive nature of writing, but Faigley and Witte wanted to dig a little deeper into the complexity of revision. Faigley and Witte focused on two distinctions: revisions that affect the meaning of the text and those that don’t (401). They stated that research has looked at the complexity of revision “...in two ways: by examining the effects of revision and by speculating on the causes of revision” (400). Faigley and Witte designed a taxonomy “...based on two distinctions: revisions that affect the meaning of the text and those that don’t” (401). Adding or deleting text during revision can affect both these areas, but they sought to distinguish the effect on meaning by identifying any changes
that brought “new information to a text or removed old information…” (402). This extended the
categories identified by Bridwell which were based on linguistic categories and included
meaning changing categories. Faigley and Witte’s study included revision samples from six
inexperienced writers, six advanced student writers, and six expert writers.

The results of Faigley and Witte’s study supported the conclusions of Sommer’s study of
4000 essays which was “that expert writers revise in ways different from inexperienced
writers.” What Sommer’s learned through interviews, Faigley and Witte captured through text
analysis (410). Faigley and Witte also concluded that “The volume and types of revision changes
are dependent upon a number of variables besides the skill of the writer. These variables might
be called situational variables for composing” which include

- The reason why the text is being written
- The format
- The medium
- The genre
- The writers’ familiarity with the writing task
- The writer’s familiarity with the audience
- The projected level of formality
- The length of the task and the projected text, (410-411)

In addition to these situational variables, Faigley and Witte observed that “successful revision
results not from the number of changes a writer makes but from the degree to which revision
changes bring a text closer to fitting the demands of the situation” (411). This is part of the
negotiation between gist, intention and the conventions of writing. They did not think that the
study answered the question of “what causes writers to revise” (411). At the end of their study they called for further observational studies of revision in non-experimental situations which “employ more than a methodology” and would incorporate the use of computers to capture the textual changes made in the process of writing. This study was able to document the recursive nature of writing and revision, which continued to support the move from a focus on product to process.

Underlying all these studies is the unanswered questions posed by Faigley and Witte: “What causes writers to revise and how textual cues lead writers to revise?” (412). Bazerman’s comments in Alice Horning and Anne Becker’s 2006 book Revision: History, Theory, and Practice, confirmed the findings of past studies which have found that novice writers did not behave as expert writers.

Yet no matter what device we use one of the most robust research findings is that students tend to revise essays shallowly, following only very concrete revision suggestions or working only on minor phrasal adjustment and sentence correctness. Even when as word processing has facilitated the moving of text, the substitution of phrasing, even the marking up and transfer of drafts, still that ability to see one’s own text with fresh eyes remains elusive. (xii)

The assumption in all these studies was that if the practices of expert writers can be identified and codified, then we can package the practices and teach them to novice writers.

Although Flower and Hayes’ development of a cognitive process model of writing for the empirical study recognized distinctive thinking processes that were hierarchical and embedded in the writing process, the studies using this model compared novice and expert writers (366).
Recognition of hierarchical relationships within the writing process was a significant step toward understanding the dialogic moves a writer makes as part of the thought process during the writing process. Bruffee states that “one of the important assumptions of cognitive thought is that there must be a universal foundation, a ground, a base, a framework. . .” (776). The assumption of universality as the foundation of discovery drove empirical research. The nature of pedagogy that incorporated thinking processes moved between algorithmic, heuristic and aleatory procedures, but did not necessarily acknowledge the role of audience and text.

After the 1980s, very few studies were conducted in the area of revision. The shift from a Newtonian view of reality in which meaning is discovered to an intersubjective view of reality, in which meaning is constructed, shifted the focus of research. The interest and focus of research moved toward social, political and cultural theories of subjectivity, power and identity formation. However since 2000, several universities have conducted writing studies of first year composition students, but none specifically focused on revision. The studies incorporated a triangulation of data that included writing samples, interviews and surveys. Sommers and Saltz, in 2004, conducted a longitudinal study at Harvard of over 400 first year writing students. They collected many primary sources such as assignments, feedback on papers, student surveys and analysis of student writing. Their goal was to tell the story of the “role writing plays in helping students make the transition to college” (127). The results of their study indicated that when writing was part of the course, students felt that they had learned more. Fishman, Lunsford, McGregor and Otuteye have also conducted a longitudinal study at Stanford which began in Fall 2001 with 189 students. The participants were asked “...to submit both assigned
and extracurricular writing” (225). The study included the analysis of assigned genres, reading summaries, resumes, newspaper articles, and plays. As they began the interviews, the participants focused on “…writing performances: students’ live enactment of their own writing” (226). Based on these early findings of the Stanford Study, Fishman, Lunsford, McGregor and Otuteye began with “…how writing performances play a role in early college students’ development as writers” (226). These performance practices of “recitation, declamation and speech making, extended reading aloud, and other forms” which “dropped out of composition’s regular curriculum in the nineteenth century” were tools that were used by the participants in the Stanford Study, particularly in extracurricular activities and define learning “… as the ‘enfleshment’ or repetition and habituation centered on the body rather than the page or the screen” (232). Revision within this study was limited to the repetition of a performance rather than the negotiation of the performance. The basis of looking at performance reverts back to the strong ties classical rhetoric has to oratory. As Sommers pointed out in her 1980 study, these strong ties to the oratory traditions do not provide a means of revision since a spoken word cannot be retracted and re-spoken (379). Revision in writing is where negotiation between gist and intention occurs to address dissonance and create a resonance with the reader bounded by the conventions of writing. Relying on performance as a measure of revision or meaning is imbued with repetition and correctness rather than negotiating meaning.

2.4 Revision Studies of Writers of English as a Second Language (ESL)

Studies on revision practices of ESL writers have followed two lines of inquiry. One line of inquiry looks at the differences and similarities between skilled and unskilled ESL writers, replicating the studies on revision that focus on novice and expert writers. A second line of
inquiry has been to look at the revising practices of second language learners in their first
language and their second language.

In 1980, Heuring completed a study of 5 ESL writers that ranged between less and more
skilled ESL writers. He found no universal patterns of revision among the more skilled ESL
writers; however, the more skilled writers had individual approaches to revision. In 1983,
Zamel conducted a case study of skilled and unskilled ESL writers. Her conclusions were that
“skilled” ESL writers “attended to more global units and included paragraph reordering as well
as refining and adding sentences.”

Zamel’s study focused on six of her ESL advance writing students. The purpose of the
study was “to investigate the extent to which these students’ experience writing as a process of
discovery and creating meaning and the extent to which second language factors affect this
process” (165). The six students represented the following language groups: Chinese, Spanish,
Portuguese, Hebrew, and Persian. The study incorporated the use of interviews and written
observations of the students’ behaviors while writing and what they actually wrote. Compose
aloud segments were not part of this study. The essays were based on readings and in-class
discussion of “issues raised by these readings…” (170). According to Zamel, all the participants
revised by evidence that they rewrote something as they wrote. There was a difference
between the more skilled ESL writers and the least skilled ESL writer. The more skilled writers
“reviewed one or two sentence sometimes reconsidering and entire idea which …transcended
sentence boundaries…” (173). The least skilled writer however, paused more often at shorter
chunks of discourse so often “that the overall relationship between ideas seemed to suffer”
(173). The revising moves included deletions and additions of sentences, rewriting sentences
“until they expressed the writer’s intention...”, and shifting paragraphs or parts of paragraphs “around when writer’s realized that they were related to ideas presented elsewhere” (174). As far as the types of changes made, the more skilled writers were less concerned with surface changes than the least skilled writer. Zamel stated that “Students understood that rereading resulted in revisions and that these revisions were part of the process of approximating one’s meaning in writing” (177). In addition to observing the behaviors of these six ESL advanced writers, Zamel extended her findings to the instructional approaches used in writing courses. Emphasis on outlining, planning, and having all the right parts in an essay were not as crucial as teaching students how to explore ideas first.

Raimes followed Zamel’s study on advance ESL writers with her own case study which included eight of her unskilled ESL students in 1985. The eight students represented languages from a variety of backgrounds: Chinese, Greek, Spanish and Burmese. Unlike Zamel’s study, Raimes’ study was designed around the think aloud protocol. Understanding that this may be difficult for ESL students, she tested the method with two students. “Although the students struggled at first,” they adapted. Raimes believed that the think aloud protocol more clearly revealed the differences between writers than the writing products by themselves. Students were asked to compose an essay in a 65 minute period. The think aloud composing session took place in a language lab where students were given a writing topic that was familiar to them (234). In addition to the think aloud data, Raimes used the students’ scores on grammar, vocabulary, and reading sections of the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency; holistic scores on the essays; answers to a 12 page “questionnaire on the students’ background, education, experience with and attitude toward English and writing” (235). The writing task was
a narrative; however, half the class was given a topic with no clear audience or purpose and the other half was given the same topic, but with a very clear audience and purpose. Although Raimes was not looking at revision alone, part of the study did incorporate revision. The coding for the writing included two types of changes: surface-level editing changes and revising changes (affecting meaning). A list of different types of changes follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface-level changes</th>
<th>Revising changes (affecting meaning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>addition</td>
<td>addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deletion</td>
<td>deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronunciation</td>
<td>word choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb form or tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These categories and subcategories resembled the categories used by Faigley and Witte in their study conducted on revision in 1981. One observation Raimes made was that students revised during the drafting process rather than waiting until the end. She also stated that “no clear profile of the unskilled ESL writer emerged from this study of behaviors during composing” (249). The similarities she found between the ESL writers in this study and previous studies of basic writers were that there was a lack of planning and that the recursive processes were at the sentence level (249). However, she did observe some differences. “The L2 unskilled showed commitment even to an in-class essay, and they did not seem preoccupied with finding errors but were more concerned with getting ideas down on the page” (250). L2 means a language that is a person’s second language which is often English, but could be used to refer to any second language. Although within her study some students received a prompt with no
specific audience or purpose and seem received the same prompt with a specific audience and purpose, this did not make any clear differences with the students’ process or product (250).

Finally, Raimes made four observations. One is that unskilled ESL writers needed “more time; more opportunity to talk, listen, read, and write in order to marshal the vocabulary they need to make their own background knowledge accessible to them in their L2” (250). In addition, students needed to be made aware of “the rhetorical options available to them,” and there needs to be “more emphasis on editing for linguistic form and style” (250). She concluded that “[a]ttention to process is necessary but not sufficient” (250).

Another case study conducted by Gaskill in 1987 as part of a dissertation used the taxonomy grid created by Faigley and Witte to analyze the writing practices of four participants whose language is Spanish and second language is English (qt. in Hall 46). Jones and Tetroe also conducted a study published in 1987 with six Spanish speaking participants who speak English as a second language and used composing aloud methods to analyze if planning transferred across languages (qt. in Hall 46). Of these studies, surface changes dominated revisions in L1 and L2.

In 1990, Hall published a study of ESL students comparing the revision practices of 4 advanced ESL students in their first and second language. The first language of each participant was different; however, the second language for each of them is English. Hall collected four argumentative essays: two in the first language and two in the second language. The results of this study were

1. More words were generated in L1 than in L2 drafts.

2. More pauses occurred in L2 drafts and L2 drafts took longer to complete.
3. More revisions were made in the L2 drafts than the L1 drafts. Following the Faigley and Witte’s taxonomy grid, Hall observed the dominate revisions were substitutions across L1 and L2 followed by additions and deletions. A majority of the changes fell into the category of meaning-preserving with very little revision at the paragraph or discourse level. Just as in revision studies with monolingual participants, first year composition students or novice writers, did not often revise beyond what Faigley and Witte identified as surface changes or meaning preserving changes.

In a Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English by Leki, Cumming and Silva the area of revision studies in ESL was summarized in chapter 12. According to the research, “…a very small fraction of individual findings reported here were supported by more than one study” (138). In addition, “L2 writers perceived the revision process as an activity that affected surface aspects of their texts (Porte, 1997): checking for errors (Lai, 1986) and proofreading (Porte, 1997). They felt that they should revise until the final draft had no mistakes in form” (Parkhurst, 1990 qtd. Leki, 120). Two studies looked at the difference in the number of surface and deeper level changes and found that “Surface changes (formal and meaning-preserving changes) accounted for most L2 revision (Lai, 1986; Sze, 2002); text-based changes accounted for little revision” (Lai, 1986 qtd. in Leki, 123). These studies mirrored much of the focus of L1 studies in the area of revision; that is, a focus on error correction. Since an increasing number of ESL students are pursuing degrees in higher education in the United States as residents or citizens, it is vital to understand the revising practices of monolinguial and multi-lingual students who begin their higher educational experience in a first year writing course.
2.4 Textbooks and Revision

To add to the discussion of revision, it is important to see how revision is addressed in frequently used textbooks. According to Amazon, in May 2013, the first most widely sold book under the category of Books, Education & Reference, Words, Language, Grammar, Reference, is *The Elements of Style*, 4th edition. This book is the number seller in three categories of Education & Reference and #242 in overall books. The paperback has one paragraph on revision on page 72. It begins the paragraph by stating that revising is a part of writing and must be done. The paragraph continues by saying that word processing has made it much easier to revise and suggests moving not only sentences but full paragraphs. Beyond this, no mention of revision is made.

The second most widely sold book under the category of Books, Education & Reference, Words, Language, Grammar, Rhetoric is *The Craft of Research*. Several pages in a section are devoted to explaining revision. The explanation is tied to questions to ask yourself like is there a main idea? Does each paragraph have a clear opening sentence? Most of the questions pertain to the individual parts of an essay.

The community college that the participants attend uses *The Norton Guide to Writing with Readings*, second edition, as the default textbook for the first year composition course. This is the tenth most widely used text under the Amazon heading of Books, Education & Reference, Words, Language, Grammar, Rhetoric. The guidelines for revision in this textbook include statements like “Revision should take place on several levels, from global (whole-text issues) to particular (the details). Work on your draft in that order, starting with elements that are global in nature and gradually moving to smaller, more particular aspects” (236). No
explanation of the levels of revision is given. No example of substantive change is given, and then to suggest that reorganization be part of this action is overwhelming to a novice writer. Past studies show that students attempt very few global revisions. Whole-text or global issues are difficult for novice writers to grasp and then to couple this with the intent of changing parts of the focus to strengthen the argument requires negotiation between whole and part of the text to create an organized message. The three page section goes on to identify reasons to revise which include “… to sharpen the focus... to strengthen the argument... to improve the organization... to revise for clarity... and to read and reread” 237-238). This completes the explanation of revision in the textbook.

These definitions attempt to identify illusive aspects of the writing process without identifying concrete ways to do this. The actions are cloaked in the language of a process view of writing, but students do not move beyond surface level changes which are tied to the standards of a product oriented current-traditional paradigm. The surface level changes are very concrete to novice writers.

*The Writer’s Reference* is the default handbook for the second semester writing course at the community college on the border. According to Amazon, this text is rated third most widely used under the category Books, Education & Reference, Words, Language, Grammar, Rhetoric and tenth most widely used under the category of Books, Education & Reference, Words, Language, Grammar, Reference. It does offer more discussions of revision, but relies mostly on defining traditional views of writing such as purpose and audience, focus, organization and paragraphing, content and point of view (21). Six pages in the revision section give examples of comments that are often made in the peer review process and then a
One common comment is “unclear thesis.” The definition given is “When readers point out that your thesis is unclear, the comment often signals that they have a hard time identifying your essay’s main point” (23). The suggested strategies are “…ask questions, reread your entire draft, or try framing your thesis” (23). If revision is to move beyond error correction and reflect the negotiation between gist and intention of the text, examples of negotiation need to be provided to novice writers. For novice writers, following the suggestion to ask questions or reread is very difficult because the action assumes the student knows how to add and delete text in a way that alters or changes the meaning of the text to reflect more focus.

2.5 Purpose of the Case Study

The revision studies conducted in the 1980s focused on the analysis of writing processes (pre-writing, writing, revision, editing), thinking processes, and communication processes that expert writers use and compare these to the processes that novice writers use. An assumption here is that if the practices of expert writers can be codified, then these practices can be taught to novice writers. This type of application did not consider the role and purpose of “struggle” in the revision of writing. It also did not consider the negotiation between gist and intention. The move to process broke up the strict algorithmic procedures of the current-traditional paradigm and opened up the use of heuristic and aleatory procedures; however, the deeper level revision moves that expert writers make continued to be illusive to novice writers. Since the 1980s with the move from a mechanical epistemology in which truth is discovered to an intersubjective view of reality in which truth is negotiated, research in writing has not returned to study the revision practices of students. Have the revision practices of writing students changed? Many
students today come from diverse linguistic backgrounds to include learning English as a second language, or struggling with first language issues in English. Past studies have focused on comparing the differences between novice and expert writers or developmental writers. This case study of seven first year writing students looks at three distinct categories of students from a first year writing course: college ready, developmental or ESL to fill the gap in research on revision. Each student placed into the course by either taking a placement test that determined the student was college ready, or the student moved into the first year writing course from a developmental course, or the student came from an ESL background.

Is there evidence that knowledge is constructed and can it be observed at the point of negotiation between gist and intention? Negotiation is tied to the construction of identity because as Brummett stated in his 1976 article that “…people get meanings from other people through communication” (29). Language is the means by which negotiation happens. As Delpit stated “Our language embraces us long before we are defined by any other medium of identity (xvii). What we say and how we say it becomes an identifier which is imbued with social, political and ideological meaning. This embraces not only the epistemic view of rhetoric, but also the role of language in humans. To include second language learners in a study of first year writing students helps to complicate and identify underrepresented populations of studies in revision.

The focus of this case study is on the types of changes novice writers make in their writing. Do these changes reflect the intersubjective nature of writing in which negotiation is a key characteristic? Raimes in her 1885 study of unskilled ESL writers stated with great hope that
For these unskilled writers, a process approach to teaching is developing— one which stresses generating ideas, writing drafts, producing feedback, and revising— in an attempt to make their behavior, and ultimately their products, more like those of skilled writers. (230-231)

Although Raimes’ study focused on unskilled writers, studies in revision during the 1980s had an expectation of improving the teaching of writing through a better understanding of the intersubjective nature of writing. Instead of fragments, run-ons, outlines, and correctness, a greater emphasis was being placed on the recursive nature of writing that recognized the role of negotiating meaning. Previous studies in revision have shown that novice writers did not know what to do beyond making surface changes when they were asked to revise. Even among ESL revision studies, the results have shown that “Few L2 writers recalled any explicit instruction in revision; this professed lack of instruction in revision techniques left many to their own devices concerning how to revise” (Porte, 1997 qtd. Leki, 2008, 120). I propose that although we speak the language of process, we teach with the language of product so that students cling to the surface changes as evidence of revision, rather than learn how to negotiate meaning through revision.

2.6 Case Study Participants

The participants for this study attend a community college along the U.S/ Mexico border location. This transnational location provides a unique community from which to draw participants because of the multiple roles English plays in this community. According to Kubota and Ward (80), the colonial and postcolonial spread of English worldwide has made the English
language plural in terms of pronunciation and rhetorical styles. Kachru represents the stratification of World Englishes by three concentric circles which he identifies as:

- **Inner circle** – former colonizers/ English as a mother tongue
- **Outer circle** – former colonies/ English as an institutional language
- **Expanding circle** – English as a foreign language (qtd. in Kubota and Ward 82).

Although these circles help to understand the complexity and extent of how and why English has become a *lingua franca*, the circles themselves imply clear boundaries between these identified groups. These boundaries are in fact much more fluid than the model can show. I will use myself as an example. Based on my ethnicity and dominant language, I would fall in the category of inner circle; however, my mother’s native tongue was Spanish and the country she was born in does use English as an institutional language. The model is not flexible enough to demonstrate the different roles of English in a community or even in a single family. This model is also not able to capture the bilingual nature of many communities in the U.S. Canagarajah has proposed a model that he calls the Negotiation Model (589). He points out that “[t]he dominant approaches to studying multilingual writing have been hampered by mono-lingualist assumptions that conceive literary as a unidirectional acquisition of competence, preventing us from fully understanding the resources multi-linguals bring to their tests.” In his Negotiation Model, he proposes that

...rather than studying multilingual writing as static, locating the writer within a language, we would study the movement of the writer between languages; rather than studying the product for descriptions of writing competence, we would study the process of composing in multiple languages; rather than studying the writer’s stability in
specific forms of linguistic or cultural competence, we would analyze his or her versatility (for example, life between multiple languages and cultures); rather than treating language or culture as the main variable, we would focus more on the changing contexts of communication, perhaps treating context as the main variable as writers switch their languages, discourses, and identities in response to their contextual change; rather than treating writers as passive, conditioned by their language and culture, we would treat them as agentive, shuttling creatively between discourses to achieve their communicative objectives (590-591)

The U.S./Mexico border provides a perspective of a community that has examples of various degrees of bilingualism. Previous studies of revision and writing have focused on groups of novice and expert writers that were assumed to be monolingual speakers/writers of English. This study incorporates student populations that are strongly influenced by bilingualism, multilingualism and student populations that are not privileged. The U.S./Mexico border is an overlapping encounter of the three circles that Kachru has defined. The inner circle consists of monolingual English speakers; the outer circle consists of bilingual speakers of English and another language, most commonly Spanish. And, the expanding circle would be recent immigrants who are learning English as a second language.

The incorporation of three student populations found in first year writing courses in this border community college provides an analysis of the writing practices of a diverse student population in a first year writing course. The “shuttling” between languages as Canagarjah has pointed out can also be observed. Valdés states that “…the largest group of English composition professionals focused on the native English-speaking population, and most of this
group’s attention is directed at “mainstream” students, that is, at students who are native speakers of non-stigmatized or standard varieties of English” (33). By including groups of students who placed college ready, moved into the first year writing course from a development course and former ESL students, this study can add to the disciplines’ understanding of how writing students with different knowledges navigate a college writing course.

In addition, the student populations are not distinct groups with clear boundaries, but instead these student populations have overlapping characteristics. ESL students in previous studies have been international students, implying a certain amount or level of economic, cultural and academic capital associated with privilege. According to the Immigration and National Act, applicants must have the following documentation to qualify for an F1 student visa:

The Immigration and National Act is very specific with regard to the requirements which must be met by applicants to qualify for the student visa. The consular officer will determine whether you qualify for the visa. Applicants must demonstrate that they properly meet student visa requirements including:

• Acceptance at a school;
• Possess sufficient funds to pursue the proposed course of study;
• Preparation for the course of study; and
• Intend to leave the United States upon completion of the course of study.

(Travel.State.Gov)
This study focuses on first year writing students who live in the U.S. as residents or citizens and have not had the same educational opportunities that an International student must have in order to move to the U.S. on a student visa.

This case study looks at the changes made during a writing session. The comparison of multiple drafts in previous studies established categories of revision for analysis, but did not offer an analysis of the changes made while the writer is drafting the text. The ability to screen capture changes as a student drafts a text can offer material evidence of negotiation. Are students today doing what Sommers observed thirty years ago? That is are they “. . . do[ing] what they have been taught to do in a consistently narrow predictable way” (382)? The critical question is how do student writers negotiate the dissonance between gist and intention? What does this gap in meaning represent? Is it a lack of prior knowledge of criteria and models, or lack of knowledge and experience with writing? This study will look at this gap. What knowledges do students bring to the act of writing and do these create or resolve the dissonance between gist and intention? This line of inquiry is important to the field of Rhetoric and Composition because Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver and Stratman state, “...revision is the interaction of knowledge and underlying processes” (27). However, these processes are socially constructed and negotiated. This study focused on the space between gist and intention that negotiation materializes and to see if students have changed their writing practices from the 1980s to reflect an intersubjective epistemology rather than a mechanical epistemology in creating meaning through discourse.
Method of Case Study

The method of data collection and analysis for this case study incorporated the methods of data collection from previous studies on revision along with the instructor comments and interviews with the participants. This section is divided into two sections. The first section describes the type of data collected and the second section describes the analysis of the data.

3.1 Data Collection

The move from a product oriented view of writing to a process oriented view of writing included a move in research practices that tried to capture the intersubjective nature of writing by focusing on the thinking and communicating process involved in writing, which served as material evidence. A significant feature of an intersubjective epistemology is the negotiation of meaning. The process of negotiating meaning is not static, but dynamic. However, capturing this dynamic feature of writing has been a challenge. Think aloud protocols and multiple drafts were used in the past to observe the changes writers made during the writing process. However, the material evidence of negotiation was limited. This case study used three types of data to gather broader material evidence of the negotiation of meaning. Recordings of all the changes made throughout a writing session, the instructor’s comments and participants’ perceptions of writing and revision provided a triangulation of material evidence of the negotiation of meaning. Screen capture technology was used to record each participant’s writing session. The instructor gave me copies of the comments he gave to the participants. The third piece of data was the participants’ comments from two interviews. One interview was scheduled during the semester the writing sessions were recorded and another interview was
scheduled after the data had been coded. Smagorinsky identifies in his article “The Method Section as Conceptual Epicenter in Constructing Social Science Research Reports” three types of protocol analysis: concurrent, retrospective and stimulated recall. A concurrent protocol is when “…a person thinks aloud during the process of completing the task” (396). Retrospective is when “…a participant completes components of the task or the whole task and then is prompted to reconstruct the process form memory” (396). Stimulated recall is when “… a person is filmed while working on a task and shortly thereafter is recorded while watching the film and reconstructing the cognitive processes for the researcher” (396). This case study followed a stimulated recall protocol analysis. The screen captured recordings of the students’ writings were completed and then two interviews followed. The first interview was a general interview about the students’ ideas about writing and revision. The second interview used the students’ screen captured recordings for discussion. Due to the amount of time needed to review and code the screen captured recordings, the interviews about the students’ writing was delayed into the next semester. In addition, the online platform for recording the writing sessions in this case study allowed participants to choose the location of the writing sessions which helped to accommodate their sociocultural preferences.

In addition to the three types of data collected, the case study included three other components. First, the technology used needed to be accessible to researchers in education. Secondly, the data collection categories mirrored the studies on revision completed in the 1980s. And lastly, participants needed to identify with one of the following categories: college ready, developmental, or ESL.
3.1.1 Participants

This case study involves seven students from a first year composition class at a community college located along the U.S. Mexico border. The student population at this community college is diverse and consists of local residents, recent immigrants, transnationals and military personnel. I visited a first year writing course with permission of the instructor in Fall 2010 to present the study and ask and for volunteers. One student did ask if there was any monetary compensation. There was no monetary compensation for participating in this study; however, the instructor did offer the students extra credit for participating. I used a survey to screen the volunteers to assure the participants represented the three categories of college ready, developmental and ESL. When I presented the study to the students, I told them I wanted writing students for the study. I did not specify that I needed students who had placed college ready, came through developmental classes or had an ESL background. I wanted students to self-identify, but I also did not want to present labels to the students. Each student was asked to complete a survey by circling yes or no to the following questions:

1. Is this the first time you have taken English 1301? Yes No
2. Did you place into this course because of your ACCUPLACER score?
3. Did you move into this course after you took English 0310?
4. Have you ever been enrolled in a bilingual course or courses? If yes, what courses?
5. Have you ever been enrolled in English as a second language course? If yes, what courses?

---

1 IRB documents were submitted and approved before the study was initiated. All students signed a release form and were given an orientation session on the study. The IRB approval number is 118261-4.
The questions were designed to solicit the necessary information without making it obvious to the student that I was looking for categories. Some students did not complete all the questions on the survey and were eliminated as possible participants. Based on the answers to these questions, eight students were invited to participate in the study: Three college ready, three developmental, and two ESL students. My goal was to have three from each group, but only two students identified themselves as coming from an ESL background. The students were contacted by email to ask if they would participate in the study and attend a training session. The three college ready and ESL participants agreed to attend the training session. The three students who identified themselves as having to attend developmental English classes prior to enrolling in the first year writing course agreed to attend also. However, only two attended the training sessions. I did contact the third student to try and set up a more convenient time for the training, but the participant was not able to attend any of the alternative times. These circumstances resulted in having two participants who had taken developmental English class(es) before enrolling in the first year writing course. The final number of participants was seven.

3.1.2 Materials

Several types of technology were used in this case study. First, a popular course management system, Blackboard, was tied to the first year writing course and each participant could access Blackboard at no additional cost to the student. In addition to Blackboard, WIMBA, a virtual office component in Blackboard, was used to provide the archival and the screen capture component for the study. With the help of the distance education office at the community college, WIMBA classroom shells were created for each participant within
Blackboard\textsuperscript{2}. This allowed the students access to their individual WIMBA classroom where the writing sessions were recorded. Students could only access their own virtual classroom and the instructor and researcher had access to all the participants’ WIMBA classrooms.

Once the students were identified, an orientation meeting was scheduled so that each student participant could learn how to use the screen capture and archival pieces of Blackboard/ WIMBA. There were two benefits of using these two tools. The archival and screen recording software did not require additional cost or installation. Secondly, the archival and screen capture tools were readily available from Blackboard, which is a popular online management tool in online education. This allowed the students to record their writing sessions from any computer with an internet connection. It took time to train students to learn how to log on and how to operate the two tools. Once a student entered their designated virtual classroom, the archival tool and screen share tool was activated by the student. The archival tool automatically saved the screen activity in two minute segments. The number designating the two minute segments varied depending how soon after entering the virtual classroom the archival tool was activated. The timer began once the student entered the virtual classroom; however, it could take a student 20 seconds or 45 seconds to activate the archival tool. If the archival tool was activated 45 seconds after entering the room, the two minute segments would be marked in the following manner: 45, 2:45, 4:45, etc. The screen capture tool recorded all the movement on the screen. When students had completed their writing session, they closed both tools before exiting the virtual classroom. The directions were posted in the

\textsuperscript{2}Blackboard Learn has added other features in 2013 similar to WIMBA to the suite of tools available and no longer has the WIMBA feature. This was an upgrade from the Blackboard version used with the participants.
Blackboard shell as a power point. Image 3.1 shows the archived segments of one writing session in a virtual classroom. This example began 20:45 minutes into the session.

![Image 3.1. Blackboard screen shot.](image)

Using an online environment allowed students to conduct their writing sessions at a location that best suited them. Also, giving control of the recording sessions to the students helped to eliminate some of the effect an observer has if present while monitoring the writing behaviors of students. Although students were quite aware that their writing session was being recorded, I felt the appearance of a frame would have less impact on the performance being captured than a video recording with a camera focused on the writer and the writer’s screen. This type of data collection added to the previous research on revision which relied on read
aloud protocols or manually recorded behavior of students during a writing session. The screen capture technology documented multiple changes on a single draft, which in the past was available through think aloud protocols, but not evident at the end of the writing session. In addition, allowing students to initiate the recordings helped to eliminate the participant observation effect. One criticism of the think-aloud protocols developed by Flower and Hayes was the participant-observation effect. Participant observation is a technique used for field research in which the researcher participates in the group being studied. The side effect of this type of research was that the behavior of the participant could be altered because of the presence of the researcher or observer. Read aloud protocol enhanced the studies of revision; however, having students record their processes verbally was an imposed behavior on the participants in order to gather data. In this case study, students controlled the recordings of the writing sessions in an environment of their choice. This helped to eliminate a clinical atmosphere for the collection of data, but there were some negative side effects. Not all the sessions were captured completely due to technological glitches, such as losing an internet connection, unknowingly clicking or deactivating one or both of the tools, as well as relying on participants who did not have that much experience with the archival and screen capture tools. This left all the trouble shooting up to the participants, which was a tradeoff to allow students to choose the time and location of their writing sessions.

3.1.3 Artifacts

The original design of the study included screen captured recordings of the first two writing assignments which included drafts, the instructor’s comments, and two different interviews with the students. The first interview was scheduled towards the end of the
semester. The purpose of this interview was to ask the student about their perception of what
good writing is and how they revised. The second interview took place in spring after the
students had completed the semester. It took me longer than expected to code the screen
captured data, and I wanted to use pieces of the screen captured data in the second interviews.

The two captured assignments changed as the semester progressed. The students
recorded the first assignment; however, the instructor used the second essay as an in class
assignment which was an argumentative essay. Since the order of the assignments changed, I
then asked the participants to record their third essay. Most were able to record their third
essay, but one recorded the fourth essay instead of the third. I do not know why some students
recorded the third assignment and some the fourth. There was a lot of overlap between essays.
Students reported that they were starting a new essay, but still waiting for comments from the
previous essay. The topic for the first essay was to write about “A Regret” that the students
had had some time in their life. Students reviewed the organization of a narrative and read
some examples of narratives from the textbook, *The Norton Field Guide to Writing with
Readings*. The third writing assignment was a comparison/ contrast essay of two texts which
the instructor gave the students: *Chocolate Cake is Better* and *Live Life Like It’s Your Last*. The
fourth assignment was an argumentative on the topic of how the student would improve the
city of El Paso. The assignments followed the traditional EDNA (Expository, Descriptive,
Narrative, and Argumentative) model. The textbook is broken up into these sections as well
with examples of tips of how to model these modes of discourse.

The third artifact was the instructor’s comments which were not recorded. Initially, the
instructor was to follow the students’ pattern and compose comments online using the review
function of Microsoft Word and the archival and screen capture software in WIMBA. The instructor explained that he was running out of time and made hand written comments and provided copies of the essays with the comments. For the first assignment, the instructor commented on the paper. For the second recorded assignment, the instructor had shifted his comments to email notes sent to the students. I received copies of these emails. This change in the format of the comments limited the study to the students’ screen captured video recordings, students’ interviews, and the written comments by the instructor.

3.1.4 Procedure

Since the study relied on two types of software, a training session was necessary for all participants. These training sessions took place in a computer/ language lab. The lab assistant and I trained the students on the procedures to activate the archival system and the screen capture software. We both made ourselves available beyond the training time to make sure that all the participants were comfortable with the procedure. Once the assignments were started, some students composed at home online and some came to the campus and used the computer/ language lab where the training was held.

A few times during the semester, I communicated with the participants to answer any questions or problems they may have had. This communication was not extensive because most of the participants understood what they were being asked to do. Halfway through the semester, I set up the first interviews with the participants. All seven participants confirmed their interview time and indicated they were willing to be interviewed; however, only three kept their appointments. I did try to reschedule with the other participants, but they did not respond after the first interview was set up. The three students who completed the first
interview were contacted at the beginning of the next semester to set up the second interview. Two responded and were interviewed a second time. The third never responded to the request of a second interview. The instructor gave the extra credit at the end of the semester to the students who participated in the recording of their writing sessions.

I developed the interview questions guided by two of Fulkerson’s four questions in his article Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century. Fulkerson stated that four questions must be answered in order to have a philosophy of composition. These four questions are:

1. The axiological question- In general, what makes good writing?
2. The process question – In general, how do written texts come into existence?
3. The pedagogical question- In general, how does one teach college students effectively, especially where procedural rather than propositional knowledge is the goal?
4. The epistemological question – “How do you know that?” which underlies answers to all the others. (657)

I used questions one and four as a basis for developing the questions for the interviews. The questions used in the first interview are

1. When you get ready to write, what do you do?
2. When you begin to write, do you start on the computer or on paper?
3. What do you find most difficult about writing?
4. What helps you focus?
5. Do you show your writing to someone to read before you turn it in?
6. How does feedback on your writing help you?
7. What do you think makes a good writer?
8. What kind of problems do you think you have as a writer?
9. Do you find it easy or hard to revise?
10. What do you change the most when you revise?
11. Do you see many differences between your first and second drafts?
12. Do you ever go back and read what you have written?
13. Do you enjoy writing?
14. Where do you tend to do most of your writing?
15. Do you experience writer’s block?
16. What type of prewriting activities do you do?
17. Do you have a favorite pen or pencil that you like to write with?

The second interviews were scheduled the next semester and guided by questions I had noted while I coded the screen captured writing sessions. The second interviews focused on specific things that happened during the writing sessions, and most of the questions were led by what the participant and I saw on the screen. These questions were:

18. You came to the end of this sentence and then there was this time lapse. Do you remember what you were thinking at the time?
19. Do you ever use the spell checker or grammar checker?
20. What type of word processor were you using?
21. You wrote quite a bit and then deleted it here and then rewrote it. Why did you change your mind about what you had written?
22. Do you recall what was happening during this time lapse?

The interviews were taped using a small digital recorder. I transcribed each of the interviews and organized the responses around specific topics. For the first interviews, the responses were organized by the questions pertaining to revisions practices and perceptions. For the second interviews, the responses were organized around the major categories of gist and intention, requirements, writing practices and examples of resistance.

3.2 Coding and Analysis of the Data

A coding system was designed for each participant and each type of artifact. Each participant was assigned a code based on how the student was placed into the course, the date of the study and course name. These codes were used to label the WIMBA classrooms for each participant and the data analysis of each participant. The following codes were used.

fycp01f2010 First Year Composition/Placed College Ready/ Participant 1 Fall 2010
fycp02f2010 First Year Composition/Placed College Ready/ Participant 2 Fall 2010
fycp03f2010 First Year Composition/Placed College Ready/ Participant 3 Fall 2010
fycd01f2010 First Year Composition/ Placed in developmental course/ Participant 1 Fall 2010
fycd02f2010 First Year Composition/ Placed in developmental course/ Participant 2 Fall 2010
fyce01f2010 First Year Composition/ ESL background/ Participant 1 Fall 2010
fyce02f2010 First Year Composition/ ESL background/ Participant 2 Fall 2010
fyci01f2010 First Year Composition/ Instructor/ Participant 01 Fall 2010

Once the semester was completed, I went into each archived file and hand tabulated all the changes made to the text during a writing session. Table 3.1 is an example of the hand written code sheet.
Table 3.1. Example of First Code Sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>Set the font. In the short story essay (two words deleted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>Carpe replaced with ie, Ob ➔ One (represented a change in spelling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the hand written code sheet, each two minute archived section was re-recorded as two minute video files in order to transfer the file out of WIMBA. I could play an archived segment in WIMBA, but I could not remove it from WIMBA. I used Screencast-o-Matic to re-record the files. At the time the study was conducted, this tool was the easiest to access at no additional cost. The rerecorded files were easy to export outside of WIMBA. The files could be saved and later hyperlinked into Excel code sheets for the data analysis. I could also remove any identifying markers on the screen such as the name of the participant or instructor. The automatic two minute segments worked very well for the coding phase of the data analysis. Two minute segments were much easier to move forward and backward in while transcribing the changes of a writing session.

After the hand written coding was completed for all the screen captured writing sessions and the files re-recorded, I created an EXCEL file for each writing session that identified the participant by code, the date of the session, and whether that was an initial draft or a revision of a previous draft. Table 3.3 is an example of the EXCEL grid. The two minute video files for each writing session were hyperlinked into the Excel table in two minutes increments. To the right of each two minute segment, columns were created to identify whether the changes were surface level, meaning preserving, or text base level.
The categories used for the columns were based on a revision of the taxonomy chart created by Faigley and Witte (1981) which had relied on similar taxonomies created by Sommers (1980), Flowers, Hayes, Carey, Shriver, and Stratman (1986), and Birdwell (1980). I used Faigley and Witte’s idea of surface change and text-base change (403). Faigley and Witte identified surface changes and text-base changes. Under surface changes, they included to groups, formal and meaning preserving. A formal change would be spelling, tense, number, modality, abbreviation, punctuation, and format. Meaning-preserving “...are changes that paraphrase the concepts in the text, but do not alter them” (403). These were divided into six categories: additions, deletions, substitutions, permutations, distributions, and consolidations. Faigley and Witte then divide text-base changes into micro and macro level changes based on Walter Kintsch and Teun van Dijk’s model “that accounts for how readers process a text” (404). A micro structural level is “where all concepts in a text are included (even those that can be inferred), and a macrostructure level... represents the “gist” of the text” (404). However, Faigley and Witte found this concept inadequate for the representation of gist “...because it does not accommodate adequately either reader’s prior knowledge or the situational context in interpreting the discourse” (404). They “...do find macrostructure theory useful for distinguishing major and minor revision” (404). Because of this I altered the taxonomy. I had three major categories: surface changes, meaning preserving changes and text-base changes. I felt that formal changes as defined by Faigley and Witte represented surface changes that could be considered mechanical in nature. I felt that changes of addition, deletion, and substitution were not at the same level as formal changes in tense, modality, format or spelling. Therefore, in the taxonomy used for this study, there are three major categories: surface changes,
meaning preserving changes and text-base changes. The data collected showed that changes were evident in all three categories. I argue that all these changes represent the act of negotiating meaning at the surface level, meaning preserving level, text base levels. This will be discussed further in discussion of the results.

An example of the first data collection grid based on Faigley and Witte’s grid follows.

Table 3.2. First Data Collection Grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Clip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tense, Number, Modality</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Clip</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Permutation</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Clip</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Permutation</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Clip</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Permutation</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I documented the changes for each two minute clip into the Excel grid, it became apparent that in Surface changes, the subcategory of Abbreviation was not used and I
eliminated it from the taxonomy for this case study. In the categories of Meaning Preserving, Text Base Changes, the subcategories of permutation, distribution and consolidation were not used by the first year writing students and were also eliminated. These categories were useful in past studies that included expert writers who exhibited these types of changes, but novice writers usually did not. The novice writers in this case study did not exhibit any of these types of changes as well. The numbering system under the heading of time clip is the two minute segment of the screen captured writing session. For example, 0.45 represents the beginning of a segment that begins 45 seconds from when the student entered the WIMBA classroom and started the archival process. Table 3.3 is an example of the revised.

Table 3.3. Revised Data Collection Grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>fycp03f2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Clip</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 45</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each time a change was made in the text during the two minute clip, a check mark was entered into the appropriate box that identified the change. In addition to the check, a comment was added by using the add comment in the review tab of Microsoft Word. The comment could be a transcription of the change or an explanation of how the change was
made. For example, in some instances the spelling change was made with the auto correct function on Microsoft Word. In other instances, the spelling change was obviously a typo and in other instances, the writer created the change based either on their knowledge or written feedback give to them by the instructor. Often the change was made and then reversed and then made again. This movement back and forth signals some uncertainty on the part of the writer and that this was material evidence of negotiating meaning between gist and intention. At the surface level a move back and forth between tenses would indicate negotiating meaning through tense. At the meaning preserving level, the back and forth movement between changes in words or phrases was evidence of the act of negotiation to preserve meaning. Similar moves were recorded at the text-base level, but not as frequently as at the surface level. The checks in the taxonomy grids were totaled for each subcategory and converted into bar graphs for analysis. The bar graphs showed the aggregated frequency of occurrences for each subcategory as well as the disaggregated frequency of occurrences by participant.

For the analysis of the interview data, I used the major categories identified in the taxonomy grid that documented the changes made during a writing session. These categories were Surface, Meaning Preserving, Text Base changes. Surface level changes included formatting, spelling, tense, punctuation. The meaning preserving changes were changes made at the word level, sentence level or paragraph level, but did not change the gist of the text. Text base changes involved changes that did change the gist of the text at the word, sentence, and paragraph level. And example of the participants’ comments is in table 3.4.
Table 3.4. Example of Charted Data from Interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Participant fycp03f2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clip 18:12</td>
<td>Surface Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, here I am being negative. See, to me this essay was too personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third artifact that I collected was the teacher comments made on the drafts or final copies. Originally, the instructor had agreed to make these comments online using the screen capture and archival system in WIMBA. However, the instructor did not have the time to do this and hand wrote the comments on hard copies of the drafts. For the second essay, the instructor sent email notices to the students with the comments. The instructor gave me hard copies of these emails. The instructor used several codes in making comments for revision. A table was created and the frequency the codes used on each draft and the specific comments made on the draft were charted as shown in table 3.5.

Table 3.5. Instructor Comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>fycp01f2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Number of times written on draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.s. (double space)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circles</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO (Run On)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR (Proof Read)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW ()</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Participants’ comments were not always tied directly to a specific clip of the screen captured recordings, but when the comments did address a specific change viewed on the screen, the clip was included in the chart.
The use of three types of artifacts (screen captured recordings of writing, audio recordings of the interviews, and instructor’s comments) provided quantitative and qualitative data about the revision practices of first year writing students. Since the social turn in composition which in Harris’ words has been “…a shift in focus away from the practice of writing and toward questions about social values, subjectivities, ethic and ideologies,” very little attention has been given to the revising practices of first year students. The assumption has been that the move from current-traditional theory to process theory has taken hold and students are following a process orientation when they write. The method for this case study focuses directly on the revision practices of students to see if indeed these practices reflected the turn to an intersubjective epistemology. Is there evidence of the negotiation of meaning through the movement between gist and intention and is this evident in the changes that
students made at the formal, word, sentence, paragraph, and discourse level during a writing session?
Results of Data Analysis

In 1980, Nancy Sommers concluded in her study of revision “that it is not that the students are unwilling to revise, but rather that they do what they have been taught to do in a consistent, narrow, and predictable way” (383). This case study looks at the revision practices of seven first year writing students to see if the move from a mechanical epistemology to an intersubjective epistemology has changed the writing practices of students in the 21st century. To address the diverse populations that take a first year writing course, the participants represent three types of students found in a first year writing course. Students can place into the course as college ready determined by placement score, or move into the course from a developmental English course or an ESL course. Three types of evidence were gathered for the study from these population groups: Screen captured recordings of student writing, instructor comments on essays, and two sets of interviews with the participants.

This discussion is framed by the material evidence from the writing sessions, instructor comments and interviews to study the negotiation of meaning between gist and intention to resolve dissonance. The data from the screen capture recordings, instructor comments and participant interviews are analyzed at the surface, meaning preserving and text base levels. These three major categories help to center the analysis of the negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention, which is a meaning making process.
4.1 Data from Screen Captured Recordings

The data for the screen captured recordings were gathered through WIMBA which is a virtual classroom that was available as part of a suite of tools in Blackboard\(^4\), an online course management system. Each writing session was recorded with the archival and screen capture tools in WIMBA. I viewed all the archived session and documented the changes made during the writing session on a grid divided into the three types of changes: Surface, meaning preserving and text base changes. The analysis for the screen captured recordings was based on the number and type of changes made through a writing session. Table 4.1 shows an example of how the changes were recorded on the Excel grid.

Table 4.1. Example Grid for Meaning Preserving and Text Base Changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Clip</th>
<th>Meaning Preserving</th>
<th>Text Base Changes Micro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 32</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>√√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major categories were Surface, Meaning Preserving, and Text Base changes. Each of these categories had subcategories as follows:

- **Surface**: Tense, Number, Modality, Abbreviation, Punctuation and Format
- **Meaning Preserving**: Addition, Deletion, Substitution
- **Text Base Changes**: Micro and Macro

Within the divisions of Micro and Macro the following subcategories were identified:

- Micro: Addition, Deletion, Substitution

---

\(^4\) Starting in 2013, Blackboard Learn no longer used the WIMBA suite of tools, but added other features similar to WIMBA. This was an upgrade from the Blackboard version used with the participants.
4.1.1 Aggregated Data – Major Category Results

The presentation of the data begins with an aggregated overview of the changes made by category. Graph 1 shows the number of changes made by all participants. A code for each participant identifies whether the student placed into the course, moved into it from developmental education or identified as an ESL student. The initials MP represent meaning preserving changes. The initials TMN mean tense, number and modal changes.

Graph 4.1. Summary of all Categories of Change. (College ready, developmental education and ESL participants)

Surface changes include changes in spelling, TNM (tense, number, modal), punctuation and format, which are the material aspects of writing conventions. Looking at this first
overview, all three groups follow a similar pattern in trends. The majority of changes were made at the surface level with the most being spelling. When we look at the specific components of the surface changes other than spelling, the changes did not follow a similar pattern. College ready students made punctuation changes more than format or tense, number, modal changes. Developmental education students made more format changes, then tense, number and modal changes followed by punctuation. The ESL groups of students made the least number of surface changes, but after spelling changes, tense, number and modal changes were made about the same number of times with very few punctuation changes. The biggest contrast in number of changes at the surface level was in the category of punctuation. For college ready students, punctuation changes were the second largest number of changes and among the developmental education and ESL students, changes in punctuation were the smallest number of changes in surface changes. The instructor did give mini lessons on comma use and sentence structure.

Meaning preserving changes included additions, deletions or substitutions at the word or phrasal level that did not change the meaning of the text. The overall number of changes showed that most changes at this level were substitutions. Among the college ready students, substitutions were made almost twice as many times as additions or deletions. For the developmental students, the number of additions, deletions and substitutions were almost the same with a slightly higher number of substitutions. The ESL students followed a similar pattern of the college ready students. Almost twice as many substitutions were made than additions or deletions.
Text based changes were reflected by additions, deletions or substitutions that affected the meaning of the text. This category is broken up into two subcategories: Micro and Macro. Micro changes are made at the sentence or paragraph level. Macro changes would be made across paragraphs and impact the meaning of the text beyond the paragraph level. College ready students and developmental students show similar trends in that more additions and substitutions were made than deletions. Very few macro changes were evident across categories. Only one macro change was documented out of all the recorded sessions. The ESL students followed a similar pattern in that more additions and substitutions were made than deletions; however, the number of changes was much smaller than among the college ready and development education students.

4. 1. 2 Disaggregated Data- Subcategory Results

Each participant was given a code to identify whether the student placed into the course as college ready, moved into the course from a developmental course or had been an ESL student. The definitions of the codes follow:

Codes for participants

P01 – First participant who placed into the course college ready
P02 – Second participant who placed into the course college ready
P03 – Third participant who placed into the course college ready
D01 – First developmental education participant
D02 – Second developmental education participant
E01 – First ESL participant
E02 – Second ESL participant
Graph 4.2 is the same graph as the first one, except disaggregated by participant. The disaggregated data by participant shows that spelling was the most common change made by participants except for one of the developmental education student who made more format changes than spelling changes. A second significant observation is that the developmental education students made more changes at the text based level than the college level and ESL students.

Graph 4.2. Summary of Changes by Individual Participants.

Graphs 4.2 through 4.13 show the number of changes made in each category by participants. A comparison of the number of changes within each category across participants focuses on the frequency of changes within each category.
Graph 4.3. Spelling Changes.

Overall, participants who placed college ready made more spelling changes than developmental education students or ESL students, although between the two developmental education participants, one made as many changes in spelling as the college ready participants and the other made less than half as many changes.

Graph 4.4. Tense, Number, Modal Changes.

Tense, Number, Modal Changes
For changes in tense, number, and modal changes, the number of changes was minimal compared to other types of changes in surface changes. One participant in each of the categories (P03, D01, E01) did make significantly more changes than the other participants.

Graph 4.5. Punctuation Changes.

The changes in punctuation were much higher for college ready students than for the developmental and ESL students.

Graph 4.6. Format Changes.
It is interesting to note that the changes in format were more numerous for the developmental education students than for the college ready or ESL students. One explanation for this could be that the participant had recently come from a developmental English course that is intended to prepare students for the first year writing course.

Graph 4.7. Meaning Preserving Additions.

Adding words or phrasing at the sentence level without changing the meaning was minimal across all three categories of participants with two participants making 11 changes for the entire writing session and the rest of the participants made less than five changes.
Deletion of words or phrases at the sentence level occurred a little more often than additions, but none of the participants exceeded more than 11 changes in a writing session.

Substituting words or phrases at the sentence level was much more common than addition or deletion of words or phrases. The largest number of substitutions without changing the meaning was just under 60 and the least number of changes was four.
Graph 4.10. Text Base Micro Additions.

Graph 4.11. Text Base Micro Deletions.
These three graphs, 4.10, 4.11, and 4.12, chart additions, deletions and substitutions at the micro level, which refer to changes that alter the meaning of the text at the word or sentence level. The number of changes at this level reached as many as 33 changes by one participant and as little as none by several participants. One participant who is classified as a student coming from a developmental English course actually made the most number of changes in additions, deletions and substitutions at this level. The second student in this category made the least number of additions, deletions, and substitutions.
Of the seven participants, only one student made a change at the macro level which was one addition across paragraphs. None of the other participants made any additions, deletions or substitutions in this category.

4.1.3 Comparison of Changes between drafts of Individual Participants

The screen captured recordings show two types of revisions. The first type consists of revisions made while creating the first draft and then revisions made between two drafts. The next set of charts compares the number of changes made in the first and second drafts of an assignment. The EXCEL data grids with video clips of the writing sessions are hyperlinked after the discussion of each graph. The charts below are divided into two types of comparisons. For the participants who were able to capture a first draft and second draft of one assignment, a comparison of the number of changes made by category is presented below. Some students were not able to capture two writing sessions for the same assignment due mainly to technical problems the students had during a writing session and the session was not recorded properly.
assignment, charts are presented below that compare the changes made from the first
recording assignment at the beginning of the semester and the second recorded assignment
towards the end of the semester. The first recorded writing assignment was a literary narrative
explaining a regret in life. The second recorded writing assignment was a comparison contrast
of two literary texts or an argumentative. The data is presented by student following the
coding of each student, i.e., P01, P02, P03, D01, D02, E01, E02.

Graph 4.14. Comparison of Two Drafts of Two Different Assignments. P01.

Based on a standardized placement test, participant 01 was identified as college ready. In the
process of gathering the data, P01 only recorded the first draft of two writing assignments. In
the first draft of the first assignment more surface changes than meaning preserving or text
based changes were made. Within surface changes, spelling and format changes were the most
common. In the first draft of the second recorded assignment, the number of changes in total
was much less than on the first assignment, but a higher number of changes was made at the
meaning preserving and text based levels. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are
hyperlinked here: [Draft 1 of Assignment 1](#), [Draft 1 of Assignment 3](#)
Participant 02 was able to record the draft and revision process for the first assignment. A significant number of changes were made at the surface and meaning preserving levels. At the text based level, more changes were made during the first draft than second draft. College ready participant 02 made a higher number of changes overall than participant 01. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here: Draft 1 of Assignment 1, Revision of Assignment 1.

Graph 4.16. Comparison of Two Drafts of Two Different Assignments. P03.
The third college ready participant shows a completely different pattern than the first two college ready participants. Very few changes were made three levels (surface, meaning preserving, text base) during the recordings the drafts for both assignments. However, in the second recorded draft, a significant number of changes were made across all categories, with spelling, format and micro substitutions being the most numerous. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here: [Draft 1 of Assignment 1](#) [Draft 1 of Assignment 3](#).

Graph 4.17. Comparison of Draft and Revision of First Assignment. D01.

The first developmental education student was only able to capture two drafts of two different assignments. In the first assignment, spelling changes were the most numerous during the first draft; however, during the revision draft of the same assignment, the most numerous changes were made at the text based level. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here: [Draft 1 of Assignment 1](#) [Revision of Assignment 1](#).
In the revision of the draft, the first developmental education participant showed an increase in changes made across categories except spelling. In addition, changes in all categories increased compared to the first screen captured draft. In the first draft, the greatest number of changes in the meaning preserving category was substitutions, followed by deletions and then additions. However, during the second recording, the participant significantly increased the number of changes made at the micro text base level which included additions and deletions, but did not make as many substitutions. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here:
Graph 4.19. Draft of First Assignment. D02 - no revision recorded.

The second developmental education student only recorded one session and did not complete the class. The student struggled with a basic understanding of how to use Microsoft Word.

When the number of changes for these sessions was calculated, the largest number of changes was format changes. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here: Draft 1 of Assignment 1.

Graph 4.20. Comparison of Draft and Revision of First Assignment. E01.
The first ESL participant made more changes in all categories during the first draft of the assignment than during the second draft of the assignment. The largest number of changes was at the meaning preserving level, particularly substitutive changes. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here: [Draft 1 of Assignment 1](#) [Revision of Assignment 1](#)

Graph 4.21. Comparison of Draft and Revision of First Assignment. E02.

The second ESL participant made more changes during the first draft than the second draft following a similar pattern of the first ESL participant. Even though the number of changes was small, the largest number of changes occurred at the text based level during the first draft. During the second draft, the largest number of changes occurred at the surface level. The EXCEL data grids used for graph 4.14 are hyperlinked here: [Draft 1 of Assignment 1](#) [Revision of Assignment 1](#)

The aggregated data graphs at the beginning of this section show overall trends of the participants’ behavior related to the number of changes made in each category and subcategory. The disaggregated data graphs show the specific changes by individual
participant. This shows detailed types of changes and the variation of changes across participant groups.

4.2 Data from Instructor Comments

In their review of the literature on teacher commentary, Knoblauch and Brannon suggest that students have trouble translating teacher’s comments into new strategies: "the depressing trouble is, we have scarcely a shred of empirical evidence to show that students typically even comprehend our responses to their writing, let alone use them purposefully to modify their practice" ("Teacher," p. 1). For instance, Newkirk ("Barriers") has suggested that teachers’ comments are typically plans for revision (e.g., "try to be more specific"). Students may learn to follow such plans where indicated yet never learn to detect or diagnose the underlying problem themselves. This is assuming that revision is a diagnostic to fix problems. Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, and Statman asked if offering local remedies for text was what students really needed or if instead they needed the strategic knowledge that will let them generate such plans on their own (53).

The second artifact for analysis was the instructor’s comments for the two screen captured recorded assignments. Initially, the instructor was to comment on the students’ drafts in WIMBA. However, the instructor was not able to and instead hand wrote comments on the first assignment and sent email notes on the second recorded assignment. The data was organized by the same major categories used in the screen recorded data, that is, surface change, meaning preserving change or text based change. Comments related to surface changes were anything addressing the format, tense, spelling, punctuation to include run-ons and fragments. Comments classified as meaning preserving included adding details or examples
to a point that had been established in the essay. Comments related to adding information that was not already evident in the text was coded as text base. Another category was added for general comments. These included statements that did not directly address something in the text.

4.2.1 Comments from First Recorded Assignment

The instructor wrote the first set of comments on a hard copy of the essay. I separated the comments into five categories: codes, surface, meaning preserving, text base, and general comments. The codes were a short hand for some surface changes, but the were placed in a separate category because they were abbreviations, diacritics or symbols rather than comments made by using words, phrases or sentences. The most frequently used codes were as follows:

d.s. – double space
circle – to highlight something
RO – run-on
PR- proof read
RW – rewrite
^ - insert
( ) or underline – identifying sections that need attention

The codes needed a separate category because the use of the codes was a common practice for commenting on the essays. This is especially easy with several computer tools or aps allowing an instructor to develop a set of common codes for revision and insert the code easily without having to rewrite the comment or code repeatedly.
Graph 4.22 shows the frequency of different types of comments made on each participant’s essay. The trend in frequency shows that the number of comments made with a code was the most frequent. This was true whether the participant had placed into the class as college ready or moved into the class from a developmental English or ESL course. The second most frequent type of comment for P01, P03, D01, E01 and E02 pertained to surface changes. For P02 and D02, the second most frequent type of comment was a general comment about the text. There were no other obvious patterns in the types of comments used by the instructor other than meaning preserving and text base comments were less likely to occur compared to the use of codes or surface change comments.
Graph 4.23. Frequencies of Types of Instructor Comments by Category for First Assignment.

Graph 4.23 shows the frequency of comments based on the type of comment across participants. The use of codes was the most frequently used type of comment followed by comments related to surface changes. The number of comments made pertaining to meaning preserving, text base or general comments varied across participants.

4.2.2 Comments from Second Recorded Assignment

The instructor comments for the second recorded assignment were sent by email to the students rather than written down on a hard copy. No abbreviations, diacritics or symbols were used. The comments were coded based on whether it addressed surface changes, meaning preserving changes, text base changes or general comments on the text. I included the section labeled code to be consistent with the graphs for the first set of comments.
Unlike the hand written comments, the emailed comments were fewer in number and were limited to mostly surface changes. Graph 4.24 shows the frequency of comments by participant. Participant D02 has no comments because this student had dropped the class by the time this essay was assigned. For five of the participants (P02, P03, D01, E01, and E02), the most frequent type of comment addressed a surface change. For participant P01, only two comments were given and both were general comments. The second most frequent type of comment across participants was a general comment about the text. An example of a general comment would be “I really like your brief transitional paragraphs between your comparison points.” I classified this as a general comment because no changes were suggested. This comment affirmed that the participant had all the required parts of the assignment.
Graph 4.25 shows the same data as Graph 4.24, but by category or type of change across participants. No data for the category of codes appears because no codes were used in the emailed comments. The most common type of comment made referenced a surface change and the second most common comment was tied to a general comment about the essay. The overall number of comments on the second recorded essay was few compared to the hand written comments on the first recorded essay.

4.3 Data from Interviews with Participants

The third type of data collected for this case study was audio recorded interviews with the participants. Two sets of interviews were conducted: one during the fall semester and a second interview during the following spring semester. Only three participants kept their appointment for the first set of interviews. The interview questions were based on the following topics.

1. Students’ experience with writing
2. Students’ activities when they began to write
3. Tools used for writing
4. Students’ actions when revising
5. Students’ most difficult challenging in writing
6. Students’ perception of good writing
7. Actions during revision
8. Comments from instructors
9. Changes after revision
10. Most helpful advice or action in learning how to write
11. Overall view of writing
12. Students’ comments which show the negotiation between gist and intention

4.3.1 First Interview

Three participants completed the first interview. Two of the participants placed into the first year writing course as college ready and the third participant moved into the course after taking ESL courses at a different community college. The ESL student had been in the United States for six years and was a member of the military. After transcribing the interviews, the comments were categorized by topic. Not all the comments were used because in the course of the interview, the participants would veer off topic and made comments that were not related to writing or to the questions. For the sake of analysis, table 4.2 shows the participants’ answers grouped by question. The questions appear in the far left hand column of the table, and then the responses to the questions are in the middle column and the analysis in the far right hand column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Topic</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Remarks/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Writing</td>
<td><strong>P01</strong> Well I think it has actually been pretty good. Because I mean <strong>I love to write and read.</strong> ...probably it began like in 5th grade actually. Because I can remember <strong>my teacher telling me that I was like a really good writer.</strong> So from then one, I just tried my best. <strong>I really liked it.</strong> In English, it was like <strong>my best class.</strong> Yah...I took pre AP in junior year. I think it was AP actually. I actually passed that.</td>
<td>Overall attitude is very positive as indicated by the bolded words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P03</strong> Um ...It kind of depends on the topic Ok something that I already have some <strong>common knowledge</strong> about ...I just start typing...whatever. If it is something that I need to research, I am like what is this? How can I define it? Then once I get <strong>the definition</strong> of what that is then I'm like I would say it this way. I would say it that way. And then um if I can't get it together like if it a <strong>certain format,</strong> like I'll kind of see how what I just wrote. If I could put it into that format. If not, do it again. Like uh...well I have not written anything in like since high school. And it's been two or three years, so I don't remember much, so I'm like just writing down...<strong>free writing</strong> I guess.</td>
<td>Combines the use of knowledge and formatting to describe his experience with writing. Identifies a specific strategy – free writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>E01</strong> ...writing ...it comes very <strong>naturally to me.</strong> ...when I was younger I would read a lot... ...if they gave me a topic, you know I will <strong>very easy</strong> just come out with a whole bunch of words that...yah</td>
<td>Writing is a natural phenomenon. Does include reading in his overall experience with writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you begin to write?</td>
<td>P01 On paper</td>
<td>The first semester this student always handwrote the draft before typing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03 Um... I guess once I get the assignment I do the <strong>pre-writing</strong>. Uh... if it seems kind of simple I <strong>mind map with the bubbles</strong>. And if it's something oh yah...I know this, I just <strong>start the writing</strong>. Yah cause uh... like <strong>once it clicks</strong>, you know, I can connect to my own personal life and it goes on to something ...that pertains to the topic Um... Let's see... uh... <strong>the requirements</strong> that he wants like uh... let's say he wanted <strong>10 pages</strong>...all right from what I wrote, can I make that into 10 pages? Then I need to go back and add. Or if he only wants <strong>one page</strong>, what do I have to cut out so it meets his requirements.</td>
<td>Student identifies two strategies for pre-writing: mind mapping and just writing. Student references a “click” with a connection to his personal life then he goes from there. This is an example of creating meaning between the assignment and the writer. Also, a strong reference to the instructor’s requirements which include number of pages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01 ...what I do is I <strong>just read</strong> them thoroughly and um...I don't know. I just go around it by just writing, just writing. <strong>And I know what he wants</strong>. He wants an introduction and then he wants uh...a paragraph and then a transition and another paragraph and then so on and I just try to follow that...</td>
<td>Student references the use of reading to help him begin to write. Secondly ties in writing practice to understanding what the instructor wants in terms of types of paragraphs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you write on paper or on a computer?</td>
<td>P01</td>
<td>No actually I wrote it down before I typed it. Well...I go back to my written paper. (In reference to making revisions.) Yah... it was lined paper. And that red line. You know how people stop at that red line, I just keep going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Uh...uh... I start usually on paper. And if I know that the final has to be turned in typed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>I usually just don't write on paper maybe because I get used to it, the computer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When do you go back and revise, and what do you do?</td>
<td>P01</td>
<td>I just fix whatever he tells me to fix and then I go back on the computer and just fix it there. But I think it's easier to fix it on paper first then I will go ahead and... Well I think most of them come from the paper, but I do make some changes while I am typing to use better words or to add a little more detail. But most of them is on paper if it is major changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Umm... uh...being that it's my own work it is hard to find my own mistakes. But I always try to ... but once I get to this point, I try looking at oh... maybe I repeated it. I try looking for it, but sometimes I don't catch it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>Like I said I try to read it out loud just to see uh...if there is a sentence there that I am not quite sure if it is right or wrong. I just start to listen to it to see if it fits. And then uh... I usually go to some of the grammar mistakes of that the professor have pointed out in the past. Um...usually commas or I had problems before with a paragraph sentences. And so uh...I try to look into my past mistakes and ... I usually find a couple.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relies on instructor’s comments to make revisions. Makes some of her own changes while revising, but relies mostly on the instructor’s comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student relies on finding his own mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student relies on reading to find mistakes by seeing if it fits. This would be evidence of a tacit understanding of the negotiation between gist and intention in that a fit was determined by how close the gist of the text was to the intention of the writer. Then he turns to the instructor’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the most difficult part of a writing assignment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P01</td>
<td>I had a little bit of trouble on instructor... like my compare and contrast essay. <strong>He told me it wasn't very well structured.</strong> So, I had to actually improve on that a lot. And also with examples and support details I needed to improve on that as well. So... ... <strong>it's just the structure ...everything else I did pretty good in.</strong> References what the instructor indicated was a problem rather than what she thought was a problem. Problem was related to the structure of the essay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Um...I guess...Well just <strong>getting the idea across.</strong> Cause uh...<strong>besides all the grammatical errors and everything, some people just don't understand</strong> ... like huh ...what's he trying to say? And sometimes like uh I go back and check my work I'm missing words or a complete sentence is gone cause... I have a <strong>problem putting my thoughts into the writing.</strong> Difficulty for this student lay in communicating effectively to the reader which is an example of the negotiation between gist and intention. Student also identifies grammar as an area of difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E01 | I think it's like I don't even know the word like uh...**syntax** of it. **I don't find it difficult to write. I just find it difficult perhaps to get my ideas together onto the paper in order to make sense.** Cause sometimes it'll make sense to me but they really don't make sense on the paper itself. So that that's probably what I **find the hardest just making sure that the right sentence goes** Student identifies syntax as an area of difficulty. Student gives example of negotiation of meaning – difficulty in getting ideas to make
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think makes a good writer?</th>
<th>P01</th>
<th>Well pretty much, <strong>like being able to make the reader understand</strong> what you are trying to say instead of just generalizing. <strong>Like actually get into detail and make the reader understand</strong> what you are trying to say and what you are trying to get across.</th>
<th>A good writer is able to make the reader understand – This is an example again of gist and intention in that dissonance is minimal and measured by the reader’s ability to understand. Student uses reader as a measure of a good writer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Well if it's in a story narrative whatever... it it... <strong>the reader has to enter that world that person's created.</strong> But let's say it is a newspaper, a professional you have to be informed, so if you got all the information, <strong>you don't have any questions at the end of it, that was a good paper.</strong></td>
<td>Student uses reader as a measure of a good writer. Identifies a different intention with different criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E01</td>
<td>Well I think a good writer is <strong>someone that is just inspired</strong> by the whole idea of what writing because uh...In order to write I good paper I think you just need to be somewhat <strong>passionate</strong> about what you are writing about.</td>
<td>Inspiration makes a good writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, when you fix it or go about it, or improve it, what do you do? Revision</td>
<td>P01</td>
<td>Well... with (instructor's name) told me to do was just to make an outline before I actually start to type the paper, and that way it is better structured. Then he asked me to put quotes from the stories that we read and detailed examples. So, I actually wrote something about my high school experience. I actually wrote you know what I heard in class and stuff like that so that helped a lot.</td>
<td>Follows instructor’s recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Uh...usually feedback from other people cause like I don’t know what you are saying. Oh ok, let me try again. I do peer reviews in class, but usually in high school I would tell my teacher did you understand or whatever...sure I like to try to make it more understandable ‘cause usually what I was trying to write didn’t make sense to the reader. Well uh...well I look at what I wrote. If it is like very simple like a cat, you know, like I need to make it more interesting. I like my fluffy round cat that you know I’ve had for years... And if it’s uh... I guess syntax ‘cause I’ve been having problems with syntax in English class. Well first drafts... I don’t really bother ‘cause it’s a first ... I want to see all the wrong things that I did... so you know.... Um... oh it’s I guess the weaknesses of the paper. Um... Like uh... you just read it and you get nothing out of it.</td>
<td>Relies on feedback from others. Mentions a specific strategy of peer review. References the reader again and making sure the reader understands. This is evidence of a tacit understanding of negotiation of meaning by reducing dissonance between gist and intention. Also, rereads and edits writing – evidence of the negotiation between gist and intention. Syntax is part of the process of revision. First draft focuses on ideas rather than getting it “right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E01</td>
<td>But what I do is like I give it a little more uh... life</td>
<td>Adds meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from Instructor</td>
<td>P01</td>
<td>But, like he said it was just some examples that were missing... specific examples.</td>
<td>Relies on instructor’s comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>And then he's like oh you have to put a point. Oh ok. The point- detail, example, flow. Um...wellbeing that it was my first in forever, my first grade was a 58 something like that. That is not good. So, we did a conference. He told me to go to the writing center. From what he told me it was mostly just grammar. So I am like ...well the point ... I understand is to you know, you have to fix those...I really didn't care about that. I wanted to know if he understood what you know was going to help my grade. So it was just like that. I really didn't care about the whole syntax thing. 'Cause you know computers can fix that for you, you know. Oh well you should check that sucker. Uh... Let's see. Emphasis... I think in the back he wrote something. Yah. Here is where I tried again. All right ... this is what he told me. I went back...did all that tried again... and you know from my guess the first page was ok. Then... here is where I got a little confused. Cause to me like uh... I'm telling myself ... these are the exact words I said. But he is telling me that it has to be past tense but I told myself. 'Cause to me I'm trying to put the person hay... this is what I was saying to myself at that time. So you know... Uh... here this is a vague help for me. Good but what? So I don't know if he is talking about combing all those sentences that I used or...Or to force that into one big sentence. And like that's.... doesn't mean anything to me No, he just went by and gave me this star. And</td>
<td>Comments are tied to punctuation and expected patterns of organization. Conferenced with instructor and recommended the writing center for help. Mostly grammar. Doesn’t care about grammar – wants to make sure the reader gets the gist. Computers can fix the grammar. Tries to renegotiate the meaning – gets confused by instructor’s comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that's what counts it seems.
And uh... I didn't get the feedback that I would kind of want.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E01</th>
<th>Um, I guess I was supposed to write in third person, and I didn't know that at first. So I used a lot of &quot;as I read this paper I noticed this...&quot; I did that or we have all...you know come across a difficult situation like this so he mentioned that I need to change that particular paper.</th>
<th>Identifies surface changes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Changes in paper after revision | P01 | Well I think most of them come from the paper, but I do make some changes while I am typing to use better words or to add a little more detail. But most of them is on paper if it is major changes. | Changes motivated mostly by instructor’s comments. |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | P03 | I need to add more because he said it was vague. But the.... I didn't do it initially ‘cause it's something personal. I didn't really want to tell him where I worked, but he wanted to know. But well you know the second time I have to add more and more. But as I did that again and it's like adadadada...so I did not check much for the grammar thing. Grammar syntax...so | Resistance to the instructor’s comments. |
|  | E01 | I used to I guess go back and forth with past tense and present tense. I did have some grammar mistakes and I did have some probably run-on sentences. The grammar you know I think it's just going to take me a minute to catch up. | Negotiate meaning through tense. Grammar |
|  | P01 | Because I can remember my teacher telling me that I was like a really good writer. So from then one, I just tried my best. | An instructor telling her that she was a good writer. |
|  | P03 | Feedback | Comments – not necessarily from the instructor. |
|  | E01 | Well I guess it was important to have somebody point out your mistakes. ... he was really picky about grammar...he would just mark my paper up on red like the whole paper. (“He” is not the writing teacher.) ... but I guess one of the most important things was to be in class and have someone actually just teach you the basics I guess. Because like I said I knew how to write but there | Wants mistakes pointed out and gives an example of how this helped him in the past. Also identifies attendance. |
|  | --- | --- | --- |
are just a couple of things that will slip. But uh... **having someone you know just letting you know what is right or wrong in the paper** then that actually helps. 
... he would just point out the mistakes, but he would never really sit down with me and tell what's wrong with it or how to fix it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall view of writing</th>
<th>P01</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                         | P03 | Like uh... like even a quote. **Oh like wow that can inspire my life.** You know. Like there is one. I just had some, but I can't remember where. I don't know the key to happiness, but I know it's not trying to make everybody else happy. 
**You know that spoke to me. That's a good quote. Yah. You can apply it to life and whatever.** But you know like uh... You've seen poster of that cat that says hang in there? That's kind of dumb. But you know I would say that the first quote I said would be more stronger I guess. 
Well... it's 'cuz um...... **I used to like writing. But due to circumstances, I had to basically quite school after high school.** I couldn't focus on it... And it's something you need to practice and practice. And when you stop, you kind of go backwards a little bit. But if I start again, I probably would like it again. **Um...easy? Oh... not really 'cause it's just a process.** You start with one step and you continue as long as you take I guess it would be the first step. As long as you take that one, **it's normal.** |

| E01 | I guess most **people struggle because they don't know what to write about.** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gives an example of being inspired by a quote – words.</th>
<th>Writing is something that can be applied to our lives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used to like writing but circumstance changed that.</td>
<td>Identifies writing as a process that is normal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Struggle with not knowing what to write -- he indicated that this is not necessarily his struggle.
Gist and Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P01</th>
<th>More examples of negotiating dissonance through gist and intention.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P01</td>
<td>...like being able to make the reader understand what you are trying to say instead of just generalizing. Like actually get into detail and make the reader understand what you are trying to say and what you are trying to get across.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P03</th>
<th>Evidence of an understanding of the negotiation between gist and intention.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Just how things click.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E01</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>If I notice that something just doesn't sound right, I just go ahead and change it. ...you know you start to get that that feeling of whether that that phrase or that sentence just sounds right or it doesn't. I got all the ideas it's just a matter of putting them all together in a way that they will make sense. ...what I find the hardest just making sure that the right sentence goes with the next sentence and that they all make sense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.2 Second Interview

Only two of the case study participants returned for a second interview. The topics of discussion for the second interview were based on specific segments of the recorded writing sessions. These segments were identified when I coded the changes made during the writing sessions. I starred segments that showed changes made at the text base level to use in the second interview. For example, in table 4.3, the changes in segment 123:38 for P01 could have been an example of a text base change or addition at the meaning preserving level. The table below charts the video recording with a transcription of the changes. The comments that the participant made while watching the writing segment follow the table. The second set of numbers is a link to the two minute video recording. The code (tl) means a time lapse.
P01 and I looked at this segment and I asked if she remembered why she inserted another sentence here. Her response was

    I think that is when I decided that...‘cause I think we had to have three main things we wanted to change about El Paso. So remember how I put job opportunities and I erased it, I guess I decided to enter it. So that is probably why, ‘cause it says building more job opportunities.

    So, I am not sure actually what happened there.

When I met with P03, we discussed similar changes that he had made along with an interesting pattern that happened during both of his recorded writing sessions. There was a very clear change in register as he composed his draft. I viewed this as evidence of resistance. Below, in table 4.4, is the transcription of two segments during the drafting of the first recorded assignment and the changes he made transcribed in the right hand column. His comments during the second interview are below the table. He was asked what he was doing at this point in the draft. The second set of numbers links to the video recording of the changes. The code (tl) means a time lapse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123:38</td>
<td><em>Inserted new beginning sentence for paragraph 3.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123:38</td>
<td>By the city building more job opportunities tourism (tl) increases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. P03 Changes in Segment 18:11 and 20:11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:11</td>
<td>I don’t feel the need to mention where it I worked (tl) but if you need to know too (tl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 11</td>
<td>....too bad ask me in person. (tl) HA. (tl) Erased entire sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:11</td>
<td>I worked at a restaurant (tl) with little class and for soemme reason very addictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 11</td>
<td>food. (tl) In this not so fine establishment I worked 52 hours plus (tl) with only one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>off out of the week. (tl) From 6 six</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the second interview, we watched these segments and I asked P03 if he remembered why he made the changes he did. His comments were

So, here I am being negative. See, to me this essay was too personal.

And you know, why does my teacher really need to know where I work? I'm just telling him it sucked, where I worked.

So like, there I am actually like talking to him in a sense.

P03 was the only participant who demonstrated an obvious attitude of resistance during the writing session. This is significant because initially in designing the study, I wanted to also focus on signs of resistance in student writing. However, the students’ recorded writing sessions provided very little evidence of resistance. In fact, during the first interview, the three participants had the attitude that they just wanted the instructor to tell them what do and what was expected and they would do it.

In addition to discussing specific changes made during the writing sessions, the comments from the second interview were transcribed and categorized by the major themes of
the comments. Four major themes were apparent in the comments: the negotiation of gist and intention, instructor requirements, writing practices and resistance. The chart below identifies the main topic in the left hand column with the responses to the recorded writing sessions in the middle column. The participants’ comments fell into three general categories: gist and intention, requirements, practices, and resistance. Under the heading of Elements, I highlighted whether the negotiation meaning was occurring at the surface, meaning preserving, text base level or with previous knowledge that student had about writing.

Table 4.5. Summary of Comments from the Second Interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gist and Intention</td>
<td>P01 If I don't like the way it sounds, Yah I just save it and change it back over again...</td>
<td>Text base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I just didn't like how it sounded. I just read it backwards, if I don't like it I change it.</td>
<td>Text base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yah. I save it just in case I have to go back to it. But I would rather just start all over again because I don't like how it sounds.</td>
<td>Text base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No I don't think I ever do (referring to copying and pasting between documents) unless I really like the way something sounds and probably I will put it in there. But more than likely I just start ...</td>
<td>Text base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that is when I decided that...’cause I think we had to have three main things we wanted to change about El Paso. So remember how I put job opportunities and I erased it, I guess I decided to enter it. So that is probably why, ’cause it says building more job opportunities.</td>
<td>Previous Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>’Cause I don’t... like I said I really think about how it sounds. I'm really picky about how it sounds because I want it to sound really good.</td>
<td>Text base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because if I don't know how to say things and stuff</td>
<td>Text base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
like that, but I have to think about it and if I don't find a way I think about another way to do it.

Yah. But if I am finished with it, but I don't like how something sounds, I don't start over again. I just change it.

If it is just one thing, but if it is from the beginning, I just change it. Probably just to make it better. Like to I don't know... I guess I thought I could develop it better. Yah. I think I did remember that while I was writing.

P03 Yes. Cause with my problem in Mr. (instructor's name) class was my grammar and tense. So, I'm pretty sure that I went back to make sure it sounded like a sentence instead of a fragment.

So, here I am being negative. See, to me this essay was too personal.

And you know...why does my teacher really need to know where I work? I'm just telling him it sucked, where I worked.

So like, there I am actually like talking to him in a sense.

Well, when I write I try to keep in mind the audience. I am supposed to try to, but when I start feeling uncomfortable or stuck, I am thinking who is this going to affect. It is just my teacher, right?

See like I'm pretty sure that's a run on or these can be connected with a comma... Now I'm trying to think um... to try and put it in words. How my experience was.

But so that's...the reader I don't think the reader needs to know and...I'm just wanting to finish this.

I'm pretty sure I would be addressing myself. But looking back, I should not have done that.
That's my big mistake. Then I switch to a more long sentence.

To make it sound nice... It turned out to be very costly...Uh.... Here is one of my negativity kind of sentences.

So I'm thinking... I am beating myself up about it. So, I'm pretty sure he laughs a lot on that one.

Well, you know it's not...you don't need the whole chunk. Ellipses and that's it. And here I'm probably thinking how to shrink it but still get the point across.

It's cause, the decision he made was changing I think. ......course which ended up taking him to his right path.

I don't know if I should put back...

I think I paused there because it didn't seem to sound right. I guess I didn't notice.

I really didn't know what to put after chosen decision.

This cannot be overturned. It's like uh... I'm trying to ... to continue that or not.

Uh... ‘cause He's seizing the day seems to small of a sentence. So I need to connect it I think.

I don't like the way it sounds...thanks to somebody dying... So, it kind of sounded wrong. I'm not sure why I added that was, but I did.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>P01</th>
<th>I think what I remember is the transition to the next paragraph.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Cause I remember he told us something like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yah. Or something like that, ‘cause I know he told us to put a transition paragraph in there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well, I don't know, ‘cause the English class my professor, she... when she tells me exactly what she is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comments were all tied to what the instructor required. Different writing instructors are used as a
looking for in the paper...

Like she didn't...um...Like for the research paper she wanted us to exactly cite everything... correctly cite...like within the paragraphs. She didn't want us to just put like page numbers. So I think that helped me to like in the citing. You know perspective. I think that has helped me a lot though...when she tells me exactly what she wants.

So I guess I was trying to do that.

Only if like the teacher tells us it has to be a certain word, but if it's not then I don't look at it.

Yah... she gives us examples. So, I know exactly what to write down.

P03  Uh...I would have put "it", but being that the mister, the professor always tells us be more elaborate ...what is... they want to know who, what, where... So that's like when I um...I can't use it.

It is not just me whining, Oh my work... Yah, I'm pretty sure I went to the bathroom.

We are not supposed to use didn't.

I have a nice run on there... I'm like oh a run on. So like that's not... I ...enough... keep writing.

I was also trying to see if it matched with my thesis.

I think the example was to bring in the main character.

It's all about him. But you know, I am just talking about him. I need to explain why.

Yah. I think he made us ...one from each. (Referring to using quotes in the essay.)

Because you are not supposed to do that. I think he told us to write it in third person.

| P03 | reference to why the changes were made. |
Uh oh....Yah. I was changing the tense there. That's 'cause I was like... once you choose. I'm um ... no. 

'Cause again. I am pretty sure he wanted third person. So, and he was taking off points for that.

'Cause I think he said two pages or a page and a half. Um... to add more to the page. Or probably add more to the sentence. It just doesn't seem enough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>P01</th>
<th>Yah. I reread it a lot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I do it online. I don't print anymore. (This is a change from the first interview. P01 made the changes in the second semester when assigned the research paper.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P03 | I guess 'cause of the format freaked me out. I'm like uh... it changed my paragraph...the way the double space...so much. |
|     | Yah. Like what happened to my sentences. I think I tried putting it back in. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>P01</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>Oh, well, that is just me being random...I would consider that...I am pretty sure at some point I start talking about setting stuff on fire. So then, it's like nah... that's not a good sentence or it doesn't really matter. Just say I worked at a restaurant. Right now, I am like hum... should I tell him the name of it should I not? If this is the first one, I don't think I did. I just said it's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am pretty sure that I'm writing that paragraph whether it is making sense or not. I'm trying to avoid the word at that point. Oh... these I don't like the cause they are all...see that's how much I remember. I didn't care about them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I just remember that there is a ...positive. He told us to like compare them. So I had to read back on them. Yah, 'cause...I can probably put that ... but I kind of want to explain it on my own... but Oh there I am just being dumb. Genius brandy dag all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Resistance | P03 | Although initially in developing the design of this study, I anticipated finding evidence of resistance, P03 was the only participant who showed and signs of resistance. The resistance surrounded issues of privacy. I did not specifically address resistance in |
death and hell... I was getting sick of trying to make that page...

It is funny seeing that really.

I’m still thinking that doesn’t sound right.

Um... Not really. I have always done that like I’ll change tense or start talking to myself.

Yah. Cause it's not about me.

Based on the participants’ comments in the second interview, P01 and P03 had different approaches to resolving the dissonance between gist and intention. As a practice, P01 read and P03 relied on understanding the format as a tool to guide changes in the test although both referenced the requirements of the instructor. Of the two participants, only P03 showed any evidence of resistance to what the instructor expected. Based on the first set of interviews, P01 accepted the authority of the instructor and did whatever he recommended in his comments. However, P03 used a register change as material evidence of resistance. The most overt sign in the drafting process was when he changed audiences and in his words, “I am like hum... should I tell him the name of it should I not?” This is in reference to details that the instructor had asked P03 to add as noted in table 4.4.
4.4 Summary

This case study included three different types of data: screen captured changes during the writing sessions of the participants, the instructor comments to the students, and two interviews conducted with three of the seven participants. It was important to use these three types of artifacts because they represent the location of negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention. The screen captured writing sessions allowed the observation of all the changes made while the students wrote. These changes were classified into surface, meaning preserving and text base changes which were made based on the writers previous knowledge, requirements of the assignment and evaluating if the reader would be able to “make sense” of the writing. The instructor’s comments represented another location of negotiation of meaning between the text, the reader and the writer in how the student responded to the comments. The interviews were a qualitative representation of the students’ understanding of writing and what the students were thinking at the time they made the changes in the writing sessions.

Several issues came up during the data collection process that limited the scope of this case study. One was that not all of the original eight participants completed the all the writing sessions. One participant never started although she had agreed to be part of the study. Another participant dropped the class between the first and second recorded writing session. Since the participants controlled the archival and screen capture tools, the participants sometimes inadvertently turned off the tools or were not able to record the writing session. In addition, the instructor had agreed to comment on the students’ essays using the archival and screen capture tools, but never did, but did make hard copies of his comments. Most of the instructor comments were tied to surface area changes, references to handouts, grammar
descriptions and explanations in the textbook. So, it is no surprise that the screen-captured writing sessions show that students overwhelmingly gravitated toward surface and micro changes. Some instructor comments were a response to the students’ writing such as “those bastards! Trick! ” However, neither set of comments reflected or communicated changes that would occur beyond the surface level of revision. This is not a criticism of the instructor, but an observation. The number of students in writing classes limits the amount of time that instructors can spend on reflecting and writing comments. The cap for writing classes at this community college is 30. The number of students in this particular class was 24.

Also, all the participants did not complete the interviews. Three completed the first interview and only two completed the second interview. The second interview had to be scheduled four months after the first interview because I needed to review and code all the screen captured writing sessions before the second interview. The review and coding process took much longer than I had expected. The second interviews using the screen captured sessions should have been conducted much sooner, ideally within a few weeks of the writing session. Even though the breadth of data was limited, the three different types of artifacts offered depth for an analysis in understanding the revision practices of first year writing students in the 21st century.

As demonstrated in this chapter, negotiation of meaning to resolve dissonance occurs at the surface, meaning preserving and text base level during the revision process. Negotiation at the surface level is mechanical in nature, i.e. knowing the correct spelling or formatting. Negotiation at the meaning preserving and text base level appeared to have more characteristics of an intersubjective nature. Of the 889 changes made across all categories,
only one change was made at the text base macro level. Fifty-seven percent of the changes were surface changes. Twenty-four percent of the changes were meaning preserving changes and twenty percent of the changes were made at the text base level. The first year writing students that I interviewed did have a sense of negotiating meaning through gist and intention as evidenced by their interview comments; however, their behavior gravitated toward more mechanical changes than intersubjective changes that rely on less concrete avenues of negotiation to include the instructor’s comments, previous knowledge brought to the writing and the sense of what sounds right, “...what clicks.” The data showed that students are very hesitant to make changes that require a broad reconstruction of ideas and concepts, i.e. negotiation between intention and gist at the paragraph or discourse level.
Discussion

Studies in revision in the past focused on two areas. One type of study collected numerous examples of essays and tabulated the errors in an effort to identify patterns of behavior in writers. The second type of study was a case study model that often compared the writing practices of expert writers and novice writers in order to understand the complex cognitive processes used by these two groups. Since the late 1980s, a few more studies have been conducted and continue to confirm that novice writers focus more on surface changes than meaning preserving or text base changes (Sommers and Staltz, Dix, Myhill and Jones, Humphris). To create a frame for the discussion of the results of this case study, I want to use recent studies on revision by Dix, Myhill and Jones and Humphris. These studies on revision were conducted with elementary and secondary school aged participants and used analysis codes similar to the codes used in this case study. My case study focuses on the writing practices of community college students on the U.S. / Mexico border which adds to the overall picture of the writing practices of students at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels.

In 2006, Dix published a study of nine students from three different primary schools in New Zealand. The students ranged in age from eight to ten years old and were identified as fluent writers (4). The assignments used in gathering data were “...focusing on constructing poetic and transactional texts, over a twenty-week time-frame” (4). The study documented surface, meaning preserving and text base changes. The most frequent types of changes made by the students were surface changes. The second most frequent types of changes were text
base changes at the microstructure level (8). The fewest number of changes were at the macrostructure level. She also found that the participants demonstrated an awareness of metacognitive awareness in three different ways (9). She stated that “…the writers were able to explain what they were doing as they revised.” Secondly, she observed that the participants “…were clear about what they wanted to say in their writing, which influenced their reasons for revising” (9). And thirdly, “…the writers confirmed the research findings …that many cognitive decisions made at the micro and macro level were not evident in the printed script” (9). One unexpected finding by Dix was that the writers continued to make revisions at surface, meaning preserving and text base levels up through the final draft (9). Dix used the findings to articulate implications for teaching revision practice. She stated that “[a]n important factor in these writing classrooms was teacher demonstration of how to construct text for a particular purpose” (10). Her study also showed that “…even though the writers could talk about the writing and give reasons for making changes, the teachers needed to be more explicit with language use as the writers did not have the precise terms to explain exactly what they were doing” (10). These findings confirm the idea that students do understand the concept of negotiating meaning; however, they are not able to articulate or execute the higher levels of revision because it has not been modeled for them.

A second study completed in 2007 by Myhill and Jones focused on the writing practices of 360 students between the ages of 13 and 15 from four secondary schools in England. There were two phases of the study. The first phase gathered writing samples from the 360 participants. The second phase included classroom observations and interviews with a subsample of 36 students from the main cohort. Although Myhill and Jones did not use the
same codes of surface, meaning preserving and text base changes, their coding system did identify changes at these levels but used codes such as write first, think later, proofreading, spelling, reading for meaning, adding text, avoiding repetition, and sounding better (332). In the analysis of the data, Myhill and Jones observed that two thirds of the students claimed to do no revising during writing (332). Rereading the text was used for various reasons by the participants. Some viewed rereading as a strategy to generate ideas. Other participant comments indicated that rereading was used at a local level to make sentences better or to add punctuation. In their findings they stated that the participants’“...conceptualization of revision is principally as a macro strategy, or even a discrete stage in the writing process, which follows textual production” (341). Myhill and Jones admitted that students did “...demonstrate some metacognitive awareness of revision activities...” that over all “...one main obstacle in refining the metacognitive awareness is the lack of a language with which to talk about writing processes and textual possibilities” (340). Myhill and Jones elaborated that “...writing, including revision, is not a set of decontextualized skills to be mastered and deployed but a meaning-making activity, rooted in social contexts, and reflecting power relations between different groups” (325). As Dix did, Myhill and Jones offered some pedagogical implications for writing.

1. Instructional practices should reconceptualize revision from a focus on correction to a broader use of revision across the writing process.(340)

2. Instruction should be attentive to developing metacognitive understanding of revision processes to help writers in using appropriate strategies. (341).
3. Metalinguistic discussion of texts, linguistic structures, and the ways in which linguistic choices can create different meaning-making possibilities can help writers develop language and cognitive structures to solve their “dissatisfaction” problems. (341)

A recurring theme in the findings of these two studies is that surface level changes were the most common and that students had a sense of what revision is, but lacked a way to articulate and execute changes particularly at the macrostructure level. There was also an emphasis of the social aspect of writing that required an intersubjective context. Myhill and Jones foregrounded the social aspect of writing in their study when they stated:

Increasingly, there is recognition that revision is not just a cognitive skill but a socially mediated activity within a construct of writing as social practice, determined and influenced by social, cultural, and historical contexts (Lankshear, 1997; Street, 1995). When students are learning to write, ‘...they learn more than the system of writing.’ ‘They learn about the social practices of language’ (Czerniewska, 1992). In this way, writing, including revision, is not a set of decontextualized skills to be mastered and deployed but a meaning-making activity, rooted in social contexts, and reflecting power relations between different groups. (324-325).

Although recognizing the social, cultural, and historical context of the writing process reflects the social turn to intersubjective theories, this recognition alone has not changed the writing practices of novice students dramatically. Students continue to rely on surface changes rather than changes at the meaning preserving and text base levels where gist and intention are negotiated. It is the act of negotiating that different knowledges converge to create meaning. These knowledges include conventions of writing, past knowledge, personal experience, gist,
and intention, to name a few which are negotiated through text to make meaning. Making these negotiations more explicit, as Dix, Myhill and Jones have suggested, would help students move beyond surface changes.

A third study in 2010 by Humphris was conducted with nine students between the ages of eleven and fourteen. Humphris stated that “Research has found that a lack of metacognitive awareness is the reason why some writers find it difficult to revise effectively or improve their work” (203). She collected think aloud protocols and interview data from the participants. In addition to the data, she implemented an intervention of “writing buddies” to see if this had any impact on the revision strategies of the participants. The results of the case study showed that during the interviews the students understood “…that it is important to improve their writing in order to produce the best work they can” (208). However, the data from the think-aloud protocols “…suggested wide variation in taking up this option” (208). The interview data also showed that “…comments referring to the checking of spelling and punctuation…” were the most common types of comments (208). Humphris also stated that although there was evidence of text base changes “…students often found difficulty in formulating reasons for the changes that they made, suggesting both their relative inexperience in identifying possible change and the need to develop a meta-language in which such changes can be discussed” (208). Humphris identified two areas of development that were required in order for students “…to become more independent and effective revisers of their own writing…” (208).

1. Students needed see revision as recursive at multiple levels throughout the writing process.

2. Students needed to have metacognitive language to talk about their writing. (208)
Based on the results of her case study, most students “...did not, or found it difficult to, articulate clear reason for the revisions they were making, suggesting the need to develop a meta-language that would enable them to discuss, evaluate and justify the choices made in the course of a writing task” (203). Dix, Myhill and Jones and Humphris all conclude that students continue to focus on surface changes rather than meaning preserving or text base changes. All four researchers also stated that the lack of meta-cognitive language makes it difficult for students to understand the meaning preserving and text base change necessary to improve writing.

The concept of negotiating meaning between gist and intention at various levels of revision can provide a meta-cognitive framework from which novice writers can articulate and execute meaning preserving and text base changes. None of the studies has directly addressed the role of negotiating meaning during the revision process i.e. evidence of an intersubjective epistemology instead of a mechanical epistemology. The critical questions posed for this case study of seven first year writing students at a community college on the U.S. Mexico border were

1. How do first year writing students negotiate dissonance between gist and intention?
2. Do students bring other knowledges which create or resolve the gap between gist and intention?
3. Since the move from a product orientation to a process orientation in teaching writing, do students in the 21st century exhibit this change in their writing practices?
Three types of data were gathered as material evidence in addressing these questions. All eight participants screen captured at least two writing sessions. The second type of data was the instructor’s comments for the first drafts of two assignments. The third piece of data was two sets of interviews with the participants. Three participants completed the first interview and two completed the second interview.

The seven participants demonstrated similar writing behaviors as the previous studies on revision. They showed through their writing and interviews that they did not revise beyond the word or phrasal level and were not interested or did not know how to revise at the paragraph and larger text level. In negotiating dissonance, the participants relied more on surface changes than meaning preserving or text base changes. The participants, who were interviewed, also demonstrated a tacit understanding of negotiating meaning through gist and intention, but did not know how to execute a change that would improve their writing i.e. resolve the dissonance between gist and intention. The participants did bring other knowledges to the writing task which was mostly what they had learned about the conventions of writing and their own experiences. As this study suggests, although we speak the language of process in our classrooms, we teach from a product point of view, and this is why students have continued to exhibit the same patterns in revision over the past 30 years and have difficulty making changes beyond the surface level. Even though a theoretical turn from a mechanical epistemology to an intersubjective epistemology occurred over 30 years ago, the writing practices of first year writing students have not changed much, but what has changed is the diverse student population in first year writing courses. This case study provides a look at three distinct groups of students who took a first year writing course. Three entered the class as
college ready, two moved into the class from a developmental course, and two students had taken ESL courses before taking the first year writing course. The discussion of the results of this case study is organized around the three student populations represented in the study.

5.1 College Ready Students

Three of the students who participated in this study placed into the course through a placement exam administered to all new students. Two writing sessions for each participant were available for analysis; however, P01 and P03 only recorded the first draft of two different assignments. P02 recorded the first and second draft of one assignment. The instructor’s comments for the first drafts were gathered for all three participants and P01 and P03 participated in two interview sessions.

5.1.1 P01

The screen captured data showed that P01 made significantly more changes in the first draft of the first assignment than in the first draft of the second recorded assignment.

Graph 5.1. Comparison of Two First Drafts. P01.

---

5 ACCUPLACER was the intuitionally designated tool for determining college readiness at the time of the study.
Graph 5.1 shows that a majority of the changes recorded in the first assignment were at the surface level, particularly spelling and format changes. Of the meaning preserving changes made on the first assignment, the majority were substitutions. At the text base level, most changes on the first assignment were substitutions. On the second recorded assignment, fewer changes were made overall although a majority of these changes occurred at the meaning preserving level rather than the surface level. Some substitutions were made at text base levels in the second assignment although not as many substitutions as in the first recorded assignment. No text base changes at the macro level were made.

The instructor comments for the first assignment by P01 were few compared to the number of comments written on the essays for the other participants. Of the types of comments given, two were given as a code, two were surface changes, and one comment was directed at a meaning preserving level, one at a text base level and one general comment for the essay for a total of seven comments. The surface level comments were “obviously short” and “while your writing skills are excellent, minimum guidelines must be met.” The meaning preserving comment was “Such as?” The instructor was asking for more detail or development and not a change in the overall idea. The text base comment was “Consider expanding with classes/ assignments you are struggling with and/or how dual credit should have been beneficial.” This comment encourages the student to add more ideas to the text. The general comment was “Good writing overall.” P01 was able to participate in the first and second interviews.

Most of the documented changes made by P01 and comments from the instructor fell into surface level changes. However, the interview data showed an understanding of
negotiating meaning in order for the reader to understand. In discussing P01’s overall experience with writing, she stated “Well I think it has actually been pretty good. Because I mean I love to write and read... Because I can remember my teacher telling me that I was like a really good writer. So from then on, I just tried my best.” This comment was significant in that at a young age P01 identified herself as a good writer because of what the teacher had said. For the second question related to how P01 begins to write, she stated that she usually writes the essay out on paper and then types it. This was the process she followed for the two drafts that were recorded. When asked what she did when she revised, her response was “I just fix whatever he tells me to fix and then I go back on the computer and just fix it there.” She also stated “I do make some changes while I am typing to use better words or to add a little more detail.” P01 relied on the authority of the instructor to guide the changes she makes. When asked what the most difficult part of writing was, P01 answered “He told me it wasn’t very well structured...its structure...everything else I did pretty good in.” Again she relied on the authority of the instructor to answer this question. When asked what she thought made a good writer, she responded, “Well pretty much, like being able to make the reader understand what you are trying to say instead of just generalizing...Like actually get into detail and make the reader understand what you are trying to say and what you are trying to get across.” This comment indicated that P01 had an understanding of the negotiation of meaning between the reader and the writer and that the writer needs to be aware of an audience. When asked what has helped her the most with her writing, she responded, “Because I can remember my teacher telling me that I was like a really good writer.” Again, P01 relied on a person in authority or the expert to determine or identify what was good.
In the second interview, P01 watched specific sections of the screen captured recordings. A majority of her comments reflected an understanding of the negotiation of meaning. The negotiations were most often tied to gist and intention. As in, “If I don't like the way it sounds, Yah I just save it and change it back over again...” And, “’Cause I don't... like I said I really think about how it sounds. I'm really picky about how it sounds because I want it to sound really good.” One comment did indicate that P01 recognized a gap in her knowledge when she stated “Because if I don't know how to say things and stuff like that, but I have to think about it and if I don't find a way I think about another way to do it.” The second most common reason why a change was made was tied to the requirements of the essay.

‘Cause I remember he told us something like that.

Yah. Or something like that, ‘cause I know he told us to put a transition paragraph in there.

Only if like the teacher tells us it has to be a certain word, but if it’s not then I don’t look at it.

The third most frequent comment related to writing practices. For P01, she stated that she reread a lot and that she had changed her habit of writing the first draft on paper first and then typing it. Due to the second semester course that required a research paper, she now has started to draft on the computer.

Overall, the changes that P01 made during her writing sessions reflected the tendency to make more surface changes than meaning preserving or text base changes; however, during the second recorded writing session, although few changes were made, more meaning preserving changes and text base changes were made. The instructor’s comments followed a
similar trend in that most of the comments were tied to surface changes. However, in the interview sessions, P01 does exhibit a sense of negotiation of meaning in wanting the reader to understand what she is trying to communicate.

5.1.2 P02

Of the three participants categorized as college ready, P02 was the only one that captured a first and second draft of the same essay.

Graph 5.2. Comparison of Draft and Revision of First Assignment. P02.

Graph 5.2 shows that the trend of changes made between the first and second draft were the same in that a majority of the changes were surface changes of spelling, followed by meaning preserving substitutions, and then surface changes involving punctuation. The number of changes per category was more during the first writing session than in the revision session. No macrostructure text base changes were made.

The instructor comments for P02’s first draft were mostly codes and general comments. Seven comments were codes and seven were general comments. The general comments included, “Yes!” “Yikes!” “Smart move.” “Congrats!” “Good story.” “Be sure to stay in close contact with your parents.” “Good writing overall.” Although P02 did not record a writing
session with another assignment, I did document the instructor’s emailed comments on the third assignment to P02. A total of three comments were given to P02. One was a surface comment, the second a meaning preserving comment and the third a general comment.

**Surface**

“As discussed, you need to avoid 1st person and telling your reader what you are about to do (do not refer to your essay in the essay).”

**Meaning Preserving**

“You were also to supply a bit of textual support’...’ from each”

**General comment**

“I really liked your brief transitional paragraphs between your comparison points.”

Although P02 did confirm the time and day for the first interview, he did not show up. I did try to reschedule the interview, but he never responded. Based on the data gathered, surface changes were more common during all the writing sessions for P02.

5.1.3 P03

The third participant who placed college ready in to the first year writing course demonstrated an overall pattern of changes that focused on surface changes, particularly spelling changes.
Graph 5.3. Comparison of Two First Drafts. P03.

In graph 5.3, the first recorded writing session, showed little to no changes. However, the changes that were made were mostly spelling or format changes and some meaning preserving and microstructure text base substitutions. In the second recorded session, although another assignment, the number of changes increased significantly. In the first recorded assignment, P03 made 13 spelling; however, in the second recorded assignment, 77 spelling changes were recorded. It should be noted that some of the spelling changes were typographical errors since the data was captured from a typed text. The total number of changes across categories in the first draft was thirty. The total in the second recorded draft was 163 changes to include more meaning preserving and text base changes than in the first recorded draft. No text base macrostructure changes were made.

The instructor’s comments on the two drafts were mostly tied to surface comments. On the first draft, 13 out of 23 comments were given by codes, and six comments pertained to surface errors or recommended surface changes. Two general comments were given, one meaning preserving comment and one text base comment. In the second recorded draft, only
two types of comments were sent to P03; four related to surface changes and one to a text base change.

**Surface**

“Well, we know that you vastly improved sentence errors in your in-class essay (awesome!), but we need to see why that didn’t apply to your comparison essay, which you had more time to prepare…”

“Above is an example of a fragment in your essay. Does the sentence after this fragment complete your thought?”

“Check the draft thoroughly, not only for fragments, but also for syntax errors. Make sure every sentence makes sense and is complete.”

“Also avoid 1st person, and do not directly refer to the essay (do not tell your reader what you are about to do).”

**Text Base**

“If Randy had made the right decisions or even if he met the right people.”

The screen captured changes and the instructor comments were very strongly tied to surface changes although there were some comments tied to meaning preserving and text base changes.

As with the data from P01, the screen captured writing sessions and instructor comments focused more on surface changes than meaning preserving or text base changes. However, the interview data demonstrated that P03 did have an understanding of negotiating meaning at different levels. In the first interview, when asked about his overall experience with writing, he stated,
Um ... It kind of depends on the topic

Ok something that I already have some common knowledge about I just start typing... whatever. If it is something that I need to research, I am like what is this? How can I define it? Then once I get the definition of what that is then I'm like I would say it this way. I would say it that way. And then um if I can't get it together like if it a certain format, like I'll kind of see how what I just wrote. If I could put it into that format. If not, do it again.

Like uh... well I have not written anything in like since high school. And it's been two or three years, so I don't remember much, so I'm like just writing down... free writing I guess.

These comments showed that P03 used his knowledge of formatting to describe his experience with writing. He also identified a specific strategy and demonstrated a think aloud process of negotiating the text. When he said, “Then once I get the definition of what that is then I'm like I would say it this way. I would say it that way,” he demonstrated a move between gist and intention. He is trying to negotiate the meaning by establishing an idea within a specific format. Formatting would be an example of using the conventions of writing to frame an argument or idea. When he was asked what he did when he started to write he stated

“Um... I guess once I get the assignment I do the pre-writing.”

“Uh... if it seems kind of simple I mind map with the bubbles. And if it's something oh yah... I know this, I just start the writing. Yah cause uh... like once it clicks, you know, I can connect to my own personal life and it goes on to something... that pertains to the topic.”
“Um... Let's see... uh... the requirements that he wants like uh... let's say he wanted 10 pages... all right from what I wrote, can I make that into 10 pages? Then I need to go back and add.”

“Or if he only wants one page, what do I have to cut out so it meets his requirements.”

P03 showed a clear understanding of writing as a process involving different types of writing activities such as pre-writing and mind mapping. Then he stated, “Once it clicks, you now, I can connect to my own personal life and it goes on to something.” This connection to his personal life and writing is another example of negotiating meaning through gist and intention with the knowledges he brings to writing. Connecting to personal experience motivated the development of a topic. He also had strong references to the requirements of the instructor which are tied to the conventions of writing. He was very aware that page length was part of what he wanted to know before he began to write. When asked, “When you go back and revise, what do you?” he stated

“Umm... uh... being that it's my own work it is hard to find my own mistakes. But I always try to ... but once I get to this point, I try looking at oh... maybe I repeated it.”

“I try looking for it, but sometimes I don't catch it.”

P03 admitted that it was difficult to find what needed to be changed although he showed a commitment to understanding it himself. This is unlike P01 who relied more on the expertise of the instructor.

When asked what the most difficult thing about writing was, P03 stated that “Um... I guess... getting the idea across. ‘Cause uh... besides all the grammatical errors and everything, some people just don’t understand... like huh... what’s he trying to say?” His comment showed
an understanding of the audience and the intersubjective relationship between the reader and the writer. It also showed that there is a negotiation of meaning between what the writer intended and what the gist that the reader gets from the text. Grammaticality was mentioned as a component of communicating an idea clearly, but more important to P03 was making sure the reader understood what he wanted to say. When asked what he thought made a good writer, P03 stated, “Well if it's in a story narrative whatever... it it... the reader has to enter that world that person's created. But let's say it is a newspaper, a professional you have to be informed, so if you got all the information, you don't have any questions at the end of it...that was a good paper.” P03 showed a clear understanding of different types of audiences and that the reader needs to be able to understand the writer in a way that the reader needed to be able to enter the writer’s world.

P03 was asked what he did when he fixed or improved what he had written, and he responded,

“Uh... usually feedback from other people cause like I don't know what you are saying. Oh ok, let me try again.”

“I do peer reviews in class, but usually in high school I would tell my teacher did you understand or whatever...sure”

“I like to try to make it more understandable 'cause usually what I was trying to write didn't make sense to the reader.”

“Well uh....well I look at what I wrote. if it is like very simple like a cat, you know, like I need to make it more interesting. I like my fluffy round cat that you know I've had for years...”
“And if it’s uh... I guess syntax ‘cause I’ve been having problems with syntax in English class.”

“Well first drafts... I don't really bother ‘cause it's a first...I want to see all the wrong things that I did... so you know.... Um... oh it's I guess the weaknesses of the paper.”

“Um... Like uh... you just read it and you get nothing out of it.”

The social aspect of writing that Myhill and Jones identified in their study is evident in the comments made by P03. Getting feedback and making sense to the reader were very important. At the end of his comments he also added that syntax was also part of the revision process because it was a secondary area that he had identified as a problem. The first problem area for him was being understood by the reader. It is interesting that P03 saw the first draft as a way to see where all his mistakes were which he expected would be pointed out by the instructor or a peer. In the process of the interview, P03 made several comments about the instructor’s feedback.

“So I am like ...well the point ... I understand is to you know, you have to fix those...I really didn't care about that. I wanted to know if he understood what you know was going to help my grade.”

“So it was just like that. I really didn't care about the whole syntax thing, ‘Cause you know computers can fix that for you, you know. Oh well you should check that sucker.”

These two comments clearly showed his acknowledgement that surface errors were part of communicating, but that what he really wanted to know was if he had negotiated the dissonance between gist and intention well enough to be understood by the reader. At this point in the interview P03 took out an essay with comments. He stated, “Uh... here this is a
vague help for me. Good but what? So I don't know if he is talking about combining all those sentences that I used or...Or to force that into one big sentence.” P03 struggled with understanding what the instructor’s comments mean and how to fix it. The frustration is at a text base level, but the solution was presented within the context of sentence structure. This was a good example of the student recognizing and wanting to revise, but not knowing how to articulate it other than through changing sentence structure. He ended with “And like that’s...doesn't mean anything to me.” The negotiation of meaning between the instructor and the students was lost.

When P03 was asked about changes to the essay after revision, he summarized the instructor’s comments and then gave a reason why he did not follow the instructor’s suggestions.

“I need to add more because he said it was vague. But the...I didn't do it initially cause it's something personal. I didn't really want to tell him where I worked, but he wanted to know.”

“But well you know the second time I have to add more and more. But as I did that again and it's like adadadada...so I did not check much for the grammar thing.”

“Grammar syntax...so”

P03’s writing at this point showed signs of resistance to the topic and the instructor’s comments. The information that the instructor wanted him to add was too personal. Several times during the two writing sessions, P03 changed registers and began to write to himself because he did not feel the instructor needed to know what he really thought or did. He then went back and changed it again to eliminate his rant in the text. He did this at least once during
each writing session. The trigger for this resistance was on a personal level and a matter of privacy.

P03’s overall view of writing was tied to inspiration and that words can inspire and appeal to our lives. He also described writing as a process that begins with one step and “as long as you can take the first step, you go it.”

“Like uh... like even a quote. Oh like wow that can inspire my life. You know. Like there is one. I just had some, but I can't remember where. I don't know the key to happiness, but I know it's not trying to make everybody else happy.”

“You know that spoke to me. That's a good quote. Yah. You can apply it to life and whatever.”

“But you know like uh... You've seen poster of that cat that says hang in there?”

“That's kind of dumb. But you know I would say that the first quote I said would be more stronger I guess.”

“Well...it’s ‘cuz um...I used to like writing. But due to circumstances, I had to basically quite school after high school.”

“I couldn't focus on it... And it's something you need to practice and practice. And when you stop, you kind of go backwards a little bit.”

“But if I start again, I probably would like it again.”

“Um...easy? Oh... not really ‘cause it's just a process. You start with one step and you continue as long as you take I guess it would be the first step. As long as you take that one, it's normal.”
P03 also tied the idea of writing to “Just how things click.” The words “click” and “making the reader understand” were a common theme among the students who were interviewed.

All three college ready participants made more surface changes than meaning preserving or text base changes. In the second recorded writing session, more meaning preserving and text base changes were made compared to the first recorded writing session. None of them made any macrostructure text base changes. Even though very few text base changes were made, the two participants who were interviewed showed an understanding of the negotiation of meaning and a desire to communicate their thoughts and ideas clearly to the reader. But they also showed a frustration in how to do this effectively and relied on surface changes to negotiate dissonance.

5.2 Developmental English Students

Two participants in the study identified themselves as having taken developmental English courses prior to advancing into the first year composition course. Developmental courses are required if a student does not score college ready on the college placement exam. A developmental English course focuses on basic English skills such as understanding the writing process, short essays, editing skills, sentence structure as well as learning to analyze essays. Neither of these two participants attended the interview sessions. D02 dropped the course the second month of the semester and was only able to record one writing session.

5.2.1 D01

D01 was the only participant who screen captured two assignments with a draft and a revision for a total of four recorded writing sessions. The discussion begins with the first assignment.
Based on the changes documented in graph 5.4, the majority of changes in the first draft were made during the first writing session and the most common change was spelling. Out of 70 changes made during the first writing session, 51 were spelling changes and ten format changes for a total of 61 surface changes. Again it needs to be noted that spelling changes in an electronic text can include typing errors. Three meaning preserving changes were made: one deletion and two substitutions. Six text base changes were made with one deletion and five substitutions. No text base macrostructure changes were made during the first writing session.

The second writing session labeled as the revision of assignment 1, showed a strong decrease in surface changes with a small increase in meaning preserving changes and larger increase in text base changes compared to the first writing session. The total number of surface changes on the second writing session was five during the revision compared to 61 in the first session. The total number of meaning preserving changes was five in the revision writing session compared to three in the first writing session. The total number of text base changes at the microstructure level was 31 in the revision compared to six in the first writing session. This showed an increase
in negotiating meaning beyond surface level changes. This could be due to the comments the instructor gave the student or the student’s willingness to revise at a different level in the second writing session.

The instructor comments documented in table 5.1 on the first draft included ten codes, five comments related to surface changes, four meaning preserving comments, no text base comments and four general comments for a total of 23 comments.

Table 5.1. Instructor Comments on First Draft of First Assignment. D01.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Meaning Preserving</th>
<th>Text Base</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide margins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One thing that is</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>missing is</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sorry – ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular/plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>details and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>examples.</td>
<td></td>
<td>carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR every sentence for grammar errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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There was no strong evidence that the instructor comments prompted more changes at the meaning preserving or text base level during the second writing session of the first assignment. The overall pattern of changes made during the first and second writing session showed that for the first writing session more changes were made at the surface level, and during the second writing session, more changes were made at the meaning preserving and text base level. For this participant, the first year writing course was not the first course at the community college. The student had taken a previous developmental writing course at the community college. This may have influenced the pattern of revision that D01 followed. One of the course objectives from the syllabus for the pre-requisite developmental English course included “Develop writing processes that are appropriate for timed and untimed situations and that include effective strategies related to prewriting, writing, and rewriting” (ENGL 0310 Official Course Syllabus 2010). Based on this objective, the student was exposed to the writing process and given “effective strategies” for revising. So, unlike the college ready students who received their previous writing instruction in high school, D01 had more recently completed a developmental English course and he may have been more cognizant in using these strategies.

The third and fourth recorded writing sessions were based on the third writing assignment given to the class.
Graph 5.5. Comparison of Draft and Revision of Third Assignment. D01.

Graph 5.5 shows that the total number of changes during the draft of the third assignment was 41. Of these, 14 were surface changes, three meaning preserving changes, and 25 text base changes to include one change at the macrostructure level. This was the only macrostructure change found in any of the writing sessions of all the participants. The most frequent change during this writing session was 13 substitution changes at the microstructure text base level.

During the revision writing session for assignment three, the most frequent change was 13 microstructure text base changes. Changes at the text base level were evidence of negotiation since the meaning of the text, the gist of the text is altered to better represent the intention of the writer. D01 showed more willingness to negotiate and revise than any of the other participants. Changes at the text base level have been considered moves made more often by experienced writers than novice writers. D01 demonstrated that although he was required to take a developmental writing course before moving into the first year writing course, the changes he made during the writing sessions incorporated more types of changes made by
experienced writers. But this does not take into account the comments given to D01 by the instructor.

The instructor comments emailed to D01 for the second recorded assignment (third class assignment) were minimal. No codes were used because the comments were not directly tied to the text. Two comments were tied to surface changes. None were recommended meaning preserving changes. One comment recommended a text base change and one comment was a general statement about the writing.

**General Comment**

As previously discussed, there are two areas of concern in your comparison essay. For your progress report, please revise and supply examples of the following:

**Surface comments**

Grammar: verbs and some prepositions

Both couples were worried about their son’s, and looked all the negative parts of the problems. (Proofread)

**Text Base Comment**

You have a 4 paragraph essay. You need to address at least two different points of comparison. How do you distinguish between “worried about the future” and “negative things”? If you cannot, then please create an additional point. Text base comment

None of these comments would on their own generate the amount of changes found at the meaning preserving and text base level during the revision writing session of the third assignment. D01 made more changes across all categories in the writing sessions for assignment three than in the writing sessions for assignment one. And, there was a clear shift
toward more changes at the meaning preserving level and text base level than at the surface level.

5.2.2 D02

The second developmental English participant was a little older than the other participants and expressed a willingness to participate in the study, but she also did not feel very confident about her writing skills. D02 dropped the class two months into the semester and only recorded one writing session and did not attend the interview sessions. The results of the writing session showed that a majority of the changes were made at the surface level as seen in graph 5.6.

![Graph 5.6. Draft of First Assignment. D02.](image)

Of the 86 changes made, 75 were surface level changes. Of these 75, 42 were format changes. In watching the writing session, D02 spent a lot of time setting the margins and adjusting different format changes available on the tool bar of Microsoft Word. Although the majority of changes for the first writing sessions tended to be surface changes for the other participants, the most frequent type of surface change was spelling. This was not the case for D02. Since I
was not able to interview her, I did not know if writing drafts on the computer was a new experience for her. This may have contributed to the higher number of format changes versus spelling changes during her writing session.

The instructor comments on first draft of the first assignment were mostly surface changes. Twelve codes were used and three comments related to surface changes were written on the essay. There were no meaning preserving comments, one text base comments and four general comments for a total of 20 comments as documented in table 5.2.

Table 5.2. Instructor Comments on First Draft of First Assignment. D02.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Meaning Preserving</th>
<th>Text Base</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not a sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe you dedicate a P to the early years of raising 3 babies and not going to school.</td>
<td>• Wow!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Check sentence carefully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Soccer mom!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Awesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good start</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A parallel pattern was not evident from the changes made by the two participants who had previously taken a developmental English course. In fact, they represent two extremes. D01 exhibited the most changes at the meaning preserving and text base level of all the
participants and D02 exhibited the least number of changes at the meaning preserving and text base level.

5.3 ESL Students

Two participants had had courses in ESL before placing into the first year writing course. E01 had moved to the United States at the age of 16 and had taken ESL courses in high school and at the community college level. This participant had also spent time in the military and had recently returned to school. E02 identified himself as ESL, but did not participate in the interviews, so no data was gathered on his ESL experience.

5.3.1 E01

The first ESL participant recorded two writing sessions for the first assignment and attended one interview session. The first writing session for assignment one showed changes across all categories as documented in graph 5.7.

Graph 5.7. Comparison of Draft and Revision of First Assignment. E01. The most frequent changes were substitutions at the meaning preserving level. A total of 91 changes were made on the first draft. Thirty-eight were surface changes, the most being
spelling changes. Forty were meaning preserving changes; the most frequent were 22 substitutions. Only 13 text base changes were made and all at the microstructure level. The revision writing session of the first assignment showed very few changes compared to the first writing session. Only eight changes were made across categories. The most frequent change was four format changes. Based on the number of instructor comments given to E01, more changes would have been expected during the revision writing session. Table 5.3 summarizes the types of comments the instructor wrote on the essay.

Table 5.3 Instructor Comments on First Draft. E01. Assignment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Meaning Preserving</th>
<th>Text Base</th>
<th>General comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• See hand out</td>
<td>• Need to state the thing you regretted</td>
<td>• Need to see more regret (what happened)</td>
<td>• Those bastards! Trick!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wide margins</td>
<td>• Need to see how the classes weren’t taken seriously</td>
<td>• How did the military experiences teach you to take school seriously?</td>
<td>• Good start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not align right margin</td>
<td>• Consider more Army details</td>
<td>• Why did you get out if it was good?</td>
<td>• Glad you are continuing your education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need commas</td>
<td>• Study GGW</td>
<td>• Visit the writing center</td>
<td>• For help with commas and run-ons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some grammar errors</td>
<td>• Commas</td>
<td>• Commas and verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first and only interview with E01 focused on his general perceptions of writing.

When asked about his overall experience with writing, he stated that “…writing…it comes very naturally to me… when I was younger I read a lot…” For E01, writing is a natural phenomenon
and tied to natural abilities. Later in the interview he stated that a good writer is “…someone that is just inspired by the whole idea of what writing because uh...In order to write I good paper I think you just need to be somewhat passionate about what you are writing.” E01 stated that he relied on reading the instructor to begin writing. Reading the instructions served two purposes. One was to understand what the instructor wanted and secondly to know what type of paragraphs needed to be included. When asked about what he did when he revised, E01 stated that

“Like I said I try to read it out loud just to see uh...if there is a sentence there that I am not quite sure if it is right or wrong.”

“I just start to listen to it to see if it fits.”

“And then uh... I usually go to some of the grammar mistakes of that the professor have pointed out in the past.”

“Um...usually commas or I had problems before with a paragraph sentences. And so uh...I try to look into my past mistakes and ... I usually find a couple.”

E01 relied on reading to test the gist of the writing to see if it fits the intention. Secondly, he checked for grammar mistakes, particularly those that had been pointed out in the past. E01 showed similar concerns that P03 showed in the interview. Both demonstrated an understanding of the negotiation of meaning, but did not articulate what that meant. Both identified grammar or syntax as a concern as well and that it needed to be fixed to help the reader understand.
5.3.2 E02

The second ESL participant recorded two writing sessions for the first assignment and the changes made on these two writing sessions are documented in graph 5.8.

![Graph 5.8. Comparison of Draft and Revision of First Assignment. E02.](image)

The first writing sessions included 28 changes. Fifteen changes were surface level changes when all the surface level categories were combined. However, the most frequent change in a single category was meaning preserving substitutions. During the first draft of the first recorded writing session, E02 made more changes at the meaning preserving and text base levels in comparison to the other participants except D01. The second writing session had only ten changes and these were mostly spelling changes followed by punctuation changes and then meaning preserving additions and deletions. No text base changes were made during the revision writing session.

The instructor’s comments that focused on the first draft of the assignment followed a similar pattern, in that; most comments were tied to surface changes. Eleven codes were used along with five comments addressing surface changes. Four comments focused on meaning
preserving and two on text base changes. One general comment was written on the essay as seen in table 5.4.

Table 5.4. Instructor Comments on First Draft of First Assignment. E02.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Meaning Preserving</th>
<th>Text Base</th>
<th>General comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grammar</td>
<td>• Too vague</td>
<td>• Stop on a moment</td>
<td>• Good general start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Punctuation</td>
<td>• Time to give specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commas</td>
<td>• Such as?</td>
<td>• Need to show us the regret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conclude on page 3</td>
<td>• Need examples/details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Check every sentence carefully for errors...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Summary of Findings

Based on the recorded screen captured sessions, there was evidence that students were willing to make changes. Graph 5.9 is a summary of all the changes made during the writing sessions. Out of fifteen recorded writing sessions 889 changes were made by all the participants. Over 50% (449) of the changes were made while writing the first draft. This demonstrated evidence of the nonlinear recursive nature of writing. During all the writing sessions, changes were made at all levels. In addition, the data showed that the instructor
comments did not necessarily prompt all the changes the participants made when they went to revise their drafts. Graph 5.9 also confirms that students were willing to make changes. All but two participants made more changes during the initial writing session of the assignment. P03 and D01 made more changes during the revision session than the initial drafting session.

Graph 5.9. Comparison of Changes Made in All Drafts and Revisions.

This discussion ends with an overview of all the changes. Graph 5.10 shows that more changes were made in spelling than any other category and that surface changes overall were the most frequent type of change.
The second most frequent changes were meaning preserving substitutions across all participants. However, the students who moved into the course from a developmental English course made more microstructure and macrostructure text base changes in total than the college ready students or ESL students which are summarized in table 5.5.
Table 5.5. Summary of Text Base Changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Base Changes</th>
<th>College Ready</th>
<th>Developmental</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro Additions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Deletions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Substitutions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro Additions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the developmental students had four recorded sessions whereas the other participants only had two or one recorded session which would skew the frequency numbers. Another contributing reason that the developmental English students had more changes in addition, deletions and substitutions could be the recent instruction and practice in writing from the previous developmental course. As noted earlier, the syllabus for the developmental course included an objective that specified strategies for rewriting. The college ready students did make frequent microstructure substitution changes but less additions or deletions than the developmental English students. The ESL students made very few text base changes compared to the other two groups.

The third and fourth most common changes were format and punctuation changes. The ESL participants made fewer changes over all types of changes but demonstrated evidence of all the category changes except text base macrostructure change.
In addition to the data presented thus far, I need to note that none of the participants reread their writing from the beginning to end once they completed the final paragraph. Rereading was identified as a key strategy used by the participants in Myhill and Jones’ study.
Implications and Conclusions

This case study attempted to examine the writing practices of first year writing students in order to survey the direction of their writing practices. Based on the collection of data, I argue that the negotiation of meaning is evident at several points. These points include surface, meaning preserving and text base changes. Although the surface level changes rely more on mechanical rules, meaning is made with regard to correctness through the use of correct spelling, tense, formatting and punctuation which are the conventions of writing, and this is a type of negotiation. Surface level changes are necessary to access the meaning of the text, but by themselves do not represent the total knowledge or understanding needed to negotiate meaning. Changes made at the meaning preserving level demonstrated moves to preserve the meaning through the back and forth movement between gist and intention within the boundaries of the conventions of writing as shown in Figure 5.1.

![Figure 5.1. Intention and Gist.](image-url)
Gist is defined as the overall meaning the text conveys to the writer or reader and intention is the purpose or meaning the writer intended. At the meaning preserving level, there is very little dissonance between gist and intention because the changes preserve the meaning of the text. It is at the text base level that dissonance is more obvious because these changes reflect a change in the overall idea or meaning of the text. It is at this level that the changes are material evidence of negotiation of meaning between gist and intention to resolve dissonance.

Myhill and Jones called for a more inclusive concept of revision that moved students beyond the dependence of surface changes alone. Do we speak the language of process, but teach with the language of product in the writing classroom? Based on the results of this study of community college first year writing students and studies recently completed with elementary and secondary writing students, students understand that writing is a process and that changes need to be made, but the way in which meaning is negotiated relied more on surface level changes in revision than meaning preserving or text base changes. Secondly, the comments from the interviews showed that students relied on surface level changes to reduce dissonance; however, they acknowledged that there was more to writing than knowing the rules. Some of the participants also acknowledged the social aspect of writing. For one participant, receiving feedback was an important step of revision. The instructor’s comments that were available indicated that the instructor also relied on surface level comments more than any other type of comment for revision. This has implications for pedagogy. If students are expected to negotiate meaning beyond the surface changes, then what we say and do in the classroom needs to mirror these expectations. Students need to be shown explicitly how to add, delete and substitute at the meaning preserving and text base levels. Although theory has
made the turn from a mechanical epistemology to an intersubjective epistemology, the changes that students made in this case study were dominated by mechanical rather than intersubjective types of changes. However, I would argue that even mechanical changes have an impact in making meaning. I am not advocating the elimination of teaching the conventions of writing because first year writing students are novice writers and do need to learn the conventions of writing. However, the conventions of writing are a heuristic frame in which the negotiation of gist and intention play out. Students need to learn the moves that will help them negotiate dissonance between gist and intention to include meaning preserving and text base changes. Instead of assuming that students will eventually get the gist of revision, explicit models of addition, deletion and substitution at the meaning preserving and text base level should be used with novice students.

Understanding how the negotiation of meaning occurs as students read and write can help develop strategies for revision. Rereading is a revising activity that triggers revision as noted by the study done by Myhill and Jones. Rereading can trigger new ideas, help students put thoughts into words and serve to revise and evaluate what has been written (334). Hirvela stated in his book Connecting Reading and Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction that often times “writing problems can be traced to reading” and that “reading and writing depend on many of the same composing processes” (1-2). Reading and writing have an intersubjective relationship which involves negotiating meaning between a text and the reader. This includes making connections to personal experience, general knowledge or specific acquired knowledge. As noted earlier, none of the participants reread their text from beginning to end. By the time a writing session ended, students had spent one to two hours composing and completing the last
paragraph was like crossing the finish line, a linear view of the writing process. Recognizing the symbiotic relationship between reading and writing can help to develop revision strategies to resolve the dissonance between gist and intention.

Learning to annotate a text is one strategy that makes the negotiation of meaning explicit to students while rereading the text. Annotating is an intersubjective activity. It requires the reader to interact with the text at multiple levels by identifying the main ideas, asking questions, tracing the develop of an idea through a text, summarizing points, adding explanations, or considering opposing views to name a few annotating activities (The Writing Process/ Invention: Annotating a Text,1-2). Students can learn how to write down questions in the margins that occur to them while they are reading. If something is not clear, they can note this. If they make a connection to knowledge they already have, this can be noted as well in the margins. Although annotating is labeled as an invention strategy, it provides explicit practice of intersubjective approaches that can help students develop revision strategies at the meaning preserving and text base levels. The same skills used to annotate a text can be transferred to the revising practices.

In addition to annotating, a retooling of the strategies used in peer review can help develop the concepts of negotiation of dissonance between gist and intention. Currently many peer review sessions are guided by pre-formed or standardized questions that can be found at the end of a writing textbook or have been developed by the instructor. The way in which these questions were developed do not always reflect any ties to the specific text being reviewed, but are general in nature which seems to undermine and limit the intersubjective action between the reviewer and the text. The questions lend themselves to perfunctory answers that often
touch surface level changes but do not encourage meaning preserving or text base changes for revision. One option is to call peer review an annotation exercise. Students are often confused by the jargon terms used by different disciplines. Peer review and annotating are similar activities and the transfer of knowledge between annotating and peer review can strengthen the peer review activity. But developing an intersubjective strategy requires students to be familiar with the hierarchical changes made in revision. The categories of surface, meaning preserving and text base level changes can provide a hierarchical framework for students to use in the peer review process. Novice writers struggle with hierarchical relationships within a text. Hierarchical relationships refer to main ideas and supporting details, unity, cohesion and the gist and intention of the text thus providing a meta-cognitive language for students to discuss the different types of revision changes. In addition, using annotation activities needs to be modeled for students. With technology like screen capture software and document cameras with a video function, instructors can demonstrate these types of revision changes within the context of composing a text rather than as an isolated lesson.

Rereading can also be incorporated into a conference session with the instructor. Student conferences are standard best practices among writing instructors. What occurs during the conference can vary depending on the instructor. If the participants in this study represent typical behaviors in that students rarely reread what they wrote, rereading can be included as part of the student. The student can lead the conference by reading the text aloud with the instructor. I have found that when I use this strategy with students, they often begin the negotiation process out loud in discussing what they see needs to be revised.
Further studies need to be conducted that include more data on instructor comments. One aspect of this case study that did not materialize was the screen captured comments of the instructor. A follow up study should include several instructors along with five to six students from each instructor. A better comparison could then be made of the negotiation of gist and intention between the first draft, instructor comments, and the revision draft. Secondly, the interviews of the participants need to occur sooner after the recorded writing sessions. This would require a quick turnaround in documenting and transcribing the changes made during the writing sessions.

The participants in this case study showed that they had a tacit understanding of the negotiation of dissonance and used previous knowledges connected to writing and revising during their writing sessions. At the surface level, the conventions of writing were presented to students as discrete items of knowledge outside the context of a text and then students applied these conventions to their own writing. This was a relatively easy transfer. However, the participants also relied on these same conventions to address other levels of meaning making in that if a sentence did not “sound right” or did not “fit,” they relied on grammar or syntax as a means of resolving the dissonance. Meaning preserving and text base changes remained elusive to students. The concept of negotiating dissonance between gist and intention at various levels of revision can provide a meta-cognitive framework from which novice writers can articulate and execute meaning preserving and text base changes.
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