University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

1992

Revising and editing in writing workshops : teacher-student conferencing, peer conferencing, self-conferencing

Miriam Baker
University of Northern Iowa

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you]

Recommended Citation

Baker, Miriam, "Revising and editing in writing workshops : teacher-student conferencing, peer conferencing, self-conferencing" (1992). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2010.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2010

Revising and editing in writing workshops : teacher-student conferencing, peer conferencing, self-conferencing

Abstract

In the past ten years there have been major changes in the area of writing instruction. Calkins (1986), Graves (1983), Atwell (1987) and others have promoted the writing process where students choose to write about their own topics, conference about their work with teachers and peers, make revisions, edit, and publish. The process is often called Writers' Workshop with the emphasis placed on the individual writer's interests, skills, and needs. It has become an integral part of the Whole Language approach to the teaching of reading and writing.

Revising and Editing in Writing Workshops:

Teacher-Student Conferencing

Peer Conferencing

Self-Conferencing

A Graduate Project

Submitted to the

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Miriam Baker

July 1,1992

This Research Paper by : Miriam Baker
Entitled: Revising and Editing
          in Writing Workshops:
          Teacher-Student Conferencing,
          Peer Conferencing,
          Self-Conferencing

has been approved as meeting the research paper
requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Education.

7/4/94
Date Approved

Ned Ratekin
Director of Research Paper

7/4/94
Date Approved

Ned Ratekin
Graduate Faculty Advisor

Deborah L. Tidwell

7/4/92
Date Approved

Graduate Faculty Reader

Peggy Ishler

7/4/92
Date Approved

Head, Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

INTRODUCTION

In the past ten years there have been major changes in the area of writing instruction. Calkins (1986), Graves (1983), Atwell (1987) and others have promoted the writing process where students choose to write about their own topics, conference about their work with teachers and peers, make revisions, edit, and publish. The process is often called Writers' Workshop with the emphasis placed on the individual writer's interests, skills, and needs. It has become an integral part of the Whole Language approach to the teaching of reading and writing.

One of the goals of the Writers' Workshop is for students to take ownership of their writing. The teacher becomes a facilitator who guides the writing process and gives continuous feedback during revising and editing. Another goal is that the focus is on the process that students use when they write. Initially, there is a great emphasis on content in the writing process. Mechanics becomes more important as a piece

reaches the final published state.

The number of steps in the writing process vary with the instructor. Those described here include 1) prewriting, 2) drafting, 3) revising, 4) editing, and 5) publishing. They often do not follow a linear sequence, but are interwoven as the writer sees the need. Teachers are involved with the students in each of the steps. This gives the teacher an opportunity to be aware of the pace of each student. Teacher-student conferences and peer conferences can take place in both the revising and editing steps. Initially in the prewriting step, students are encouraged to create lists of interests and topics that they know about. Other pre-writing activities include sharing of books and story ideas with partners or small groups. Instructors also use pictures, student created art, or story starter ideas for variety in the pre-writing step. Sometimes the instructor will introduce a writing skill or form of writing and encourage the students to create a piece of their own using the same format. Examples of this would be use of dialogue and correct punctuation in prose or a specific poetry structure such as cinquain.

Following direct instruction, students apply the

skills in the context of their own writing. Later in the revising or editing steps, these skills are reinforced in teacher-student conferences.

During the drafting step the students have time to think and write. Then they may choose to read their writing aloud "to the wall". Students go to an area where they can read their work aloud so that they can hear how it sounds. Students may also choose to share their ideas or first draft with a partner.

Prior to the revision step students decide if they want to continue working on a piece or put it aside. If they put it aside, they return to step one and select a new topic to write about. If they decide to continue on with their story, they make revisions and rewrite the piece to include any changes. A teacher-student conference could take place at this point.

The students are then ready for the fourth step of editing with a partner. After they make any further changes, they conference with the teacher. In a teacher-student conference, the teacher has several options. The students can read their stories aloud to the teacher who highlights positive areas in the content, questions portions that are unclear, and

makes suggestions. The teacher might also read the story silently more than once and then choose one or two skill areas to reteach or reinforce. These skill areas could be topics recently covered in class or specific skills that the individual child needs to improve.

In the fifth step, the publishing stage, students make a final copy of their work and decide how they wish to share it with others. The teacher may assign a class publishing date when all students must have a piece finished, or students can publish at their own individual pace.

The implementation of the Writers' Workshop is unique to each instructor and classroom. Therein lies the challenge of refining the effectiveness of the process. Individual teachers need to develop the steps of the Writers' Workshop in ways that work for them in their classrooms.

This research paper will explore ways teachers can become more effective in facilitating the Writers' Workshop. It will deal particularly with the management of time spent in conferencing, teacher-student conferencing techniques and the training of students to conference with their peers and

themselves. There will be a review of current thought on the use of time and conferencing in the writing workshop process and also a description of and reflection on personal experiences in implementing the Writers' Workshop.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Two steps of the writing workshop, revising and editing, encourage writers to seek input from others through a peer conference or a teacher-student conference. When writers discuss their work with peers or teachers they have opportunities to look at their materials in different ways and make decisions about how they want their final draft to be. Students and teachers need guidance in conferencing with each other so that the writers will receive the most benefit from peer or teacher-student conferences. Not only will students benefit from conferencing with others, but the final goal is for students to be able to look at their own writing more objectively.

In the writing workshop, students frequently need individual guidance when writing on their own topics, at their own pace. The teacher-student conference is a way to reach writers at the point where they are interested in learning how to change or improve their work. During the writing workshop block, time for teacher-student conferences is at a premium. Teachers need to have meaningful interactions with students about their work in progress, meet with as many

students as possible, and monitor the rest of the class all in a short amount of time. Teachers and researchers have experimented with effective ways to meet these needs. Two areas to consider are the amount of time teachers spend conferencing with individual students and the techniques teachers can demonstrate which will encourage writers to look at their own work objectively in the writing workshop block.

Teachers need to demonstrate conference techniques with their students and give them many opportunities to practice these skills with one another so that they can ultimately internalize those techniques when conferencing with themselves. Two important factors emerge, managing the time in the classroom to conference with peers or teacher and effective methods of conferencing.

Time Management

In <u>Writing: Teachers and Children At Work</u> (Graves, 1983) the conference approach was stressed to the point where teachers felt they should be having lengthy all-encompassing conferences with each child

about each piece. This is not realistic. Graves
(1991) now suggests that in many encounters with
children the basic conference essentials should be:
1. Where did the piece come from? 2. Where is it now?
3. Where is it going? Many conferences can be kept
short because the teacher focuses on single issues and
lets the child do most of the talking. He also
recommends group conferences where demonstrations and
modeling of conference techniques can be observed by
the students. Then they can practice these techniques
to become effective at helping each other in their
writing.

A thirty-seven minute framework for conferencing
was recommended by Graves (1983). The first ten
minutes--give immediate help to six or seven students
as seen in folders checked the night before. The next
fifteen minutes--regularly scheduled conferences where
the teacher sees students on the same day each week
for discussion of progress. The next twelve minutes--
individual conferences with four or five students who
are at an important stage. This could possibly be
done in a group. Conferences can be shortened by
choosing one skill to highlight and teach.

Other research has confirmed a shorter time frame

for effective conferencing. Gaesser (1990) outlined three types of conference approaches of varied lengths that could be implemented. The first two are teacher-initiated while the third is student-initiated.

1. Short formal or informal conferences--30 seconds to 3 minutes. "How is it going?" With teacher guidance and suggestions the child decides what is needed in a piece of writing.

2. Scheduled conferences--5 to 10 minutes. This type is more in-depth, concentrating on only certain skills.

3. Student-initiated conferences--5 to 10 minutes. The student decides when to ask for a conference.

Butler and Turbill (1987) describe conferences as a brief discussions with the writer to give individual support and guidance at the child's point of need. They recommended meeting with each student at least once a week.

In essence, individual teacher-student conferences need to be thirty seconds to ten minutes in length with the majority in the three to five minute range. This length forces teachers to key in on one or two important skills rather than to overwhelm

the writer with many suggestions. The shorter length
also frees teachers to make contact with many
different students in one writing session. Teachers
need to be predictable in frequency of contact. The
conference, whatever the length, needs to be child-
centered with the teacher offering options and
possible solutions to specific writing problems.

Methods of Conferencing

Methods of teacher and peer response to student
work can be in several forms. Students could read
their work aloud while the teacher or peer listens.
Listening to the students ideas and work is a form of
response as is an oral or written response from the
teacher.

Listening to a student's work dignifies the piece
and gives the teacher an opportunity to hear how it
sounds without the distraction of seeing the paper
where spelling or other mechanical errors might
interfere with the teacher's focus on content. The
teacher would then retell the story to the student.
In this way students would know if their meaning was
clearly understood.

In responding to student work, teachers need to be listeners. They need to listen for the content of the writing as well as for ways to help students with specific skills. While listening to the student's work, the teachers are also modeling a way that students could listen and respond in peer conferences. Active listening is the most important feature of all conferences, especially content conferences. The listener should be able to retell what was shared and then make comments (Calkins, 1983).

In their research, Fitzgerald & Markham (1987) used an interview format to determine the students' revision concerns. The very act of sitting with individual students and questioning them about their work gives the students more time to consider what they have written and see areas where additional clarification could be made.

Teacher or peer listening and oral response complement each other. Immediate feedback in teacher-student conferences will frequently be verbal with perhaps a few notes or highlighted areas for students to consider. "I try to demonstrate specifically by noting particular words or ideas that grabbed my attention or specific places where clarity is needed.

Being a helpful responder requires very concentrated listening; it is a difficult task which must be carefully modeled before one can expect students to try it." (Routman, 1991, p. 56.)

In the teacher-student conference the teacher could use the Praise, Question, Polish format (Lyons, 1981). This conferencing method encourages students to listen to one another, repeat the main ideas, find positive portions to praise, ask questions about things they don't understand, and make suggestions that writers might want to consider when polishing or preparing to publish their work. Students could also choose to share their writing with a partner or small group for Praise, Question, Polish comments.

Calkins (1983) suggested that teachers should be specific in praise or questions that promote student thought and interaction. Appropriate questions are: 1. What kinds of problems do you run into during writing? 2. How do you solve them? 3. What changes did you make between the first and final drafts? 4. How did you go about making them? 5. Why did you make changes 6. What are you planning to do next?

Several researchers (Russell, 1983, Calkins, 1983, Dudley, 1989) taught their students conferencing

skills they could use with each other. Russell (1983) started by asking volunteers to read their drafts orally. Then she asked questions regarding the content of the writing such as: "What is your favorite part?", "Does your lead sentence 'grab' your audience?" or "What do you plan to do next with this piece?" (Russell, 1983, p. 335). After she had modeled this, she asked students in the group to ask similar questions. The class formulated a list of basic questions that could be asked. As a way of controlling the movement within the room, she designated three conference centers. Students asked permission to conference and took their basic list of questions with them to a conference center.

Calkins (1983) suggests using the mini-lesson portion of the writing block to teach these peer conferencing skills. Routman (1991) stresses teacher demonstration or modeling of these skills. Students then need to practice conferencing with one another to refine the process so they can help one another and ultimately themselves.

One of the Peer/Group Conferences Nathan (1989) suggests is a Revision Conference where partners follow a conference guide and questions (Appendix A).

Appendix B is an example of another format called an Editing Conference where writers can use a proofreading checklist or ask partners to look for editing changes that the writer may not have noticed.

Some researchers like Nathan (1989) feel that paired conferences, whether with peers or teacher, should have a format to follow. A guide could also be used when students revise and edit their own work. A guideline for "Having a Conference with Yourself" has been suggested by Atwell (1987). (Appendix C). A simplified checklist is shown in Appendix D. This could be used in lower grades or as a quick-check.

An alternative to partner or peer conferencing could be a "Writer's Circle" (Calkins, 1983, p. 111) where children in groups of three or four would take turns reading their work aloud and receiving responses or questions. Gere & Abbott (1985) also suggested peer conference group interactions similar to cooperative learning strategies. The students met in groups of four to six students and followed the "teacherless writing group" model outlined by Peter Elbow (1973). There was a specific structure that students were taught and several members of the group had definite jobs such as

leading the group, listening, or writing responses. Groups observed the following rules:

1. The writer reads the same selection aloud twice, taking a short break between the two readings.

2. The writer does not comment on or apologize for the selection read.

3. Listeners, who have no copy of the manuscript, make notes between readings, and during the second reading but not during the first.

4. After the first reading, the listeners write a general impression response which summarizes the meaning of the reading for them. During the second reading the listeners take detailed notes on the language of the selection, noting what they especially like and dislike.

5. Each listener, following an order established either by the group leader or by discussion, offers comments on the selection read, and the writer notes all comments for later reference.

6. The time available to the group is

divided by the number of participants so
each has an equal share, and steps one
through five are repeated until all
participants have read their work.

Student groups could be tape recorded for further
analysis by the teacher or individual students. This
would free the teacher to move around the room while
still having the opportunity to monitor the group. It
could also serve to keep the group members focused, or
be shared with absent members to bring them up to
date. The group members could also listen to their
previous discussions at the beginning of the next
session to review or clarify their statements.

In the teacher/student conference, teachers are
often expected to respond immediately to student work.
One author echoed my sentiments regarding initial
responses to student work. "I find it impossible to
give any but a superficial response to a paper that I
only hear, even it I hear it twice. I need to be able
to see the words on the page and to reread sections as
necessary." (Dudley, 1989, p. 30). Teachers can give
students thorough feedback and pinpoint specific
skills that need attention when they take time to see

the student's work as well as hear it. This could be accomplished by asking students to turn in their drafts one day prior to their teacher-conference time. Teachers would then be able to read, reread, and make written comments ahead of time. When the teacher-student conference takes place teachers can carry on a more thoughtful discussion with students in a shorter amount of time.

Many teachers are able to give more concrete suggestions when they write responses and options to student work. This also models a revising and editing technique that the students could use. Researchers suggested respecting the student's writing by putting comments on a separate sheet of paper which could be attached to the work (Mashek-Smith, 1989; Froese, 1991).

In a written version of the partner conference called "Quiet Share" (Calkins, 1983, p. 111), each writer would find readers who would read his/her piece and write a response on an attached index card. This strategy could be used within one classroom, between classrooms in one building, or even between buildings or grade levels.

The methods of conferencing discussed here include listening to student work, oral response, and written response. The strategies described can be used in both teacher-student and peer conferences and help student writers think about and improve their writing skills. Emphasis is placed on teacher demonstration of techniques as well as opportunities for student practice. These methods will be more successful when modeling and practice have taken place.

The preceding review of professional thought centers on two elements of the Writers' Workshop, management of time for conferencing and methods of conferencing. The amount of time devoted to individual teacher-student conferences is determined by the type of help the writer needs at a given point. Writers may need just a quick question, "How are you doing?" or "What are you writing about today?" to get them motivated. This would take no more than one to two minutes. At other times writers need a conference of five minutes or more on content, sequence, revision, or editing. Teachers can make the teacher-student conference more meaningful by considering the ways they respond. How teachers listen to students

and what they say and write about student work can
have a positive impact when conferencing with
students. When students see conferencing techniques
demonstrated and then have many opportunities to
practice in groups and pairs, they grow as writers as
well as helping their peers.

"The ultimate goal in the process of revision
is to help writers critically assess their on
writing. In order to do that, writers must
see teachers modeling revision strategies and
then practice these questioning techniques
with their peers so they can internalize the
process for their own use." (Beach, 1986).

DESCRIPTION OF ACTION RESEARCH, RESULTS, AND

DISCUSSION

After analyzing the research, I chose nine possible actions that could be compatible with my classroom management and my fifth grade students. The actions and their results are discussed here.

Time Management

Applied Action 1

Set up a rotating schedule so that students and teachers know when to expect conference contacts (Graves, 1983) and vary the length of conferences so that more students can be reached frequently (Gaesser, 1990; Graves, 1983).

Results and Discussion

Hour long blocks of writing time were scheduled at least three times a week. The class roster of twenty-three students was divided into six sections so that I could meet briefly with three or four students per day. At this meeting we discussed their topic, a skill to apply, or their progress on a story. At the beginning of each class period I also determined if there were students who were ready to meet with me for a longer time to revise or edit a piece they were preparing to publish. I met with those students for a longer period of time following the first set of brief conferences. When I varied the length of the conference I felt that I could reach more students and spend more time with those who were ready for a revision or editing conference. This helped students to be accountable for their work as they knew I would be meeting with them at least every one and one-half to two weeks.

Applied Action 2

Have one fourth of the class leave their
writing folders on their desks Monday through
Thursday as they leave. This would give a
manageable amount of material for the teacher
to look through daily to note areas of need
(Graves, 1983).

Results and Discussion

Some weeks I asked four to five students per day
to leave their writing folders on their desks when
they left for the day. This helped me assess the
quantity as well as the quality of the students' work.
I then had uninterrupted time after school to look
through the folders for topic choices, amount of
writing accomplished, and areas of need.

Students were encouraged to indicate any recent
work they wanted me to be sure to see. This is
another form of accountability which could be
alternated with the rotating schedule described in
Applied Action 1.

Applied Action 3

Request that students put piece to be
published in designated Conference Basket
when they want to have a teacher-student
conference. Teachers then have time to
look at it carefully prior to the conference
(Nathan, 1989; Gaesser, 1990; Dudley, 1989).

Results and Discussion

I asked students put their rough drafts in a
Conference Basket at least one day before they wanted
to meet with me for a conference. This indicated to
me that they were ready for a teacher-student
conference. I took time outside of Writers' Workshop
to look at and think about the students' writing so
that I had constructive comments and suggestions for
them the next day. When I was able to read over the
stories at my own pace I was able to see the overall
progress of individuals. This helped me to decide
which revising or editing comments would be of most
benefit when I conferenced with the students.

Conference Techniques

Applied Action 4

Hold group conferences for students with
particular needs (Graves, 1983, 1991).

Results and Discussion

Group conferences were held for handwriting
needs, punctuation of dialogue, and peer editing
skills. It was difficult to make time to meet with
small groups when I also needed to monitor the entire
group and meet with individuals. This strategy could
be more useful by incorporating it into reading skills
groups. Another suggestion might be to set aside one
day a week to work with groups or plan to meet with
one different group each day of Writers' Workshop.

Applied Action 5

Model listening and questioning strategies

including Praise, Question, Polish, (PQP)

with individuals, small, and large groups

(Calkins, 1983; Graves, 1991; Routman, 1991;

Lyons, 1981).

Results and Discussion

Direct modeling for peer conference took place as

part of the lesson format. At the beginning of the

year I spent time establishing my expectations for

peer conferencing and modeling examples of listening

to the writer's story and responding with the PQP

format. Following demonstrations, the students were

given opportunities to practice these skills.

Throughout the year periodic modeling and practice

took place.

Modeling also took place each time the teacher

held individual teacher-student conferences. As

students took part they were also hearing comments and

questions that they could use as they conferenced with

their peers.

When the teacher-student conference began I asked the students to tell me about their writing. This gave me a quick overview and helped me to focus on the main ideas when I listened to their work. After I listened to the story I retold what I heard. I pointed out two or three things that I particularly liked as the Praise part of PQP. Then I asked questions about sections that I didn't understand. Finally, I made suggestions that the students could consider when revising.

In the upper grades, students frequently write stories that are several pages long. I often have the students share just the first page or two and we highlight PQP on just that section. Students can then finish revising or editing their paper by using a similar format with a peer or on their own. I can meet with them again to see what changes they have made and if they have followed skill suggestions emphasized when we met previously.

Applied Action 6

Make all written comments regarding student
work on a separate sheet of paper which is
attached to the writer's piece (Mashek-Smith,
1989; Froese, 1991).

Results and Discussion

When reading student work, I used a separate
sheet of paper or Post-It notes to write comments or
suggestions. At other times I asked the students'
permission to add notes, punctuation, or spelling
corrections on their papers. When discussing the
writing directly with the students I asked if they
would mind if I made suggested changes on their paper.
When I read student papers outside of class time I
made notes on a separate sheet of paper. These notes
helped me when I sat down with the student. Students
could also read through my notes and then ask about
areas that were of concern to them.

I would emphasize that students skip every other
line on their drafts so that they can make changes

more easily. Students could also number the lines of
writing before putting the paper in the Conference
Basket (Applied Action 3). This would make it easier
to refer to specific areas on a separate sheet.

Applied Action 7

Demonstrate use of revision/editing guides
(Appendix A, B, C, D) that students can
follow as they conference with one another
(Atwell, 1987; Nathan, 1989; Russell, 1983).

Results and Discussion

I made copies of revision/editing guides and
discussed them with the entire class. The students
saw me model conferences using the guides and they
also practiced using the guides or sets of questions
in small groups as I circulated around the room.

Applied Action 8

Set up "Writer's Circle" where children can volunteer to take turns reading their work aloud and receiving responses or questions (Calkins, 1983, p. 111). Teach cooperative learning strategies that can be adapted to the writing workshop (Elbow, 1973; Gere & Abbott, 1985).

Results and Discussion

I used a cooperative learning format similar to that described previously on page 16-18 of the Review of Literature. Individual students read their work aloud and the rest of the students in that group participated in the response portions. Discussion prior to the activity centered on appropriate, positive responses. I was pleased with the respect the students gave one another during this time. They listened quietly and had positive comments or questions.

At various sessions students were either required or had the option of reading their work aloud. In the

optional format some students chose to share frequently while others never did. If needed, students were limited to sharing once every two weeks, sharing a piece just once, or having a time limit of five minutes. If several groups were meeting at once, I used a tape recorder with one or two groups to help me monitor their discussions.

Applied Action 9

Set up a "Quiet Share" where writers find readers who will read their piece and write a response on an attached index card (Calkins, 1983, p. 111).

Results and Discussion

"Quiet Share" was used after a publishing week when everyone had a published story. Individual comment sheets were attached to each story and students were asked to read and comment on as many stories as they could. There was a discussion about appropriate comments and questions. Students were expected to write praise or questions in a positive

form.

Students were asked to silently read and respond to as many stories as time permitted. Emphasis was placed on writing positive responses. The class suggested comments which could be made such as: "I liked the part where..." or "There was lots of action in your story." etc. The readers could also write questions they had about the story. The students were asked to initial their responses.

As we began I handed each student a story. They were to read and respond to it and then take it to a central location in the room and pick up another to take back to their seats. The class spent approximately one-half hour on this activity and most stories had three to four comments. In scanning the responses I found that many students had made specific references to something they liked in the story. Some had written, "I liked it." or a similar general comment. As time permitted later in the day I noticed students reading stories they had not been able to read earlier. The writers were also eager to see what others had said about their work.

CONCLUSION

This action research gave me an opportunity to concentrate on use of time management and conferencing techniques in the writing workshop. I experimented with ways to manage the time and activities within the writing workshop block and make more effective use of the time in teacher-student conferences.

I used a variety of individual and group activities described here to ascertain my students' needs. This kept the Writers' Workshop interesting for the students and gave them opportunities to show their skills in different ways. One aspect of the activities described here is the emphasis on accountability for me as well as the students.

By taking the time to conduct teacher-student conferences I gained the trust of the students and learned more about their individual needs. When I took time to respond to their work orally or in writing it conveyed to them the importance of what they were doing. They grew more confident and began to make suggestions or see areas where they might want to change their work.

Direct modeling of conference strategies is an

important factor in a successful Writers' Workshop. It is most effective when combined with frequent opportunities for students to practice the skills with one another. Conferences about writing, whether they be teacher-student, peer, or individual will be most meaningful when teachers and students have observed and practiced the skills so that they feel very comfortable.

The most successful strategies were to vary the length of the teacher-student conference and have students leave work out to be assessed on a rotating basis or when they were ready to publish. Other activities that worked well were use of the "Writer's Circle" where students shared their work orally, and having a "Quiet Share" with published pieces. An area that needs further refinement is the organization of group skills conferences.

The Writers' Workshop format is an ever evolving process of taking writers from where they are and encouraging them to become more self-directed. Through careful management of time and the development of effective conference procedures teachers will find the Writers' Workshop to be a productive way to enhance the learning process for students.

REFERENCES

Atwell, N. (1987). <u>In the Middle. Writing,
Reading and Learning with Adolescents</u>.
Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Boynton/Cook
Publishers, (Heinemann Educational Books,
Inc.).

Beach, R. (1986). Demonstrating techniques for
assessing writing in the writing conference.
<u>College Composition and Communication</u>, <u>37</u>
(1), p. 56-65.

Butler, A. and Turbill, J. (1984). <u>Towards a
Reading-Writing Classroom</u>. Portsmouth, New
Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Calkins, L. (1983). <u>Lessons from a Child</u>.
Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann
Educational Books, Inc.

Dudley, M. (1989). The writing workshop:
    Structuring for success. <u>English Journal</u>.
    <u>78</u> (1), 28-32.

Elbow, P. (1973). <u>Writing without Teachers</u>. New
    York: Oxford University Press.

Fitzgerald, J., & Markham, L. (1987). Teaching
    children about revision in writing. <u>Cognition
    and Instruction</u>, <u>4</u> (1), 2-24.

Froese, V. (1991). Introduction to whole-language
    teaching and learning. In V. Froese (Ed.)
    <u>Whole-Language Practice and Theory</u> (1-16).
    Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and
    Bacon.

Gaesser, V. (1990). Options for evaluation and
    assessment in the whole language program. In
    R. Blake (Ed.) <u>Whole Language--Exploration
    and Application</u>. (p. 111-117). Brockway, New
    York: S.U.N.Y. New York State English Council.

Gere, A. R., & Abbott, R. (1985). Talking about
    writing: The language of writing groups.
    Research in the Teaching of English,
    19 (4), 362-381.

Graves, D. (1983). Writing: Teachers and
    Children at Work. Portsmouth, New Hampshire:
    Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Graves, D. (1991). Build a Literate Classroom.
    Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann
    Educational Books, Inc.

Lyons, B. (1981). The PQP Method of Responding to
    Writing. English Journal. 70 (3), 42-43.

McVitty, W. (1986). Getting It Together.
    Organising the Reading-Writing Classroom.
    Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann
    Educational Books, Inc.

Mashek-Smith, V. (1989). Teacher Initiated Whole
    Language Reading Instruction in a Skills-Based
    School District: A Self-Report Case Study.
    Cedar Falls, Iowa: University of Northern Iowa,
    Doctor of Education dissertation.

Nathan, R., Temple, F., Juntunen, K., Temple, C.
    (1989). Classroom Strategies that Work.
    Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann
    Educational Books, Inc.

Routman, R. (1991). Invitations: Changing as
    Teachers and Learners K-12). Portsmouth, New
    Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Russell, C. (1983). Putting Research into
    Practice: Conferencing with Young Writers.
    Language Arts. 60, 333-340.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE GUIDELINES:
    Listening with a purpose in mind

(Feel free to start at step #3 if you'd like.)

1.   Read your draft to your partner.

2.   Let your partner tell you what he or she
      remembers the most about your piece (i.e.,
      What was interesting or what sounded good?).

3.   Read your draft again, but this time ask your
      partner to listen for Conference Question(s)
      #_____ and/or #_____.

4.   Let your partner respond to what you asked
      him or her to listen for. Your partner may
      give you other worthwhile suggestions.
      Listen carefully.

5.   Remember, you are the author. Suggestions
      that others give you may be helpful, but they
      may not be. Change only those parts of your
      draft that you feel need changing.

CONFERENCE QUESTIONS:
     A few possibilities

1.   Listen to my opening line(s). Does my lead
      interest you? If not, how might I improve
      it?

2.   Do you think I need more information
      anywhere? That is, are there places in my
      draft where you would like me to get more
      specific? Where?

Appendix A (con't.)

3. Do you ever get lost while reading/listening to my draft? When?

4. Do I get too wordy in my draft? That is, have I put in too much detail ("dead wood")? Where?

5. Have I mentioned things in my draft that are hard for you to picture or that you wish you could picture? (for example, people, actions, or situations) What are they?

6. Do you think that the sentences/paragraphs in my draft are in the best order possible? If not, which sentences/paragraphs would you move around? Why?

7. Do you think I should let my feelings/inner thoughts show more in places? Where?

8. Do I stay on my topic?

9. Do I have a good ending? If not, do you have a suggestion for how I might improve it?

10. Does my title fit my draft?

Other Possibilities

11.

12.

Source:
    Nathan, R., Temple, F., Juntunen, K., Temple, C. (1989). Classroom Strategies that Work. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc. p. 31.

APPENDIX B

AUTHOR'S EDITING CHECKLIST

AUTHOR_____

TITLE_____

DATE BEGUN_____DATE FINISHED_____

NAME OF PEER

EDITOR_____

	SELF EDITOR (step 3)	PEER EDITOR (step 4)
1. Does it make sense?-----------		
2. Spelling----------------------		
3. Punctuation: periods, question marks, commas, quotes, etc.---		
4. Paragraphs--------------------		
5. Capitals----------------------		
6. Excess words------------------		
7. Varied sentences (Author starts sentences in different ways)--		

COMMENTS:

Bring this to your teacher conference (step 6).

APPENDIX C

Having a Writing Conference with Yourself

Read your piece to yourself, at least once but probably several times. The best writers spend a lot of time reading over and thinking about what they've written.

Your next job is to make some decisions about what's down there on that paper: the weaknesses of the piece--the parts that need more work--and its strengths--those parts that work so well you want to do more with them. In other words, your next job is to have a writing conference with yourself.

Questions About Information

Do I have enough information?

What's the strongest or most exciting part of the
     piece and how can I build on it?
Have I shown (not told) by using examples?
Have I told my thoughts and feelings at the points
     where my readers will wonder?
Have I told where, when, and with whom this is
     happening?
Have I described the scene and people with enough
     detail that a reader can see it happening?
Is there any part that might confuse a reader?
     Have I explained each part well enough that a
     reader will know what I mean?
Does this piece need conversation? Did people
     talk? Have I directly quoted the words they
     said?

Do I have too much information?

What parts aren't needed--don't add to my point or
     story? Can I delete them?
What is this piece really about? Are there parts
     that are about something else? Can I cut
     them?
Do I have more than one story? Which is the one
     story I really want to tell?

Appendix C (con't.)

Is this a "bed-to-bed" piece, going through every
     event of the day? Can I focus on just the
     important part of the day and delete the
     rest?
Is there too much conversation? Too many fussy
     little details? Have I explained too much?

Questions About Leads

Does my lead bring the reader right into my piece,
     into the main ideas or actions?
Where does the piece really begin? Can I cut the
     first paragraph? The first two? The first
     page?

Questions About Conclusions

Does my conclusion drop off and leave my reader
     wondering?
Does my conclusion go on and on?
How do I want my reader to feel at the end of the
     piece? Does this conclusion do it?
What do I want my reader to know at the end of the
     piece? Does this conclusion do it?

Questions About Title

Does my title fit what the piece is about?
Is my title a "grabber'? Would it make a reader
     want to read my piece?

Appendix C (con't.)

Questions About Style

Have I cluttered my piece with unnecessary
    adjectives and adverbs?
Have I said something more than once?
Have I used any word(s) too often?
Are any sentences too long and tangled? Too brief
        and choppy?
Have I paragraphed often enough to give my
    reader's eyes some breaks?
Have I broken the flow of my piece by paragraphing
    too often?
Is my information in order? Is this the sequence
    in which things happened?
Have I grouped together ideas related to each
    other?
Does the voice stay the same--first person
    participant (I did it) or third person
    observer (he or she did it)?
Does the verb tense stay the same--present (it's
    happening now) or past (it happened before)?

Source:
    Atwell, N. (1987).In the Middle, Writing,
    Reading and Learning with Adolescents.
    Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Boynton/Cook
    Publishers, (Heinemann Educational Books,
    Inc.). p. 104-105.

APPENDIX D

STORY CHECKLIST

_____ I PUT MY NAME AND THE DATE ON MY STORY.

_____ I USED CAPITAL LETTERS IN THE TITLE.

_____ I USED CAPITAL LETTERS TO BEGIN ALL
SENTENCES AND PROPER NAMES.

_____ I USED COMMAS AND QUOTATION MARKS WHERE
THEY WERE NEEDED.

_____ I SPELLED AS MANY WORDS AS I COULD
CORRECTLY.

_____ I USED PARAGRAPHS.