Many researchers in composition instruction assume that free and journal writing exclusively and necessarily produce "meaningful" writing. This is not substantiated in their limited case study research, or in the research of anyone else. We need to establish a precise definition of "meaningful" writing, determine its place in the curriculum, and determine better means of designing instruction that produces writing that is both meaningful and of high quality. The meta-analysis of Hillocks (1984) indicates that structured composition assignments produce better writing than nondirectional writing experiences. This article explores the reasons for this, and establishes hypotheses based on these reasons for developing a theory of composition instruction. The hypotheses support a need for structured instruction, rather than student-generated direction.

An Apology for Structured Composition Instruction

PETER SMAGORINSKY
University of Chicago

In Emig's (1971) work, *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders* she severely criticizes composition instruction in the United States, saying on the basis of her case study of eight students that "much of the teaching in American high schools is essentially a neurotic activity. . . . What is needed for a reversal of the current situation? Assuredly, frequent, inescapable opportunities for composing for all teachers of writing especially in reflexive writing, such as diaries and journals" (Emig, 1971, pp. 99-100). This insistence on the value of reflexive writing underlies all of her claims about the teaching of composition, and leads her to denounce the customary demands of English teachers, those that require the student to engage in what she calls "school-sponsored" or "extensive" writing.

Emig and many of the others involved in the various national "writing project" approaches to teaching composition claim that

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION, Vol. 3 No. 1, January 1986 105-121
© 1986 Sage Publications, Inc.

from the SAGE Social Science Collections. All Rights Reserved.

school-sponsored writing assignments—those given by a teacher on a particular topic, to be written according to certain specifications and to be completed by a given date—have little or no meaning to students. Due to the excessive demands the teacher makes, the writing no longer "belongs" to the students: They must organize, punctuate, direct, and style their writing in such a way that it pleases their only audience, the teacher. Assignments of this sort benefit students little, for the assigned topic may not be of any interest to them; the rules for style and organization may confine them, and prevent them from expressing themselves in an honest and sincere manner; they become concerned with how the product will look to the teacher, instead of how the process will help them learn about their topics, their worlds, and themselves; and ultimately, they might find the act of composing to be an alienating and worthless task, rather than the fecund learning experience it ought to be.

The alternative to such traditional means of teaching writing, she says, is to give students opportunities for "reflexive writing," allowing them to explore more freely their personal writing processes, rather than bend to the dicta of teacher demands. If allowed to engage in free writing, students will have an automatic interest in their topics, will explore new forms and modes of expression, will engage in a process of self-discovery, and will find meaning in their writing. They will not be forced to write in a particular style within given time boundaries about an assigned topic; instead, they will write when their muse summons them, and cease not when they have recorded a specified number of words or pages, but when the spirit leaves them.

Emig and other researchers who advocate reflexive writing are reacting to what Goodlad (1984) has reported to be the predominant teaching style in American schools, which he calls the "frontal" style, and which Hillocks (1984) calls the "presentational" style, one which places the teacher at the head of the classroom, doing most of the talking and specifying all student behaviors. The students' task is to pattern their thinking and writing processes on whatever models and materials the teacher presents. In criticizing this "presentational" approach to teaching, which puts the student in a primarily passive role with little opportunity for inquiry or original, independent thought, Emig and others whose research support her conclusions may have a legitimate point, although the findings of Goodlad, whose study encompasses far more students than do Emig's case studies, are more convincing in pointing this out. We must take a

closer look at both the reflexive writing advocates' criticisms and the alternatives they offer, however, before we can agree with their whole appraisal of the state of composition instruction. Their assumptions in building their argument for a writing curriculum based on an emphasis on reflexive writing are as follows:

(1) In order for writing to be good, it must be meaningful to the writer.

(2) School-sponsored writing assignments—that is, those for which topic and quality criteria are specified by someone other than the writers (usually a teacher)—work to deny the writers the opportunity to produce meaningful writing, and thus stifle their own natural writing processes.

(3) All self-sponsored writing is meaningful.

(4) Free or reflexive writing is of higher quality than other modes of writing. A look at each of these assumptions will help us come to a better understanding of the merits of teaching composition through free or reflexive writing, and help us generate hypotheses for the formulation of a theory of composition instruction.

(1) *In order for writing to be good, it must be meaningful to the writer.* The research of Csikszentmihalyi (1982) on the joy of learning is illuminating in examining this assumption. Csikszentmihalyi attempts to create a model for individuals to follow so that they may experience continual personal growth without becoming either bored or frustrated, and implores educators to teach so as to present, as frequently as possible, opportunities for students to have "peak experiences" as they learn. Csikszentmihalyi's study of high school students indicates that most school-related learning is extrinsically motivated, and thus the students never choose to learn, and feel no responsibility for their work. Instead of such a system, he feels that we need to structure activities that put students in the "flow," a situation where learning is intrinsically motivated and appropriate levels of skill and challenge are present to help a person grow into a more complex individual. According to Emig, in school-sponsored composition assignments, this is not likely to happen, for the students are too distracted by meeting the demands of the teacher to get in the flow of writing. As Csikszentmihalyi would suggest, then, their motivation is strictly extrinsic, and they neither feel commitment to the writing, nor find meaning in doing it.

At this point we must establish a definition for "meaning," a concept that remains rather opaque in the research of Emig and

others even though they frequently refer to it as an institutional goal. If we accept the findings of Csikszentmihalyi, we can define a "meaningful" experience as one in which a person chooses to learn and feels responsible for his or her own choice, rather than being motivated by external rewards and deterrents. In such situations, a person pursues a task for its own sake, and the experience of active change involved in learning is its own reward, resulting in changes in the complexity of the learner. Challenges and skills are equally balanced to allow someone to get in the "flow" of an activity.

Reflexive writing advocates would insist that all writing done in an English class must be meaningful. If we accept a transfer of Csikszentmihalyi's findings on learning in general to learning through writing, we can say that the more meaningful writing is to an individual, the more optimal a learning experience it will be; and the less meaningful it is, the less it will challenge the writer and aid his or her growth into being a more complex individual. We can, then, say that we should allow students considerable opportunities to get into the flow of writing. We will examine later whether or not reflexive writing necessarily does this, and whether it is or is not the only type of writing that can put people in the flow.

The current concern here is this: Should we consider meaningfulness to be such great importance that we ignore other dimensions of writing? Students, after all, will be required in their lives to do writing of a sort that has no personal meaning to them, and for which will exist certain standards for style, structure, and form. They will write reports, respond to teachers or professors who insist on objectivity and detachment, write memos, write analyses that require generalization and support, and do all manner of writing that is not intended to be personally meaningful to them, yet is required for their academic or professional survival. We must prepare our students to write well no matter what the situation requires; our responsibility as teachers goes beyond merely providing writing opportunities that spring from the writer's feelings and experiences. So, although we must remember the importance of personal expression in our students' writing, we cannot make it an exclusive consideration. If we are to teach our students to be good writers, then we must teach them to write well under all circumstances, not just those that are meaningful to them.

(2) *School-sponsored writing assignments—that is, those for which topic and quality criteria are specified by someone other than the writers (usually a teacher)—work to deny the writers the opportu-*

nity to produce meaningful writing, and thus stifle their writing processes.

> The crucial distinction in this study is between what are presented here as the two dominant modes of composing among older secondary-school students: the reflexive and the extensive. The reflexive mode is defined here as the mode that focuses upon the writer's thoughts and feelings concerning his experiences; the chief audience is the writer himself; the domain explored is often the affective; the style is tentative, personal, and exploratory. The extensive mode is defined here as the mode that focuses upon the writer's conveying a message or a communication to another; the domain explored is usually the cognitive; the style is assured, impersonal and often reportorial. (Emig, 1971, p. 4)

This finding, deduced from interviews with eight students, is what Emig bases much of her criticism of teaching practices on. In claiming that only two kinds of writing exist, and that one is inherently meaningless and the other inherently meaningful, she takes a very narrow view of composition instruction, offering a forced choice between these two alternatives. Are these the only options we have? Emig and other researchers make a good point in criticizing composition instruction that results in dreary, overly rule-bound, predictable writing, and indeed, research reveals that much secondary school instruction is carried out in this manner. Applebee (1981), for instance, reports that the majority of teachers seem interested only in how well the students have mastered content and form, and show little concern for why students are writing.

The problem, however, with the criticisms of the reflexive writing advocates is in their black-and-white attitude: We must either teach in this prevalent style, or through self-sponsored writing. Hillocks (1984, pp. 143-146), on the other hand, has identified not two, but four modes of instruction:

> *Presentational Mode*
> The presentational mode is characterized by (1) relatively clear and specific objectives, such as to use particular rhetorical techniques; (2) lecture and teacher-led discussion dealing with concepts to be learned and applied; (3) the study of models and other materials that explain and illustrate the concept; (4) specific assignments or exercises that generally involve imitating a pattern or following rules that have been previously discussed; and (5) feedback coming primarily from teachers. . . .

> *Natural Process Mode*
> The natural process mode is characterized by (1) generalized objectives, such as to increase fluency and skill in writing; (2) free writing about whatever interests the students in a journal or as a way of "exploring a subject"; (3) writing for audiences of peers; (4) generally positive feedback from peers; (5) opportunities to revise and rework writing; and (6) high levels of interaction among students. . . .
>
> *Environmental Mode*
> The environmental mode is characterized by (1) clear and specific objectives, such as to increase the use of specific detail and figurative language; (2) materials and problems selected to engage students with each other in specifiable processes important to some particular aspect of writing; (3) activities, such as small group problem-centered discussions, conducive to high levels of peer interaction concerning specific tasks. . . .
>
> *Individualized Mode*
> In the individualized mode of instruction students receive instruction through tutorials, programmed materials of some kind, or a combination. The focus of instruction may vary widely, from mechanics to researching, planning, and writing papers. The chief distinction is that this mode of instruction seeks to help students on an individualized basis.

The presentational mode would correlate with the mode that Emig and Applebee identify as the most commonly used in American school systems, an observation underscored by Goodlad's identification of the "frontal" mode as the most common teaching style. The natural process mode is that which is endorsed by Emig and many proponents of the national writing projects, and which, as Hillocks (1984, p. 145) says, "emphasizes the student as the generator of ideas, criteria, and forms." These two modes are the only ones that Emig and her circle of critics consider, and, if we were to stop at that, we could have to grant them their points, for a strictly presentational approach is going to require the student to conform his writing entirely to the demands of his teacher and the models he presents.

The choice we face is not merely between the presentational and natural process modes, however, for other alternatives are available. Hillocks (1984, p. 145) notes that chiefly we have the option of the environmental approach, which "appears to place teacher and student more nearly in balance [than the presentational or natural process modes], with the teacher planning activities and selecting materials through which students interact with each other to generate

ideas and learn identifiable writing skills." The environmental approach would produce "school-sponsored writing," since the teacher sets up the tasks and assigns the compositions, guiding the students towards what he or she has predetermined as quality criteria; yet, the tasks allow the students enough flexibility to approach the composition in a way that suits them. The teacher makes all segments of an instructional unit responsible to the behavioral objectives set up prior to designing the unit, an element of instruction that runs counter to the tenets of those who espouse the natural process mode.

The existence of the environmental mode belies Emig's claim that we must choose between traditional extensive (or presentational) instruction, and reflexive (or natural process) instruction, in determining how to teach writing to our students. The question we must now ask is, does the environmental mode prevent students from writing in meaningful ways, as some researchers say the presentational mode does? One way to judge this would be to examine a sample environmental lesson to see if and where opportunities for meaningful writing arise. Some environmental lessons are centered around an abstract concept such as courage or progress, and have among their behavioral objectives the writing of an extended definition of this concept, each point of which the students must illustrate with examples form either the literature studied or from hypothetical or real human behavior, including their own experiences.

In examining such issues, students are examining problems closely associated with their own development as human beings. Yet, they are also engaging in a "school-sponsored" activity: The teacher is assigning the topic, specifying the due date, informing the students of what sort of information should be included in the essay, and serving as the audience for the composition, although group work in which students critique the substantiation of one another' s criteria is often included in the unit. Thus, according to the natural process enthusiasts such as Pianko (1979, p. 18), it will inhibit the students' writing processes; will be "simply an exercise, sometimes in futility," instead of "a learning experience" will not allow the students to have any personal commitment to their writing; will be a shallow, artificial experience, "something which must be done for others, and the quicker they can complete the task, . . . the faster they can ease the tension they feel during the writing" (Pianko, 1979, p. 11); will not "begin with an idea developing out of students' confrontations with life," as writing should; and will be an assignment in which students

are evaluated on "how well [they] follow instructions, not [on] how well they write" (Pianko, 1979, p. 18).

Is this in fact the case? In defining a concept such as progress or courage, aren't students defining their own values, using real or literary figures as examples of behaviors that they themselves might exhibit? Wouldn't we call such an experience "meaningful," at least by the previously established definition? Or is only that writing which students initiate meaningful, as the natural process adherents insist? I would suggest that writing in which students examine an essential aspect of human behavior and use as examples either their own experiences or behavior they have observed in real or fictional characters, is meaningful, whether they initiate it themselves or compose it in response to an assignment.

If we can accept this, then we see how the environmental teaching mode can provide opportunities for the students to produce writing that springs from personal concerns, yet that they produce within specified guidelines. Emig's criticism of presentational teachers is in accord with the criticisms of Applebee, Hillocks, and Goodlad. As alternatives, however, we have more options than just the teaching mode that she propagates. We can still retain the academic rigor that the presentational teachers might claim is inherent to their approach, and still allow students to explore themselves and their worlds with intellectual curiosity—as natural process teachers strive to do—if we teach in a mode that directs students inquiry in meaningful ways.

(3) *All self-sponsored writing is meaningful.* Disciples of the natural process teaching mode regard meaning as the primary quality that writing can have; they assign it such importance that they would have us give our students only those writing opportunities that arise from their own personal experiences and feelings. All self-sponsored writing is meaningful, they say; therefore, all writing should be self-sponsored. This assumption is worthy of examination, for many people are not so confident that reflexive writing necessarily inspires meaning and commitment.

Emig encourages all teachers to compose in reflexive writing, such as diaries and journals. If all such writing produced meaningful utterance, perhaps we would accept Emig's insistence on their importance. Journals and diaries, however, are a matter of taste, one which, my experiences have told me, many people never acquire. In having assigned journals to my students in the past, and in having spoken to a number of people who have kept journals over the years, I have found (through these informal, nonsystematic observations)

that whereas some people find them to be sources of great personal inspiration, others absolutely despise them, and for a variety of reasons: Some people become morose and depressed through excessive introspection; some find that writing for no audience other than themselves is pointless; some become bored by the daily recording of mundane events.

Furthermore, those of us who have in the past forced all of our students to keep journals know that for many adolescents, the journal is not a place for serious reflection, but an assignment for which they must fill up a given number of pages; they produce nothing but endless and tedious summaries of their day-to-day lives, with only the most occasional and cursory judgment or reflection. How worthwhile an activity is this? This is not the magical writing process that natural process partisans insist is organic in all self-sponsored writing, but a drudgery like any other chore. They seem to have assumed that all people share their own genuine feeling that journal writing is an inspirational and meaningful activity, when in fact no empirical evidence exists to indicate that this is so. Just as some people like chocolates and others prefer vanilla, some people like to write about themselves and others do not.

If we look to the research of Csikszentmihalyi (1982, p. 171), we can gain some clues as to *why* great amounts of reflexive writing are not appealing to many people. He has found that "a person who devoted most of his or her psychic energy to introspection would not have enough attention left to relate adaptively to the environment." For many people, excessive introspection can be a self-destructive activity, for it can leave them unbalanced; with so much attention directed inward, they lose their perspective on the world around them. For such individuals, an overemphasis on reflexive writing might be a disturbing and anxiety-producing practice.

We must be wary of the claims made about reflexive or free writing, for its proponents go no further than to make subjective judgments about the external parameters of the situation; nowhere in their research, or in the research of anyone, is there evidence that a heavy emphasis on reflexive writing is worthwhile for all people. Instead, their conclusions are based on case studies of small, homogeneous groups of children whose attitudes seem to reflect quite closely those of the investigators.

The assumption that all self-sponsored writing is necessarily meaningful, then, appears suspect. Although reflexive writing might

have a place in the English curriculum, it should not be regarded as having exclusive properties for inspiring meaningful writing.

(4) *Free or reflexive writing is of a higher quality than other modes of writing.* Determining whether reflexive writing is or is not of a higher quality than writing assigned through other instructional modes is an important consideration, for it will have a great bearing on whether it should or should not be the primary mode of writing a student does. We have already seen that, although it can provide opportunities for meaningful writing among certain types of people, it probably does not provide sufficiently complex problems to promote growth for all writers; and, we have seen that it is by no means the only mode through which a student can express personal concerns. Here, finally, we shall see if the natural process mode affects the quality of composition more favorably than other modes.

Hillocks' meta-analysis reveals that, when evaluated by trained raters, reflexive writing does not show a degree of improvement from pretest to posttest scores that exceeds the improvement attained by using other modes of instruction. Hilloks (1984, p. 160-162) finds that the environmental mode, in which "the instructor plans and uses activities that result in high levels of student interaction concerning particular problems parallel to those they encounter in certain kinds of writing," which "places priority on high levels of student involvement," and which "places priority on structured problem-solving activities, with clear objectives, planned to enable students to deal with similar problems in composing," is "over four times more effective than the traditional presentational mode and three times more effective than the natural process mode." The natural process mode, he concludes, "studiously avoids the approaches to writing instruction which this report demonstrates to be more effective."

We must wonder whether the natural process emphasis on reflexive writing offers sufficient challenges to the broad range of personality types we find in a typical classroom. The greatest successes of the free writing experiments have come with hand-picked students under special conditions, as in the New Hampshire case studies of Graves (1979) and others; even these, which allegedly report on a group of eighteen students over a two-year period, in fact concentrate primarily on those students whose responses are most successful. The evidence from the meta-analysis indicates that this mode does not inspire the whole range of students to write well, however. If we look at the characteristics of the environmental mode to see which of its elements best promote quality writing, perhaps we

can see which areas of instruction the natural process mode neglects.

A key difference between the two is that in natural process writing, the students select the topic, mode, and direction of their writing, whereas in the environmental mode, the teacher determines the type of problem the students will solve, teaches them strategies to help them arrive at solutions to the given task, and ultimately challenges them individually to perform tasks of the same type but using unfamiliar materials. For example, a second composition assignment in the aforementioned unit on progress would be to write, following the formal study of thematically related literature, a composition analyzing an unfamiliar work of literature to determine the author's beliefs on the issue of progress. Hillocks (1982, p. 665) traces this type of inquiry back to Aristotle, and points to its use in the natural sciences:

> Although the concerns and certain methods of Aristotle and [biologist Karl] von Frisch are vastly different, they clearly share the basic strategies of inquiry: observation, . . . description, comparison and contrast (definition), generalization, and testing generalizations against further data. The fact that these strategies are evident in many disciplines suggests that they are important to any writing concerned with reporting or analyzing data. That is to say, the writing of a person skilled in these strategies is likely to be more effective than that of one who is unskilled in them, simply by virtue of the fact that the skilled person will deal with them more thoroughly and effectively with the data in question.

The reason that people with such experience will handle novel situations with greater facility is that they have acquired a schema for processing new information, and will be able to recognize more easily elements and patterns that fit into this schema. Thus, they will be able to write about them with greater ease and clarity. When an environmental teacher provides for his students a number of different schemata for recognizing patterns, and the appropriate strategies for solving problems involving those patterns, the students will have a repertoire of comprehension means that will help them more readily sort through the information they encounter, and more clearly relate their understanding in writing to detached third parties.

How is this different from the natural process mode of inquiry? In reflexive writing, the students set up their own problems; the belief is that frequent involvement in the writing process will ultimately result in the students learning strategies of inquiry on their own.

Such a developmental approach assumes that: (1) All of the problems that students need to solve are those that have already occurred within their immediate range of experience; (2) they can recognize these problems when they occur; and (3) students are only interested in solving problems that they discover as a result of introspection, which assumes that: (a) all people are primarily introspective, and (b) people are not concerned with solving problems that are unrelated to their personal experiences or immediate personal concerns.

Each of these assumptions is dubious. The first, that we only need to solve problems that have developed through our previous experiences, does not help us if we are concerned with solving new problems as they arise. If we are taught—by someone who has experienced a wide range of problems, and who can anticipate types or categories of problems that might arise and teach us appropriate strategies for recognizing them and solving them when they occur—new schemata for processing information, then we will become more adaptive to the world, and be able to present a clearer articulation of our analyses should the need occur.

Considering the second assumption, we must note that only the most sensitive of us can recognize each of our problems as they arise. The idea that learning is largely developmental, which those who endorse the natural process mode believe, implies that we can recognize those problems that we must solve in order to develop into more complex beings. Perhaps some people are so finely attuned to their needs that they can be left to thrash through their problems in a non-directional manner until they intuitively arrive at solutions; if we do not accept this, however, we must consider that a great number of people probably benefit from being taught schemata for identifying and solving problems.

The third assumption lies at the heart of a belief in the value of reflexive writing: that we are all by nature introspective. This idea is not supported by any known research. Conversely, psychologists such as Carl Jung have identified two types of personalities, the introvert and the exravert; this offers a plausible explanation for why many individuals react adversely to excessive reflexive writing. June Singer (1973, pp. 187-188) gives a cogent explanation of these two types, or "attitudes," saying that "in the introvert, the subject, his own being, is the center of every interest and the importance of the object lies in the way in which it affects the subject. In the extravert the object, the other in and of itself, to a large degree determines the focus of his interest." Each of us is predominantly one or the other,

although no sane person is at either extreme; rather, continues Singer, we "find ourselves somewhere on a continnum between the extremes, perhaps closer to one or the other of the poles closer to the center." Although reflexive writing is probably suitable for someone who is predominantly introverted, and therefore reflexive by nature, it does not seem the best writing mode for extraverts, who orient themselves externally. We must assume there to be an even distribution of introverts and extraverts in the population; should we, then, insist on massive doses of journal and other personal writing for all students, when it may be appropriate for only a portion?

Some might posit that, conversely, the environmental approach will appeal only to extraverts. As we have seen, however, an environmental lesson engages the students in problem-solving activities, gradually weaning them away from teacher-directed thinking and towards individual inquiry. If part of the solution to the given problem is to have the students relate personally to characters in literature, or make judgments based on their experiences, then the environmental assignments accomodate this, as in the example of the extended definition of progress. As Singer notes, few people are exclusively extraverts or introverts, but rather possess both attitudes with one predominating; the environmental teaching mode, with both detached problem-solving activities to appeal to the extraverted side and personal responses to appeal to the introverted side, has the balance required to get the greatest number of students to respond well. Limited by its one-dimensional appeal, the natural process mode, although no doubt resulting in splendid work for a good number of students, (such as those featured in the case studies of scholars such as Graves and Emig), does not afford enough variety of experiences to be helpful to all students, as indicated by the results of Hillocks' meta-analysis.

CONCLUSION

This examination of some assumptions behind the natural process mode of teaching composition has illuminated several points and has helped bring us closer to developing hypotheses from which to form a theory of teaching composition. Participants in the national writing projects, many of whom favor the natural process mode of instruction, have made an excellent point in criticizing the lack of oppor-

tunities for meaningful expression in most composition assignments; Goodlad notes a "flatness" in classrooms taught in the predominant frontal or presentational teaching style.

Such criticisms are directed towards the prevalent presentational teaching mode, and the sole alternative offered by natural process proponents is an emphasis on reflexive writing. Yet, the concept of a natural "writing process" is something that remains ill-defined in their literature; the writing process, according to Murray (1978, pp. 86-87), contains three stages: "prevision," everything that precedes the first draft; "vision," the first draft; and "revision," what the writer does after the draft is completed. This description is not helpful if we are to identify aspects of the writing process that might aid us in diagnosing student writing and designing instruction that will improve areas of weakness.

Other researchers have attempted, through more systematic analysis of the writing process, to identify certain elements that make it up. Johannessen, Kahn, and Walter (1982) posit that teachers must conduct a "task analysis" of writing skills that are needed to write fluently in particular types of compositions, and design and sequence activities that will allow students to become proficient in these skills prior to writing; attention to these areas is vital in order for the written product to be fluent, and practice and mastery of them prior to writing are necessary in order to reduce the students' cognitive load when they compose.

Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982) propose that writing resembles conversation, except without a partner who will provide feedback to the writer and force him to clarify what he is trying to say; part of the writing process, then, is to learn self-questioning strategies,, or conversational cues, to help provide coherence to written expression. By teaching such skills, a teacher can provide instruction that will cause a student to be more attentive to a fundamental aspect of the writing process.

Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982, p. 52) have labeled such instruction "procedural facilitation," which is "any reduction in the executive demands of a task which permits learners to make fuller use of the knowledge and skills they already have. It is to be distinguished on the one hand from teaching new knowledge and skills and on the other hand from *substantive* facilitation in which the teacher or experimenter actually enters into the task as a collaborator." They are as critical as any other researchers here of the presentational mode of instruction, which depends on substantive facilitation, or excessive

teacher control. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982, pp. 44-45) are also suspicious of exclusive free writing, saying that "students need a lot of experience in writing, but not just experience of any kind. They need to have been actively engaged in wrestling with composition problems." We must teach so that we are procedural facilitators, setting up problems for our students to solve, so that they may grow into more complex organisms. This would put them in the flow of learning in well-designed and well-sequenced activities, instead of having just those students who are introspective and can set up their own problems by understanding their inner complexities through reflexive writing respond well to our teaching.

We can begin a theory of composition instruction, then, with the hypotheses listed below.

(1) We must have direction in our instruction. We must therefore determine behavioral objectives for our students, so that we are aware of the specific skills that we expect them to master for a given unit of instruction. In order to do this, we cannot regard the writing process as some amorphous phenomenon, but should identify elements of the writing process that the students need to master in order to write well, and include in our instruction activities that foster the development of those skills. Thus, we are making our instruction responsible to the goals we expect our students to achieve. We can then determine our objectives and plan instruction that makes increasingly complex cognitive demands on our students, and then inform our students of the objectives, so that they know what sort of problems they are learning to solve, which schemata they will need to learn in order to recognize these problems, and which criteria they will be evaluated upon in satisfying the objectives. Such structure will make students explicitly aware of different elements of the writing process, and give them strategies for being attentive to areas that are important for particular tasks, and to areas in which they have exhibited weakness.

(2) We should help our students become skilled with regard to settling specified problematic types of situations, instead of expecting them to meet nebulous instructional goals. Often, the problematic situations will be related to issues in their own lives, such as when they write an extended definition on an abstract concept such as progress or freedom of speech; theoretically, in that these issues should force them to come to terms with their fundamental beliefs, and in that they may generate examples from their own experiences to support their generalizations, this writing could be "meaningful" to the students.

(3) Although we should consider the importance of meaning in our students' writing, we should not make it the sole factor in our teaching; we must be responsive to needs they have other than the need to find relevance in their studies. Such needs might include expanding their syntactic repertoires, honing their awareness of audience, learning revision strategies, learning argumentation that involves support of generalization, learning strategies for specificity in writing, and learning schemata for recognizing various types of patterns and writing coherently about them.

(4) We should not be substantive facilitators, as in the case of the presentational teachers who do not adequately engage their students in learning, who do not wean students away from teacher dependence and therefore do not teach independent thinking skills, and who inhibit their students from getting into the learning flow. Nor should we be nondirectional facilitators who watch students develop "naturally," but cause frustration and anxiety by not informing their students of the instructional direction, and also prevent their students from getting in the flow. Furthermore, we should not emphasize a single type of writing that does not appear to satisfy the needs of all students. Rather, we should be procedural facilitators, who create problems for students to solve that involve equal degrees for challenge and skill, thereby putting them in the flow of learning and promoting their growth into more complex, happy individuals. No teaching method is perfect and results in 100% well-integrated, highly skilled, motivated, and happy students. A teacher who builds his instruction from these hypotheses, however, will have the greatest chance of motivating the broadest range of students to learn and grow.

REFERENCES

Applebee, A. (1981) *Writing in the secondary school,* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1982). From conversation to composition: The role of instruction in a developmental process. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advance in instructional psychology* (pp. 1-68). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1982). Learning, "flow," and happiness. In R. Gross (Ed.), *Invitation to life-long learning* (pp. 166-187). Chicago: Follett Publishing.

Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders.* Urbana, IL: NCTE Research Report #13.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Graves, D. (1979). What children show us about revision. *Language Arts, 56,* 312-319.
Hillocks, G., Jr. (1982, November). Inquiry and the composing Process: Theory and research. *College English,* 659-673
Hillocks, G., Jr. (1984). What works in teaching composition: A meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies. *American Journal of Education, 93*(1), 133-170
Johannessen, L., Kahn, E., & Walter, C. (1982). *Designing and sequencing prewriting activities.* Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and National Council of Teachers of English.
Murray, D., (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In C. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing* (pp. 85-103). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
Pianko, D. (1979). A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13,* 5-22
Singer, J. (1973). *Boundaries of the soul: The practice of Jung's psychology,* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Peter Smagorinsky teaches English at Oak Park and River Forest High School in Oak Park, Illinois, and is a Ph.D. candidate in curriculum and instruction in the Education Department at the University of Chicago. He has published in journalism and small literary magazines, and this is his first major publication in an educational journal. He was a presenter at the NCTE conferences in 1984 and 1985, and at the Basic Writing Conference in 1985.