

*Landmark
Essays*

on
Writing Process

**Edited by
Sondra Perl**

Landmark Essays

江苏工业学院图书馆
Writing Process 藏书章

Edited by Sondra Perl

Hermagoras Press
1994

Landmark Essays Volume Seven

Copyright © 1994 Hermagoras Press

Published 1994 by Hermagoras Press,
P.O. Box 1555, Davis, CA 95617

Cover design by Kathi Zamminer

Typesetting and Camera-ready Production
by Graphic Gold, Davis, California
Manufactured in the United States of America
by Braun-Brumfield, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

ISBN 1-880393-13-1

4 5 6 7 8 9 0

Introduction

Writing Process: A Shining Moment

by Sondra Perl

What happens when we write? What occurs as we compose? Can the processes by which individuals give shape and meaning to written texts be observed, documented and understood? To what theories about composing could such understanding lead? And based on what premises do we even ask such questions?

For a brief time in the life of the academy, these and other related questions became the focus of attention. It was a moment when researchers, writers and scholars looked beyond an examination of written texts to inquire into the nature of composing itself. The growing interest in these questions paralleled the growth of a new, young field: in the early 1970s, both studies of composing and composition studies emerged as exciting avenues for research and inquiry (North, 1986a).

Prior to this time, authors such as Peter Elbow, Ken Macrorie, James Moffett and Donald Murray had written about writing and its teaching in ways that helped scholars, teachers and students think about composing issues. But beginning in 1971, a steady line of new work began to appear: work that looked at individual writers and examined precisely what they did as they were engaged in the act of writing. As a result, the landmark essays written in the early days of composing research are easy to identify. But fields and inquiries do not remain static. And as the new field of composition studies began to change and redefine itself, so did interest in composing research and theory. By the mid-eighties, there were fewer studies of individual writers at work. By the early nineties, even fewer, and many of those who began the early work had moved on to study other related interests.

So too, as the field of composition studies became more sophisticated in its understanding of research, the designs and assumptions underlying the early work were called into question (Emig, 1982; Durst, 1990). Researchers were challenged to design studies that were sensitive to the varying contexts in which writers write and to the ways their own roles shaped their investigations. The more comprehensive studies called for by these critiques are only now beginning to appear, exemplified in the recent work of Anne Dyson (1994) and of Glynda Hull, Mike Rose, and their colleagues (1991).

Searching through the major journals of the field, it may appear then, at first glance, that landmark essays on writing processes have diminished. But if we read closely and look, occasionally, outside the academy, we find that interest in writing processes is still alive; it comes to us, however, in a new guise. There are writers who show us more of themselves at work than ever

before, revealing their processes in the midst of their own writing. There are others who take the lessons we have learned from the early studies and use them to teach writing, even to those no longer in school. And once we broaden our understanding of what constitutes a “process approach,” we can recognize, in retrospect, the authors who were mindful of the power of writing processes long before there was a field of composition or a single empirical study of composing processes.

In this introduction, I aim to tell the story of how inquiry into writing processes became the focus of attention for a substantial number of composition researchers and scholars, what happened to this inquiry, and where it has led. But like all stories, this one, too, is composed by an individual writer with a personal philosophy and view of the world. As a result, the version printed here is neither innocent nor the only one available: it is the story I tell and reflects as much about my reasons for selecting particular essays as it reflects particular movements in the field. To read it as if it were the only history, or the only truth, would be to ignore an important lesson of the post-modern era, namely, that there is always more than one version to any story and more than one form to contain it, that the voices we write in are multiple and the tales we tell never fully told. Consequently, I will begin by providing an historical sketch of the way research on composing helped to shape a field but conclude with comments on the situated nature of all composing, and in this case, especially, my own.

The Moment Begins

Nineteen seventy-one marks the movement in the field of composition from an almost exclusive focus on written products to an examination of composing processes. In that year Janet Emig published *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*, hailed at the time as “an audacious venture into relatively unexplored territory” (Buxton, p. v). Emig’s was the first study to ask a process-oriented question, “How do twelfth-graders write?” and the first to devise a method to study writing processes as they unfolded. By asking her students to “compose aloud,” to say whatever crossed their minds while they were writing, Emig was able to document, at least in part, what happened as a small sample of twelfth graders composed.

Looking closely at the writing behaviors of eight students, Emig demonstrated that insights about composing could be gathered by using a case-study approach. One result of her work was a careful analysis of the dimensions of the composing process among twelfth graders, and the taxonomy she devised has become familiar to many teachers across the country. Less familiar but equally important, and the starting point for this volume, is her review of the literature on creativity and composing. Here Emig showed precisely why the teaching of composition had proceeded in so haphazard and contradictory a manner: on the one hand, interviews with professional writers had provided only idiosyncratic, at times puzzling, and often unreliable descriptions of creative processes while, on the other, the dicta in textbooks had offered formulaic approaches diametrically opposed to

those given by professionals. After guiding us through this mass of conflicting evidence, Emig argued convincingly that one way to resolve the conflict was to observe, carefully and systematically, what student writers did as they wrote.

In 1975, Donald Graves published the second major study on composing processes. Using a case-study approach, Graves sat next to second-graders and observed them working on their writing at school and at home, and he spoke at considerable length with their parents and teachers. Graves was among the first to show that young children could write and that their writing processes, like those of adults, did not necessarily follow the linear logic of textbooks: the common instruction to plan, write and edit in a lockstep fashion. In fact, Graves found, even among young children, there was evidence of discrete patterns and developmental shifts.

Building on the work of Emig and Graves, I designed a study to examine the composing processes of basic writers, underprepared college students at the City University of New York. Given the look of their finished products, often studded with crossed-out words, misspellings, misstarts and errors, it seemed prudent to ask whether such writers even had composing processes: consistent behaviors that recurred as they wrote.

To gather my data, I observed five writers at work, and following Emig, I, too, asked them to compose aloud, tape-recording whatever they said. Since my interest was in documenting the sequence and flow of my students' composing, I devised a coding scheme to order and systematize what I was observing which then enabled me to detect patterns of composing within and among the students. Through careful coding, I discovered that students who produced flawed written products did, nonetheless, have consistent composing processes.

The designs of these early studies on composing were partly modeled on the tenets of experimental research. Even within a case-study approach, researchers looked to control as many variables as possible. Cautioned by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Schoer in *Research in Written Composition* (1963), that early work in composition was suspect precisely because it did not control for such variables as "the topic," "the setting," and "the length of time allotted" to writing, we designed studies that asked writers to engage in similar activities on similar occasions in similar settings, so that what we came to discover could not be dismissed as being merely idiosyncratic or as occurring only by chance.

During the ensuing years, then, researchers of writing processes conducted studies of one or more writers, often in what could be described as laboratory conditions. The writers were of different ages and abilities ranging from young children (Calkins, 1980; Lamme & Childers, 1983) to adults (Selzer, 1983), from native speakers of English (Bridwell, 1980) to speakers of Spanish (Raines, 1985; Zamel, 1983) or Chinese (Lay, 1982), from basic writers (Hull, 1987; Pianko, 1979) to professionals (Schwartz, 1983). Audio-tapes, videotapes and protocols were collected. Analyses were designed to discover pauses and patterns (Matsuhashi, 1981), to create cognitive process

models (Flower and Hayes, 1981) and to produce theories (Greene, 1990; Hairston, 1986).

In tone, too, the early studies reflected the thinking of their time. Researchers were to be distant, faceless and voiceless. We were to observe and take notes but not to participate. Assuming that the premises which worked for experimental researchers in a laboratory would work equally well for us and produce findings equally useful and generalizable, we kept our distance. And we reported our findings as if we had had very little to do with producing them. In other words, as writers of these early essays, we worked at being as objective, informed, and distant as the methods we used.

The next three articles in this volume also reflect this early stance. They are controlled studies and attempt to isolate and examine features of composing in rigorous and systematic ways. Linda Flower and John R. Hayes, who have since published numerous articles on writing processes, based their work on theories derived from the information-processing branch of cognitive psychology. Using problem-solving as a frame for their studies, their aim was to uncover the thinking processes writers used in the act of solving rhetorical problems. They, too, asked writers to compose aloud; then they created transcripts which could be analyzed according to the network of goals and the hierarchy of relationships that seemed to keep the process moving. In this article from their early work, they describe their approach and then provide examples of the types of problems writers set for themselves and how these writers then devise means to solve them.

In 1980, Nancy Sommers published an article that reconceived all writing as revision. Describing the ways the process of revision worked for the college students and adult writers she observed, Sommers emphasized how narrow most students' conceptions of revision were and how truncated their processes. Her work added to the growing body of research which argued that a linear model of composing with three distinct stages was misleading. Sommers called for a theory of writing that was both holistic and recursive, "in which a sense of the whole writing both precede[d] and gr[e]w out of an examination of the parts."

In the same year, Mike Rose conducted a systematic study of a debilitating writing problem: writer's block. In the article included here, he reports the findings of a study in which he interviewed ten students, of whom half wrote with relative ease and half experienced a form of "nearly immobilizing writer's block." Looking for and discovering both patterns and differences among these students, Rose provided a foundation for conducting even more rigorous investigations using a problem-solving framework.

Close observation of writers at work led to theoretical questions too: What theories of meaning, we asked, would be adequate to convey the complexity and richness of composing? My investigations led me to consider that we write not just with our minds but also with a wider kind of knowing that is often visceral and embodied. In "Understanding Composing," I suggested ways in which this knowing works and how writing enables us to bring what is at first only implicit in our knowing, a "felt sense," into explicit

form.

Ann Berthoff also pursued questions of meaning, arguing that writing must never be divorced from the shaping power of the imagination. Highly critical of research based on the positivist notion that reliable knowledge must be logically ordered and lend itself to mathematical modeling, Berthoff reminded us that writing is an act of making meaning. Materialist, behaviorist and technicist theories, she maintained, could never elucidate the power of mind. To do so, she suggested in "The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand," we must inquire into composing in the tradition of such thinkers as I. A. Richards, Susanne Langer, William James, and C. S. Peirce, whose philosophical works address questions of meaning and the relationship between signs and symbols, and between representation and interpretation. Only by addressing such questions, she argued, would we arrive at a sound understanding of composing.

So vigorous was this early work and so widespread its initial impact that Maxine Hairston termed its effect on the field a "paradigm shift." In her essay, "The Winds of Change," Hairston identified the ways findings from composing research had begun to contradict what she called the "current-traditional" paradigm. The winds, as she saw them, brought a breath of fresh air as they summoned forth, particularly for practitioners, a new awareness: of writing as "recursive" instead of "linear;" of the importance of attending to composing processes as well as written products.

From the early to mid-eighties, then, composing processes were under investigation. Among the noteworthy studies published in 1983 is Carol Berkenkotter's study of Donald Murray, a well-known writer and teacher of writing. Berkenkotter observed Murray as he wrote at home and in her office, examining how he worked in both naturalistic and controlled settings, with topics he had chosen as well as those she had assigned. We come to see through her study that composing processes are, indeed, affected by the contexts in which writers locate and find themselves. Berkenkotter voiced a concern that would increasingly come to shape research on composing: the caution that writing arises out of specific contexts and that approaches which attempt to control variables may have so stripped away these contexts that what remains is only the merest trace of what might have occurred in more natural settings.

In the mid-eighties, articles appeared in which the early work on composing was analyzed and evaluated. In 1985, James Reither praised past work and then raised important and forward-looking questions: How do the social contexts that shape our lives influence what we say and write? And what is the role of "social knowing" in the processes of composing? In 1986, these questions were developed further when Lester Faigley outlined three prominent views of composing, or in Berthoff's terms three philosophies, and asked: How is social knowledge constructed in history? While Reither pointed us toward the social dimensions of composing, Faigley challenged us to examine how even our understanding of what is social is affected by historical perspectives and political contexts.

Suddenly, the once seemingly simple act of studying writing processes engendered a range of theoretical, methodological, political, pedagogical and practical questions. Among them: Who is the writer in the act of writing? To whom does she write? What is the basis of her knowledge? What is her relationship to the world? Can she be known separate from the contexts in which she lives? And who determines the contexts and her relation to them? Consequently, research on composing was no longer seen as a neutral activity conducted by an observer who stood aside watching and documenting a complex phenomenon, but as a philosophical and political act itself in which researchers were challenged to be aware of the stances they were taking and how they situated themselves in their studies.

These critiques from the mid-eighties had an impact on the way writing was subsequently studied and described. Those who wrote about writing processes began to describe the settings which gave meaning and order to their lives. Min-zhan Lu, for example, in her article "From Silence to Words," chronicled her own struggles with composing, showing explicitly how her speaking and writing, in both Chinese and English, were always a function of the differing political and social contexts in which she was living. Lu's article reminds us that language is neither neutral nor a strictly individual possession—that the social settings out of which we write also shape the meaning we express.

Increasingly, too, as the premises of studies based on experimental designs and conducted in laboratory settings were subjected to critique, researchers began to make finer distinctions and ask different kinds of questions. Elizabeth Flynn in "Composing as a Woman" argued that our construct of "the writer" had been fashioned with little regard to gender. Are our research methods or research samples "androcentric"? she asked. Are male writers "the standard" against which female writers are judged? Flynn called on us to bring the insights gained in feminist studies, particularly those dealing with difference and dominance, more fully into our thinking, scholarship and research on composing.

In work appearing, then, between the end of the eighties and the early nineties, several themes can be distinguished. Writing is no longer viewed merely as an individual act but as a social one as well (Berlin, 1988; LeFevre, 1987); contexts in which writers write are taken into account and studied (Berkenkotter *et. al*, 1988; Herrington, 1985; McCarthy, 1987); researchers no longer remain anonymous but speak through their research, making their own biases and perspectives explicit (Perl & Wilson, 1986; Sommers, 1993); writing, now viewed as a cultural act, is increasingly studied through ethnography, a method suited to the study of cultures (Doheny-Farina, 1986; Dyson, 1988); the scene of writing is more often understood now not as a room in which a writer is isolated and alone but as a room in which many voices reside: those that both shape the writer and to which he or she responds in return (Brodkey, 1987). Finally, the forms in which we tell of our discoveries, in which we report the findings of our research, expand. Stories, portraits, tales, and narrative accounts begin to supplant the more traditional

reports of research as we move closer to an understanding that what we are trying to describe may not be the truths of laboratory science but the truths of living and shaping and creating—the truths of being human.

Many of these views are expressed by William Irmscher, as he reflects on 40 years devoted to the study and teaching of composition. In his article, “Finding a Comfortable Identity,” Irmscher values the lessons learned from empirical research but is nonetheless critical of our borrowing models of inquiry from the sciences, models which inevitably reduce the complexities of composing. Reminding us that writing is above all a symbolic act and an essentially human activity, Irmscher encourages us to use case studies and ethnographies, methods better suited to the aims of humanistic inquiry, and to embrace methods of reporting that, like literature, “present the fullness of experience.”

Studies of composing have led us then not to fuller and more detailed models or to larger and longer taxonomies as we once suspected they might. Rather we are arriving at an understanding of the complex relationship between writers and the contexts that shape their lives. In this relationship, writers are both constituents of their particular cultures and capable of playing constituting roles themselves—in other words, both creatures of varying cultures and creators of variously unique expressions and extensions of them.

In the early nineties, teachers and writers begin to rethink the ways in which writing processes have been understood and described. Lex Runciman reflects, for example, on the shaping power of metaphor. To liken the act of writing to a problem, he claims, will result in students making it one. Critical of the problem-posing language of some composing studies, Runciman reminds us that we write for many reasons, including those connected with pleasure and satisfaction. Examining his own process of writing, he shows us what many researchers ignore or overlook in their studies: the rewards of writing.

Donald Murray, too, has long known and written about the pleasures of writing. In his 1991 essay, “All Writing is Autobiography,” Murray explores the cultures which have given him an identity and the pleasure he derives from reshaping his understanding of those cultures through writing. Murray reminds us that no matter what we are writing, no matter the form or the content, the structure or the point, we write out of who we are, representing ourselves in print. His article is a treatment to the ways writers, in dialogue with and shaped by their histories and communities, are also actively constructing the meaning of their own experiences.

Nancy Sommers exemplifies Murray’s point in “Between the Drafts.” Standing back and critiquing the way she positioned herself within her earlier work, Sommers now sees that earlier self as a “bloodless academic creating taxonomies, creating a hierarchy of student writers and experienced writers, and never asking myself how I was being displaced from my own work.” In contrast, twelve years later, Sommers presents both her work and herself, her voice now shaping the dialogue with others, neither submerged nor silenced but present and aware of the interplay.

Such a broadened and contextualized understanding of composing processes, of course, leaves ample room for further inquiry. Researchers of composing have only begun to investigate, for example, the ways student writers choose to participate in the discourses of the communities in which they find themselves (Clark and Weidenhaupt, 1992; Sternglass, 1988), the ways teachers respond to, intervene in, challenge and support the work of students (Prior, 1991; Walvoord and McCarthy, 1991), and the ways composing is shaped by issues of difference (Lunsford and Ede, 1990; Tedesco, 1991). These and other context-sensitive studies require enormous investments of time and energy. It may be, in fact, that such work will most usefully be conducted by teams of researchers, since the agenda is broad, and composing, while a major feature, is often only one aspect of literate activity under study.

Academic writing is not, however, our only source of sophisticated understanding of what it means to compose. The reflections in *The Writing Life* by author Annie Dillard awaken in readers a sense of what makes composing so exciting and essential a human act. Excerpts from *Writing for Your Life* by novelist Deena Metzger begin to explore why. Both authors speak for an aspect of composing often overlooked in academic research: the sense that a writer can create, out of all that has come before, something new. Dillard, writing metaphorically, and Metzger, more concretely, speak for the fear evoked and the fearlessness called for by such an act of creation. For both know that during composing one composes both a work and a self, and both are speaking not only to academics and teachers but also to all those who wish to write.

Similarly, the final two essays in this volume speak to writers within and outside the academy. Since 1970 when it first appeared, William Stafford's "A Way of Writing" has often been anthologized. Stafford writes knowingly of his own writing process and of the value, for any writer, of receptivity, of waiting quietly and paying attention to whatever comes. In his view, writing is not reserved for an elite few but is available to all as "one of the great, free human activities." Brenda Ueland concurs. I close with her to underscore the point she makes, one she understood in 1938, long before we began our academic study of writing processes: that the shining moment we pursue in our ever-sophisticated studies and inquiries belongs ultimately and always to all of us, who by virtue of being human are necessarily readers, writers, thinkers—composers—shapers of meaning.

What Shines in the Shining Moment?

What does it mean to compose? How do we, as observers of composing processes, make sense of what we see? And what is it we are actually composing? A piece of writing? A life's work? Ourselves? The essays I have chosen to include in this volume mirror my own interest in these questions. While throughout much of this introduction I have traced how thinking and methodology within composing research have evolved, to conclude I want to highlight a few aspects which have remained the same and the perspective on

research I most value.

First, in the work I respect, writers and what they do are at the center of inquiry. The focus is on what actually occurs as people write and how they make sense of what they are doing. In choosing such a focus, we grant human action central importance and enact the belief that looking closely at individuals can be a primary starting point for understanding them and their worlds.

But we must also ask, who is creating this understanding and from what frame of reference? The early work on composing, my own included, proceeded as if researchers could stand outside their research, observe a group of writers at work, document what they were doing, examine transcripts and tapes to determine patterns of behavior, and then report findings in scholarly language devoid of personal preferences.

Later on, it became obvious to many of us that such a stance was already imbued with preferences, most notably the theory that knowledge can and ought to be created with little or no reference to its creator. Such a stance implied that researchers could observe and report their observations without any concern that their personal predilections might be implicated in the construction of what they were reporting.

Yet when we enter a setting with the purpose of coming to understand how others act and make sense of the world, we have a hand in shaping the material. What we attend to, what emerges as important, which contextual factors we consider relevant and which, wittingly or not, we ignore, all influence how reality appears to us. And so, in this view, research findings are composed too, by the individual hand of the researcher and by whatever influences have trained that hand and won its allegiance.

As a result, the work I have increasingly come to value in composition research turns back on itself enough to take the researcher's shaping role into account. The integrity of such work rests not so much on a lifeless detachment from the phenomena being studied as on the author's vital engagement, and on a faithful rendering of what has been observed, including the author's revealing, as much as possible, his or her own impact on what has been seen and said.

When conducting such inquiries, researchers begin, then, not with an hypothesis to test but with a readiness to pay close attention to the phenomena at hand. They begin by observing writers and readers, teachers and tutors, parents and children as they go about the work of creating and constructing literate lives. They enter the contexts in which these people live and attempt to understand what is occurring from the inside, turning themselves as much as possible into participant-observers, recognizing that they can only come to understand others' frames of reference if they, too, enter those frames. Once having done so, they may then convey what they have learned through writing, by attempting to bring to life the people they have come to know and the particularities of their living.

Consequently, the writing I value in composition research resembles the writing I value in literature, complete with careful descriptions that take me

inside the phenomena, that, through the slow piling up of detail, show me a person's actions and suggest what such actions might mean.

I am not suggesting, however, that the act of turning research data into finished prose is or should be the same as writing fiction. While both may benefit from an author's attempt to render lived experiences, only researchers are bound to record as accurately as they can what is before them and then to engage in careful sifting and sorting to determine how best to make sense of what they have seen. In fact, once they discern the human contours of what they have set out to describe, once they have a sense of the patterns and regularities and the ways the individuals they have looked to understand construct their lives, researchers find themselves faced with another composing task: fashioning what they have come to see into a text that will convey their understanding to others.

There is, then, underlying my preferences in research, a particular theory of learning at work, namely that we come to understand deeply and fully by attending to what is before us in slow and careful ways, whether we are studying ourselves or others, whether we are studying finished texts or those in the process of being written, whether those texts are school-based or professional, literary, artistic or musical; and that when we attend in slow and careful ways, we can compose our way to new understandings.

To understand in this view is to attend to the phenomenon before us in such a way that we let it speak, both to and with us. This method is not a solitary one; it establishes dialogue first at the most intuitive level, so that we come to know, deeply and intimately, by letting the situations we study speak to us through our living in their midst. Only then can we hope to give voice to what we have both seen and entered and make it come alive for those who read our renderings.

In the broadest sense, then, composing is something we all do: the students and parents and writers and teachers who serve as subjects of our research and those of us who write the research itself. It is what each of us is engaged in when we shape our understanding of life through the writing we do. And it is what can continue to light our way in composition studies for it illuminates what makes this inquiry still so intriguing and so rich: that only human beings have this capacity to look and see more, to create new texts and new work and in the creating compose our way to new understandings and new selves.

Table of Contents

Introduction

<i>Sondra Perl</i> Writing Process: A Shining Moment xi (1994)	
---	--

Essays

1. <i>Janet Emig</i> The Composing Process: Review of the Literature 1 (1971)	
2. <i>Donald H. Graves</i> An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children 23 (1975)	
3. <i>Sondra Perl</i> The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers 39 (1979)	
4. <i>Linda Flower and John R. Hayes</i> The Cognition of Discovery: Defining a Rhetorical Problem 63 (1980)	
5. <i>Nancy Sommers</i> Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers 75 (1980)	
6. <i>Mike Rose</i> Rigid Rules, Inflexible Plans, and the Stifling of Language: A Cognitivist Analysis of Writer's Block 85 (1980)	
7. <i>Sondra Perl</i> Understanding Composing 99 (1980)	
8. <i>Ann E. Berthoff</i> The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand 107 (1983)	
9. <i>Maxine Hairston</i> The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing 113 (1982)	
10. <i>Carol Berkenkotter</i> Decisions and Revisions: The Planning Strategies of a Publishing Writer 127 (1983)	
11. <i>James A. Reither</i> Writing and Knowing: Toward Redefining the Writing Process 141 (1985)	

12. <i>Lester Faigley</i> Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal	149
(1986)	
13. <i>Min-zhan Lu</i> From Silence to Words: Writing as Struggle	165
(1987)	
14. <i>Elizabeth A. Flynn</i> Composing as a Woman	177
(1988)	
15. <i>William F. Irmscher</i> Finding a Comfortable Identity	191
(1987)	
16. <i>Lex Runciman</i> Fun?	199
(1991)	
17. <i>Donald M. Murray</i> All Writing Is Autobiography	207
(1991)	
18. <i>Nancy Sommers</i> Between the Drafts	217
(1992)	
19. <i>Annie Dillard</i> The Writing Life	225
(1989)	
20. <i>Deena Metzger</i> Writing For Your Life	227
(1992)	
21. <i>William Stafford</i> A Way of Writing	231
(1970)	
22. <i>Brenda Ueland</i> Everybody Is Talented, Original and Has Something Important to Say	235
(1938)	
<i>Bibliography</i>	239
<i>Index</i>	245

The Composing Process: Review of the Literature

by Janet Emig

Most of the data about the composing process occur as three broad types. First there are accounts concerning established writers, chiefly of imaginative, but also of factual, works such as the scientific essay and the historical monograph. These accounts take three forms: (a) description by a writer of his own methods of working; (b) dialogue, usually in the form of correspondence, between a writer and a highly attuned respondent, such as a fellow writer or a gifted editor; and (c) analysis by professional critics or fellow writers of the evolution of a given piece of writing, from sources tapped to revision undertaken and completed. Second, there are dicta and directives about writing by authors and editors of rhetoric and composition texts and handbooks. Third, there is research dealing with the whole or some part of what has been called, globally, “the creative process”; or with a particular kind of creative behavior—the act of writing among adolescents.

These descriptions of the composing process present certain difficulties as sources of data. (1) The data are unsystematic: they do not deal with part or all of the composing process according to any shared set of strategies. (2) The statements provided by different sources of data contradict one another—more they are often unique, even idiosyncratic. (3) Very few of the sources deal in adequate theoretical or empirical depth with how students of school age write. They answer very few of the following major and interesting questions about students as writers:

If the context of student writing—that is, community milieu, school, family—affects the composing process, in what ways does it do so, and why?

What are the resources students bring to the act of writing?

If there are specifiable elements, moments, and stages in the composing process of students, what are these? If they can be differentiated, how? Can certain portions be usefully designated by traditional nomenclature, such as planning, writing, and revising? Are

elements organized linearly in the writing process? recursively? in some other manner? How do these elements, moments, and stages in the composing process relate to one another?

If there is a phenomenon “prewriting,” how can it be characterized?

What is a plan for a piece of writing? When and why do students have or not have a plan?

Under what conditions—physical, psychic—do students start to write?

If writing is essentially a selection among certain sorts of options—lexical, syntactic, rhetorical—what governs the choices students make?

What psychological factors affect or accompany portions of the writing process? What effects do they have? What is a block in writing (other than dysgraphia)? When and why do students have blocks? How can they be overcome?

Under what conditions do students stop work on a given piece of writing?

If all, or certain kinds of, writing within schools differs from all, or certain kinds of, writing outside schools, how do they differ and why?

If there are modes of school writing, how can these be differentiated? If the mode in which a piece is written affects the process of writing, or the process the mode, how?

What is the press of such variables as the reading of others’ writing and the personal intervention of others upon any portion or upon the totality of the writing process?

Accounts By and About Established Writers

On the established writer as a useful source of data about writing, an investigator can say simply with the novelist Peter de Vries, “Don’t ask the cow to analyze milk”;¹ or he can examine this source.

If he does, he finds that writers’ comments on how they write assume many modes. Occasionally, prose writers and poets write about their writing within their novels, short stories and poems: James Joyce in *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Thomas Mann in “Tonio Kröger,” and Wordsworth in “The Prelude” are examples. In addition, they write about their own writing in diaries, journals, note-books, letters, prefaces to their own and to others’ works, essays, full-length critical studies, autobiographical sketches and full-

¹ Peter de Vries, Interview from *Counterpoint*, compiled and edited by Roy Newquist, p. 147.