

Preparing ESL Students for College Writing: Two Case Studies

Laureen A. Fregeau

[lfregeau \[at\] usmail.usouthal.edu](mailto:lfregeau@usmail.usouthal.edu)

University of South Alabama (Mobile, AL, USA)

Introduction

Three years into my career as an instructor of non-credit ESL courses I began to question my approaches to teaching writing, especially their applicability to the future needs of my students. I had tried a variety of approaches. At the onset of this research I was doubtful that any of the approaches had successfully improved my students' writing skills or preparedness for college credit course writing. As coordinator of our program, I wanted to know what approaches would be effective and how we could improve our students' chances to succeed in writing in their future college courses.

With the help of two former students I explored approaches to best prepare my students for college credit writing and liberal arts and sciences courses. I continued my investigation with an examination of what writing skills my students would need for college credit courses in liberal arts and sciences.

Method

Selecting a case study approach, I conducted and recorded a series of structured and unstructured interviews¹ with the two participants, Betsy and Bozena. Interviews were followed with document review. All writing including prewriting, notes and early drafts the two participants produced in writing instruction courses during one semester were examined. Samples of their writing from liberal arts and science courses were also examined. Instructor responses on writing assignments participants produced in my non-credit ESL class and other courses were then reviewed and compared.

Structured and unstructured interviews were conducted over a one semester period. To discover the participants writing skill needs and weaknesses we explored:

1. their writing process;
2. the writing they were required to do in the aforementioned courses;
3. their composition professors' responses to their writing compared to their liberal arts and science course subject instructors' responses;
4. their retrospectives on approaches and content needed to adequately prepare them for writing in college credit courses;
5. differences between approaches and content they learned in my class and in their college credit courses;
6. effects of the various approaches on their learning of writing;
7. the effectiveness of the various approaches in preparing the students for college credit writing and general courses;
8. appropriateness of the various approaches for their learning styles;
9. and, effectiveness of the various approaches in motivating them to learn or be more attentive to their writing.

Students' Backgrounds

The two participants were selected for their differing linguistic backgrounds and varied educational experiences. They were also selected for the different academic programs into which they had been placed after completing my course.

Bozena

Bozena, a European female in her twenties had studied several languages, including some English, before she emigrated to the U.S.A.

She completed a college degree in her country and worked there several years. Bozena likes everything about writing in her language including writing fantasy, book interpretations and discovering ideas on paper.

When Bozena arrived in my class, she could barely communicate in English. During the semester she attended my class I experimented with dialogue journals. The course had become competency based teaching skills such as writing notes, resumes, and filling out forms. I asked the students to write about their life experiences in journals or as papers. Dictations continued to be employed, but with fewer corrections. Fewer surface errors were corrected, however, under pressure from students I continued to correct these errors.

Bozena took ESL II, Biology and Algebra during the semester she participated in this research. She also had taken ESL I. Our discussions focused on writing requirements from these courses.

Betsy

Betsy is a Hispanic female in her twenties. She went to school in the U.S.A. for grades one and two. In third grade she returned to her country and continued school until eighth grade. While in school in her country she learned some English. Betsy returned to the U.S.A. and earned her General Education Diploma.

Betsy likes to write. She has kept a diary in Spanish, has written poetry and corresponds regularly with family and friends. In school in her country she learned how to write paragraphs, summaries and reports. Her family made her practice writing regularly. Betsy looks at writing as an art.

Betsy attended my class for one semester. That term I corrected all surface errors in all student work. Most writing consisted of dictation, grammar based/vocabulary practice sentences and text copying. At the time I thought my beginner and intermediate students were not ready for any "more complex" or "freer" writing.

The semester Betsy participated in this research she took Composition I, Sociology and Speech. Each of these courses required writing. A previous semester, Betsy took Contemporary Women and Psychology. The required writing from these courses was examined and discussed as the basis to explore Betsy's writing needs.

Betsy and Bozena had different expectations of writing for college credit courses. Betsy expected to be required to know how to do essays, to use correct grammar and spelling, and to write organized ideas. Bozena expressed a desire to write about her ideas but expected her fear of grades to interfere with this process.

Students' Writing Processes

Early interviews focused on the students' writing processes, including how the writing they were required to do in their college credit courses influenced this writing process. The students described their writing processes as dependent on the type of writing to be done and the circumstances under which it was to be done.

Bozena

Referring to composition course writing projects, Bozena indicated that grading influenced how she would approach her writing. If the assignment was not to be graded she would "not care about grammar" and "write more and pay attention to ideas." Assignments to be graded would be shorter with more attention paid to better grammar. Strategies for writing graded assignments included "thinking ahead about grammar," and eliminating a sentence when unsure about the grammar. Such sentences would be eliminated even when the idea was important to communicate meaning. Bozena's writing process depended on what the professor required. It was easier for her to compose in paragraphs than use an outline. When an outline was required she would first write the paragraphs, then the outline.

Bozena begins her writing process with contemplation. Once her thoughts are organized she proceeds to write. Alternatively, she integrates processes thinking and writing paragraph by paragraph. Following the completion of her first draft, Bozena uses a dictionary to improve vocabulary usage. She edits and recopies the assignment if the grammar and spelling are not "perfect." Conversely when writing in her native language Bozena did not "worry about grammar ... I know spelling and grammar ... I just write

my ideas. Ideas are important."

Betsy

Betsy's writing process was also situational and varied. Personal correspondence was written without deliberation. When writing for college credit classes she would first think of the topic, then proceed to write about her ideas. She would not write paragraphs immediately. Instead she wrote a series of ideas then put them together into paragraphs. Betsy had difficulty "doing everything in order." New ideas would come to her as she composed. These ideas would be written on the paper as other ideas would be crossed out. Simultaneously Betsy would circle spelling she did not know how to correct. Draft after draft would be discarded as another was written with new ideas and sometimes with corrected spelling. She often found herself starting her writing over when her ideas changed as she wrote. This process would become tiresome and Betsy would put the assignment aside to come back to another day. Thus, writing assignments took days and "used a lot of paper!" Betsy sometimes had her assignments proofread by a friend after which she would make changes and correct errors.

Betsy knew a writing assignment was finished when she was happy with it. Some assignments she was never happy with and were never finished. Betsy was happy when she finished writing in Spanish because she was confident of her spelling and could accurately express her ideas. In English she felt there is always something missing. She usually handed in her work feeling unsatisfied with the finished product.

Writing in College Courses

College credit courses taken by participants fell into three categories: ESL, non-ESL composition courses and courses which required writing skills but did not teach writing (liberal arts, science). Writing requirements for these courses varied as did the participants' reactions to those requirements. Requirements in both courses that taught writing and in those which required writing skills for assignments affected participants' abilities to operate in the college writing environment. This was especially true concerning attitudes about and approaches to writing. In the former courses, attention to structure and form was required while content and audience were less important. In the latter courses the opposite was true.

Writing Course Content and Approaches

Bozena

Bozena's ESL II instructor focused on form over content or communication with an audience. Composition of complete sentences and paragraphs was the major focus. An outline was required before attempting to write a composition. Considerable time was spent learning the correct form for outlining. "Correct" outline form contained line for line sentences for each paragraph. Topics were usually prescribed, but sometimes the students were told that the topic was unimportant as long as the outline was done correctly. Bozena had written numerous papers while attending college in her country but had never been required to do outlines. She caught on quickly outlining but viewed it as a waste of her time. Outlining blocked her thoughts rather than helped her organize. Ultimately Bozena decided to write her paragraphs first and then construct the outline from the finished writing. This approach was very successful for her. She achieved high grades in ESL II.

Eventually ESL II students were required to write a short composition. Instruction included chronological order, focusing on the topic, clarity, and thoroughness. Bozena already had learned these skills in her country. She needed to apply them in English, but repetitive low-level practice was not useful. Audience was not emphasized in either participants' classes. Bozena and other students in her classes knew their instructor was to be the audience. They wrote accordingly, watching for grammar, spelling and punctuation.

Betsy

Audience was not discussed in Betsy's classes. Nor did her classes concentrate on outlining skills. Instead she learned structure and strategy for writing an essay: identify a topic, show the main idea in the first paragraph, address the topic specifics, conclude in the last paragraph.

Betsy was required to write a variety of rhetorical form compositions for Freshman Composition I. Betsy would go to the instructor for approval of her topic when possible. The instructor often suggested a topic for her. The class practiced comparison and contrast,

description, and argument rhetorical forms. Students were instructed to choose a topic, refine/define it, brainstorm ideas, delineate, outline, formulate a statement of opinion, outline a paragraph for a rough draft, and finally write the final paper from the rough draft. The instructor would write essay steps on the board for students to follow. Betsy did not understand all the written instructions and thought she did "everything wrong."

The class wrote an essay composition for their final exam. They were instructed to choose a topic and practice their essay for one month prior to the exam. The instructor scheduled extra time with Betsy to correct surface structures and reduce the composition length. Betsy felt this indicated the instructor perceived Betsy as incapable of writing a satisfactory composition on her own. Betsy was instructed to memorize the composition and then write it on the final exam. Betsy tried, but she was unable to memorize a four hundred word essay. Instructors from her English classes were willing to spend additional time tutoring and explaining structure and vocabulary.

Betsy was very frustrated by writings she composed. She wanted the reader to understand her intended meaning. But, due to an insufficient knowledge of English structure she sometimes could not accurately express her ideas. She wished her writing were more sophisticated, but she "didn't have the words." Betsy was further frustrated when her instructor reworded her papers in ways that changed her intended meaning.

Writing Course Effects on Participants' Writing Skills and Attitudes Towards Writing

Both participants viewed the content of courses they were required to take as inadequate in for their needs. Bozena viewed ESL course content as too elementary. Betsy viewed non-ESL composition course content as too advanced. Bozena resented being required to take courses that offered content she knew. She developed a dislike for the professor and no longer enjoyed college. She learned more English outside the classroom than she did in ESL II. Betsy became frustrated, but recognized that her writing had improved through practice. Both participants indicated they desired more practice writing in English.

The participants suggested approaches that they believed would have served their writing needs. Bozena wanted to learn to express her thoughts in English. She suggested this need would have been served by ungraded assignments. If the stress of earning a good grade had been eliminated, Bozena felt she would have practiced more meaningful and sophisticated writing. She would have had more opportunities to edit meaningful writing and improve her spelling and grammar in a more complete writing process.

Betsy felt her writing had improved despite her frustrations. Her assignments were usually meaningful and she enjoyed researching the information. The process of searching for topic information exposed her to "real" English vocabulary and usage. She suggested that because she was forced to write more in English she became more comfortable with writing in English. She expressed a continued need and desire to learn more about English grammar.

Liberal Arts and Science Course Writing Requirements

Writing skills requirements for college credit courses in liberal arts and science differed from those of the college composition and ESL writing courses. Requirements for liberal arts and science courses included writing research reports, essay tests and answering homework questions. The participants attitudes towards writing for the college composition and ESL writing courses differed significantly from their attitudes towards writing for liberal arts and science courses.

Betsy was enthusiastic about writing assignments for her sociology course. Research papers were the typical writing assignment in Sociology. Assignment topics were selected by the students. Topics were high interest, such as career opportunities, pay and benefit structures. The instructor gave guidelines and was more concerned with ideas than with grammar and punctuation.

Bozena was also more comfortable with and motivated by writing approaches used in liberal arts and science courses courses. One reason for this was that the focus of writing was on the effective communication of ideas. Some professors would correct spelling, others looked for meaning. If the professor could not understand the meaning, the answer was incorrect. Thus, Bozena spent less time looking over grammar and spelling, and more time on ensuring her ideas were clearly communicated. On written tests or for in-class exercises there was no time to correct spelling and grammar. Betsy found the college developmental reading course effective because her professor understood her writing despite surface errors. Bozena concluded that clear context was the key to clear communication.

Participants reported difficulty with sequencing, topic selection and clarity of expression when writing research papers. Betsy thought that sequencing was difficult because there were so many possibilities. Expressing researched information in her own words also difficult. Bozena agreed that sequencing could be difficult if the topic offered no natural order such as with an event or narration.

An instructor of a liberal arts course indicated that Bozena's writing was meticulous but revealed her distress and had little content. This instructor noted that a paper which Bozena wrote in haste had interesting content but abundant surface errors. The instructor felt that papers Bozena devoted extended time to were perfect grammatically, but lacked content. This instructor was looking for content. Neither Betsy nor Bozena had sufficient writing skills to complete assignments with both complex content and correct grammar.

ESL and Composition Instructor Responses to Participant's Writing

Examination of participant's assignments revealed that English instructors primary responses to the students' writing were grading, correction of surface errors and rewording of unclear text. Occasionally the instructor responded that a paper was too lengthy. Inconsistent error correction and confusing instructor rewording of student text were unproductive for student acquisition of writing skills.

The most frequently corrected errors were spelling and verb tense errors. The instructor typically wrote in the correction, indicating the presence of an error without indicating the type of error committed. There was no consistency in error correction approach between courses. One instructor usually employed the editor's notations, another usually gave the correct answer. Some common errors were left uncorrected in assignments completed later in the term. A frequent response was to reword the student's text when it was not clear. Corrections were usually grammatical but frequently changed the student's intended meaning.

The most prevalent instructor response was grading. One instructor gave a grade for content and a grade for mechanics. These grades were neither objective nor consistent. Students were confused about why the instructor asked them to select a topic and then rated this preference. Mechanics were inconsistently corrected and of little consequence to the intended meaning or language usage accuracy. Nebulous responses such as "very good!", "MMMMMMM", and "nice, but redo," confused rather than instructed.

Student Feedback

Student interpretations of and responses to instructor corrections, grading and rewording of text tended to be similar. Responses included resentment, frustration, compliance and noncompliance.

The participants concluded that the types of responses described in the previous section indicated whether or not the instructor "liked" the paper. Bozena felt these types of responses were hypocritical and ineffective in improving her writing: "I get "Very Nice," but an A- for one punctuation error and I think it's not very nice."

Betsy and Bozena determined their writing course and some liberal arts and science course instructor responses indicated they were primarily interested in grammar. However, they were frustrated - sometimes confused that each instructor had different grammar requirements. One instructor required one or two designated structures to be correct for a given assignment. Only those structures were graded for that assignment. Another instructor defined "good grammar" as no repetition, accurate vocabulary, the use of appropriate examples, and short concise sentences. Fearing a low grade, Bozena complied with instructor requirements and any changes in requirements. Betsy was less concerned with grades and less compliant with instructor requirements. When instructors indicated brevity was required, Bozena accepted this and counted her words. When Betsy had something to say she wanted to say it all and ignored word limits. Betsy felt instructors communicated requirements and corrections through demeaning approaches. She would have preferred a guide to follow rather than repetitive reviews of errors.

Neither participant acquired language proficiency or writing skills from corrections written on their papers. They simply copied the instructor's corrections into their next draft and handed it in. Grades were raised if students copied instructor corrections accurately. Participants indicated that if they studied the corrections they might remember them, however this was not required for completion of the assignment.

There were instances when copying instructor corrections resulted in confusion. Betsy would guess where to insert the instructor rewritten text when she did not understand the instructor's meaning. This often created an even more confusing text. Betsy's original

text was clear even when awkwardly phrased or grammatically incorrect. The rewrite was incomprehensible. The instructor wrote a question mark where Betsy had copied the corrections. The instructor forgot she had written that text. Betsy's positive attitude toward corrections did not reduce the quantity of errors she made. If the instructor had asked a clarification question instead of rewriting the paper, there would have been much less confusion. The correction of surface structure errors was ineffective in promoting participants' writing skills.

Betsy and Bozena participated by invitation in a class involving a process approach and then enthusiastically indicated they believe a process approach, including dialogue journals, would be more effective than the more traditional product oriented ESL instruction approaches they previously experienced⁶. They expressed a desire to participate in an entire writing class based on peer reading, clarification questions, idea revisions and instructor/student conferences.

Liberal Arts and Science Instructor Responses to Participant's Writing

The types of responses to student writing differed significantly in liberal arts and science courses. Instead of correcting surface errors or rewriting the student's composition, these instructors looked primarily at meaning and clarity of communication.

Both participants' liberal arts and science instructors looked for a demonstrated understanding of concepts, original ideas and clarity rather than form, grammar and spelling. Grades on written exams depended on clear communication of content. The participants indicated they might look at spelling or grammar corrections, however they generally do not unless these are considered for their grade. Betsy reported trying to edit grammar and spelling corrections, although she absorbed little information from this activity. High frequency surface errors on Betsy's papers continued to appear despite instructor corrections.

Conclusions

The two case studies in this research revealed that our college credit and non-credit writing courses were not employing approaches effective in improving Potentially English Proficient (PEP) student writing skills or language structure usage nor in promoting a positive attitude toward writing. The content of these courses did not articulate with the writing skills requirements for liberal arts and sciences courses students would subsequently take. An examination of innovative approaches in a non-credit ESL writing course and a review of writing requirements and approaches in liberal arts and sciences courses provided insight into effective approaches.

Ineffective approaches were frequently used in non-credit and credit writing courses. Surface structure correction was the most common type of correction used as an approach to teaching writing skills and language structure². Repetitive copying of teacher-made corrections and rewording was another frequently employed approach. These types of approaches tied to the correction of surface structure errors were not effective in teaching writing skills or language structure. They were distracting, causing students to focus primarily on surface structure rather than on the clear expression of their ideas. Further, these corrections, especially rewordings, may change the meaning of what the student originally intended to communicate. At best, correction of surface structures may prepare PEP students to expect this type of instructor response from college credit course writing instructors. At worst, students will not acquire the skills they will need for their college career and may become resentful and frustrated with writing.

Grading of errors promoted student resistance to use of new language structures. Revisioning which consisted of copying instructor-made corrections was not an effective approach to teaching writing skills or language structure. Requirements in writing courses were often inconsistent. This was confusing to students. Inconsistent grading was also confusing to students and promoted resentment towards writing practice.

College credit and non-credit writing courses were intended to prepare students for liberal arts and science course writing requirements. Instead they emphasized skills not needed in liberal arts and science courses. The result was that PEP students went into liberal arts and science courses without having acquired the academic English writing skills they needed to succeed in these courses.

Bozena's ESL writing class experiences presented her with a narrow and inaccurate view of college writing. She learned that the audience is not important, except when the audience is grading you. This implies that organization, ideas and writing audience-based prose are not important, surface structures are³. Since liberal arts and science course instructors *are* expecting the former, PEP students who have been focused primarily of surface structures may be unprepared for writing in these courses.

To be successful in academic writing in liberal arts and sciences courses, PEP students had to enter the courses with writing skills they had learned outside writing courses. Students who had L1 academic writing skills or even non-academic writing experience transfer these skills to English. They relied on these skills learned outside of writing courses to help them succeed. These skills were not sufficient to alleviate writing problems the students had. The result was sometimes frustration or confusion.

Despite frustration and confusion, Betsy benefited from her college writing courses because she was forced to practice writing. Betsy had no background in college level writing in her L1. Fortunately her attitude about grades buffered her from the potential loss of creativity in her writing process. Both Bozena and Betsy were resilient. Students who, like Betsy, have little background in L1 writing and who, like Bozena, are primarily concerned with grades may be less resilient, more resistant.

When an instructor required communicative writing Bozena was able to transfer her L1 writing skills to L2 using the communicative writing process she learned in her own country. ESL instructors need to consider that her writing in these courses could have been affected had she not learned idea-centered writing in her country. Clearly students with college level L1 writing expertise would benefit from an ESL approach that facilitated transfer of L1 writing process skills to L2 while improving vocabulary and knowledge of English language structures.

The two case studies gave insights into some effective approaches we could employ in place of the ineffective approaches we had been using. The students indicated that process approaches rather than micro-product approaches are more effective as tools for motivating students to practice writing, to develop a positive attitude toward writing, and to teach writing skills and language structure. Positive feedback (recognizing and reinforcing what the student has correctly acquired) is more effective in promoting language structure acquisition and a positive attitude than is error correction. Students indicated that a process approach including dialogue journaling, peer reading, clarification questions, idea revisions and instructor/student conferences would be effective.

Betsy and Bozena brought different backgrounds and attitudes about writing with them to their college writing courses. Their experiences in writing in English at college have resulted in each having different outlooks towards writing, both positive and negative. Whether a student learns writing or not may depend on their attitudes⁴ towards writing and what requirements they perceive as contributing to their learning. Students who perceive course requirements and content as useless are likely to "avoid" learning. They may resort to completing assignments in an easy formulated way which requires little application of writing process skills.

Students displayed motivation to write in their liberal arts and science courses. Motivation was due, in part, to student selection of high-interest topics for writing assignments. Student input into the selection of topics also promoted a positive attitude toward writing and language learning. More important to motivation and positive attitude than student selected topics was the use of real communicative writing tasks. These were writing tasks where topic and content were highly valued.

Bozena and Betsy were comfortable writing in their L1. Bozena was comfortable with writing in English before taking college credit ESL writing courses. Grading systems she experienced created apprehension about writing. Grade anxiety redirected her attention from communication centered to grammar/structure centered writing. Stress due to the grading of surface errors can be eliminated. Low stress ungraded writing practice was more effective in promoting a positive attitude towards writing practice and learning new language structures. Multiple drafts and editing can replace the copying of instructor made surface error corrections. Individual conferences can assist students who have difficulty with revisions of particular errors.

The use of assignments that make the natural connection between learning and practicing reading and writing jointly are effective in promoting writing skills and language structure acquisition. Students see the natural connection between reading and writing in these assignments and this promotes a positive attitude toward writing. A clear connection between writing skills needed for writing requirements in liberal arts and science courses promotes a positive attitude toward writing skills and language structure acquisition⁹.

There is clear need to reexamine approaches used in ESL college writing preparation courses. One could contend that writing course approaches and curricula should not be closely connected with the writing skills required in liberal arts and science courses. However, if the purpose of writing courses is to prepare students for liberal arts and science courses, then requirements of the former must more closely articulate with requirements of the latter. Emphasis should be on acquiring communicative academic writing proficiency over less meaningful correction of surface errors. While surface structure will always remain important to English and ESL instructors, perhaps it is time we recognize that our obsession with it is hurting our students. Betsy and Bozena both thought it important to learn how to spell, punctuate and use correct grammar in English. Undeniably, to communicate well (Betsy's concern) and to feel confident in the society (Bozena's concern)⁵ appropriate knowledge and manipulation of structural elements of the

language is necessary. It is evident that most language structure and writing skills acquired by Bozena and Betsy involved repeated *functional* use of style and structures⁷. Surface structure concerns must be balanced with the ability to organize and express one's communication in an effective and applicable manner. A student who can follow a set of instructions for structure and form, but who cannot adequately and to their own satisfaction express their thoughts is not prepared for college or professional goals.

Since conducting this research I have become an advocate of a process-oriented approach for teaching writing to PEP students and native speakers of English. I currently incorporate a process approach to writing across my curriculum. I have found dialogue journals and repeated functional use of language to be effective tools for improving writing⁸.

Notes

1. Research design and questions were formulated from Brown, H. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall and Saville-Troike, M. 1976. *Foundations for teaching English as a second language: Theory and method for multicultural education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
2. Teaching ESL writing through a focus on drills and grammar is prevalent according to according to Farr and Daniels 1986. ESL teachers commonly assume this approach will improve student writing skills. See Farr and Daniels 1986. *Language diversity and writing instruction*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
3. ESL teachers have been found to consistently focus on correcting surface errors using editor's codes and red ink. See Williams, J. and Capizzi Snipper, G. 1990. *Literacy and Bilingualism*. New York: Longman. For further discussion of the overuse of error correction see Brown, H. 1980. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
4. See issues of affective domain on language learning in Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. 1972. Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers and Spolsky, B. 1969. Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. *Language Learning*, V19, 271-283.
5. These are examples of both integrative and instrumental motivation. See Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. 1972. *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers and Macnamara, J. 1973. The cognitive strategies of language learning. In Oller, J. and Richards, J. (eds). 1973. *Focus on the learner: Pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
6. For a discussion of product and process approaches to teaching writing see Williams, J. and Capizzi Snipper, G. 1990. *Literacy and Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.
7. Further discussion of functional use of language in teaching writing can be found in Williams, J. and Capizzi Snipper, G. 1990. *Literacy and Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.
8. For further discussion of my use of dialogue journals see Fregeau, L. 1996. Using dialogue and reflective journals. *Writing across the Curriculum Newsletter* V2 n1, 3 and Fregeau, L. 1997. Using dialogue and reflective journals in teacher preparation. *SRATE Journal*, V6 n2, 45-49.
9. For further information on the natural connection of reading and writing in the promotion of language learning see Brown, H. 1980. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall and Widdowson, H. 1984. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. V, No. 10, October 1999

<http://iteslj.org/>

<http://iteslj.org/Articles/Fregeau-CollegeWriting.html>