CHAPTER - II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This survey of related works fulfils the following needs.

a. To look for identical work or works in terms of similarities in major concepts chosen by the researcher so as to avoid blind duplication.

b. To collect supporting concepts, ideas and theories related to the problem chosen by the researcher.

c. To choose appropriate means and methods of research work suitable and appropriate to the problem.

d. To augment the language-teaching devices of the researcher for post-research application in class room situations of the researcher.

2.1. BOOKS

French, F.G. (1965) is of the opinion that some mistakes are consciously committed by the students because of factors like laziness, excitement, cross-associations and instinctive translations as well as out of carelessness and forgetfulness. Some mistakes disappear in course of time automatically. He identifies areas of problems like sentence patterns, phrase patterns, tense and structures needed for the use of words. He warns against misdirected
explanations, which lead to the repetition of mistakes. He suggests to teach vocabulary first followed by tenses and structures taught simultaneously.

**Louis, Kolly. G. (1969)** prefers self-identification of errors and mistakes and self-correction. He also asks not to be bound by one theory or method. He suggests using abridged works of famous writers as the learners can be motivated by exploiting their respect for these writers.

**Rivers, Wilga (1969)** insists upon the need to improve other skills – viz. listening, speaking and reading so that the skills in writing can be developed more efficiently. She stresses upon the good but ignored techniques like copying, recombination, reproduction and composition to develop writing skills. She prefers short writing assignments, which can to be corrected immediately for on the spot discussion.

**Joseph, Foley. J. (1971)** highlights the effective methods to learn writing. “If you want to write, then read.” He also says, “If you want to learn to write, then write”. He presents different types of errors in evaluation like student test error, scale error and reader disagreement. These are the hazards in the reliability and validity of a test. So a teacher must prepare an integrated task-based approach.

**Lindeman, Richard. H. (1971)** discusses teacher made tests and standardised tests. How observation on the part of the teacher helps to measure both the general scholarship and specific attitude of
the learner is presented by him. He also presents different kinds of judging qualities like content validity, concurrent validity and predictive validity.

**Arapoff, Nancy (1972)** brings out the roles played by grammar, aural comprehension and oral production at varying degrees in writing about an experience. She also prefers familiar adopted passages for tasks for controlled and guided writing as substitutions and reference to grammar aspects would be easy. She also stresses upon the need for pattern practice and translation tasks before guided writings.

**Gwynn, Brooke. M. and Gurry, P. (1973)** feel that the desire to write comes from the desire to say. So information is vital in writing. "They write badly because they have nothing to say". So the teacher must first bring up locked-up information by cajoling and clarifying. Tasks, according to them, must be true to life, detailed and extensive. The learner must be tempted to probe into them. They ask the teachers not to interrupt but just to observe closely.

**McCauley, Donald (1973)** wants to exploit the stored images and emotions of the learner while teaching sentences. Thus he says that good teaching is to become both formal and situational to reduce the gulf existing between 'usage' and 'use. He believes that there is no contemporary usage basis to establish standards of correctness. He also warns the teachers to remember that rules are not universal. He believes that school grammar is not far different from scholarly grammar. He brings out the patterned activities framed by Holliday at
three levels i.e. formal substance and context. He brings out T.G. Grammar's focus on underlying regularities on language. As a native speaker produces infinite number of structures that he never heard before, teaching of grammar must help the learners to generate new structures by selection and applications of rules learnt with varying combinations. He also discusses 'context free' and 'context bound' grammar rules.

Harris, David. P. (1974) brings out the characteristics of a good test like reliability, practicability and easy interpretation of scores. He discusses how to construct a test that fulfils general objectives and derivations, and helps to determine item difficulties. He also informs the steps found in composing basic test statistics like frequency distribution and standard error measurement.

Wallwork, J.F. (1974) discusses how each type of linguistic unit functions with its own pattern and at the same time interlocks and interacts with other units having different patterns. He also discusses how a word acquires different meanings by different kinds of associations. He stresses upon the use of ostensive methods while teaching through gestures and actions to demonstrate meaning.

Bright, J.A. (1975) feels that errors can be reduced by adjusting the level of difficulties in a test to the capabilities of the class for the beginning. He discusses the main stages in writing like mastering the elementary mechanics of writing from spelling and hand writing, controlled structures using substitution tables to guidance
about form and arrangements (independent operations) in guided and free writings. He feels that the teacher should also work along with the learners. He recommends pieces written in order of time, dealing with moral incidents having a knot, flashbacks, pieces having consistent points of view and mood for tasks.

He also suggests using two contrasting pieces about the something for guided writing. He also warns that students do not always learn from their mistakes. So he asks for immediate reinforcement by spot correction, discussion and re-writing.

**Hornby, Alan. W. (1975)** brings out the role played by spoken contacts in writing. He recommends story telling to develop listening and writing skills simultaneously. He feels that there is no need to breakdown and reconstruct every single sentence from a given model. If one is striking enough, it could be kept intact. He also recommends oral drills before written tasks as they offer immediate response, which help to check clarity of comprehension and thus help remedial measures to design then and there.

**Lindwal, Mauritz. C. (1975)** focuses on assessing pupil achievement by choosing the right evaluation procedure, basing on specific objectives, validity and reliability of instructions, objectivity and comprehensive outlook, while interpreting raw scores.

**Tracy (1975)** brings out the differences between formative and summative evaluation. He discusses identifying ways of
measurement, validity and reliability pertaining to classroom performance.

**Barnard. J.B. (1976)** discusses how the title helps to select and order information. He also discusses how to open and conclude a paragraph and how the last sentence must either sum up or draw conclusions.

**Cooper, Robert. L. (1977)** feels that not always skills to be measured and tasks given are go hand in hand. So conclusions become tentative. He presents a three dimensional framework to test proficiency in a comprehensive manner, involving the four skills (LSRW), four aspects (phonetics, syntax, semantics and all these three) and two varieties (formal and informal).

So he suggests that a task to be divided in terms of skill, knowledge and variety. In the same manner, he suggests a test to be based on planning, item tryout and standardising. If more items are involved, more reliability can be achieved.

**Dykstra, Gerald and Christina (1977)** bring out the role played by studies in TGG (Transformational Generative Grammar) in identifying instinctive learning. For this, the internal capacity (contained reflexes) of the learners must be stimulated – the built in system to learn must be encouraged and thus the teachers must help the students to guess rules – both normative and puristic ones. They also suggest to base L2 teaching models to be based on L1 models. They also recommend the teachers to formulate their own teaching
theories. They present steps to construct a good model like rewriting a piece in another tense, retelling the situation, to writing the author's intentions, self-evaluation etc. They, warn against disclosing the steps to the learners beforehand as they may jump in at once and may get confused. They also believe that errors may disappear with subsequent practice. They recommend limited and selected vocabulary which is easy to remember. They warn that complex sentences using simple and familiar words are possible. For tasks, they recommend unfamiliar but interesting situations (E.g. the life of Hercules). They also warn that the teachers should not lose heart when one model is not successful. They recommend traditional textbooks for models in description (E.g. The Moon Stone, Born Free, The thirty-nine steps, etc.) They do not rule out dictation, which improves skills in spelling. They suggest explaining the spoken and written variations side by side to the learners.

**Optner, Ruth. L. (1977)** explains how sensory experience can be put into words in a descriptive passage. He also explains how objects, or persons can be described by comparison and contrasting with the help of the elements one sees, knows and imagines. He presents basic elements in writing like feelings, opinions, physical details, functional characteristics and personal flavour. He also explains how a process description could be well written.

**Chaurasia (1978)** recommends the discovery method – the learners probing and exploring other possible solutions. He suggests
making use of Poley's table of specifications, which contains concepts of idea (relevance, logic and subordinations), organisation (emphasis, transition, paragraph structure, theme, situation), skill (tone, originality), mechanics (spelling, punctuation and syntax) and vocabulary (frequency, range, figurative, etc.). He expects the teacher to keep the entry behaviour of the learners in mind while constructing tasks and tests.

**Neelakantha, Susheela (1978)** presents different kinds of errors at the discourse level like lack of coherence, presuppositions, lack of acceptability and grammaticality, wrong register and lack of appropriateness. In description, she warns against vogue introduction, abrupt concluding and the use of wrong metaphors, hyperbole, and wrong comparisons. She also goes on to point out possible mistakes like inconsistent reference, vague and superfluous references, faulty verbal ellipses, faulty verbal substitutions and omission of conjunctions.

**Rivers, Wilga. M. and Mary, Temperley. S. (1978)** want repeated-enforcement of the rules and conventions under novel contexts. So they want a single one-grammar concept taught at a time by using cognitive examples. New contexts can be made by conversions, expansions and combinations of existing contexts. They also discuss different types of tasks and drills, in which, "appropriate rules used, remembered at appropriate times." According to them, the final goal must be 'writing to create visual effects.' For this they insist
upon clarity of thought and linguistic skill. Clarity of thought will be achieved when complex ideas are broken down into simple ideas connected sequentially.

**Dakin, Julian (1982)** believes that each learner must be permitted to work at his own pace with breakdowns. Then, by giving familiar structures and more practice, he can get over these difficulties (breakdown). Later, by generating cognitive conditions, the teacher can enable him to try free writing.

**Hartley (1982)** insists upon the need to master reading and listening skills to develop the skills of writing. He discusses the mechanics of storage and retrieval of rules. He is of the opinion that unlike in L1, age is not a problem in learning L2. He presents how one form can be used in the place of another to convey the same meaning—'repertoire'. He says, “Transformation in it is made by our ability to predict the suitable alternative”. This is because only 'surface structures change'. He also presents problems in vocabulary learning like homonyms, connotations, polysemies etc. He presents a series of clues in teaching, ranging from mere-statement to marker, which includes directives, elicitation, cues, bids, nominatives, answering, evaluation and accepting.

**Heidi, Duly (1982)** gives the checklist of common errors and offers guidelines to the selection of a research design both longitudinal and cross-sectional design, for language elicitation techniques.
Turk, Christopher and John Kirkone (1982) bring out the causes for poor writing like the belief that same word(s) should not be repeated in a paragraph, and unusual words are elegant and interesting. They also feel that the notion of bad grammar must be replaced by accepted grammar. According to them, simple and direct style is more impressive. The problem to start writing can be solved by using known phrases. They accept false starts. They also feel that editing will make a draft better organised. They recommend the use of words based on frequency. They discuss how to describe tables, illustrations and graphic presentations. Sequencing from the familiar and general to the detailed and to specific will help fluency. Thus, they feel that ambiguity can be avoided.

Byrne, Donn (1983) discusses the writing systems, their properties like universal principles in writing. She warns that writing is a fragile skill. She presents the components involved such as motor, praxic, visuo spatial and visuo linguistic in writing. She focuses upon the problem of translating intended meaning or feeling into a text. The problems involved in producing a cohesive, unambiguous and explicit piece of writing for meeting the goal, are highlighted by her. She also discusses how planning and revising help to write a good written piece.

He also presents a comparative picture of the spoken and written forms of a language. She asks if first language acquisition process of the child can be applied to second language acquisition.
She compares the two different approaches to language namely analytic and synthetic. The first one is teaching by breaking the language into components arranged in pedagogic sequence and the other one is teaching in succession of structurally analogous but contextually unrelated sentences. She feels that the final goal of teaching must be 'communication'. The knowledge of how sentences are composed and combined logically is also focussed upon. For this she advocates situational teaching. She presents the two basic functions in writing, namely assembling words and patterns to form grammatical sentences and doing the same to fulfil a given rhetorical aim.

Crystal, David (1983) believes that sometimes, abstract reasoning solves problems in teaching like the problem of teaching words like 'music', which are associated with feelings and emotions. He also focuses upon the problem of defining, as a single word may have many functions in the same sentence. So 'sudden flashes' of insight and intuition help a lot. Here, intuition must be used to select an experience by the students and a technique by the teachers, so he prefers 'models' with directly observable function and system for teaching vocabulary and structures. Thus, structures can be classified in an interrelating manner by establishing basic functional units like class, unit, structures and system. Then infinite number of sentences can be produced by using the same rule.
Falych, Claus (1983), stresses upon ‘role play interactions’ before teaching the art of describing a person or an action. So he suggests tasks of problem solving types. He insists upon developing ‘strategic competence’. He warns against students’ nature to avoid risks by message adjustments, and message abandoning, over elaboration, and semantic avoidance. He is not against borrowing LI rules while developing strategies like presenting information about the topic. He says that spontaneity in writing, as in speech, without adequate learning is possible, as the students create their own rules and evolve their own production strategies. He advocates a systematic process of production, which is subconscious and automatic as in L1, to be developed in L2. He expects the teacher to prepare well in advance against problems like ‘memory lapse’. He defines a good strategy as, “... systematic series of steps by which the learner arrives at the stage of effective and clear expression with minimum effort”.

Kasper, Gabriel and Claus Foilerch (1983) discuss how structures can be taught more effectively. They suggest two ways. One is synthetic structure drill – a structure is taken from a piece and similar structures made with vocabulary substitution, insertion and expansion. The other is analytic teaching – different structures simultaneously taught by Q/A methods. They also talk about the inter-related roles played by function, notion, topic, setting, interaction, social role and exponents in descriptive writing. They present the ways in which sentences and paragraphs are connected with the help of different types of connectives. Ways include repetition
of ideas and key words. Connectives include pronouns, conjunctions, etc., and further types of conjunctions like additives, adversatives, casual and temporal.

**MC Murray, David. A. and Sue Campman M. (1983)** inform how pre-tests are to be conducted in descriptive writing. They want the words, sentences and paragraphs to be identified and labelled under sources of description like colour, shape, size etc. Patterns of organisation like zoom in/zoom out, panorama etc. are given. They discuss the techniques of descriptive writing from simple exploratory sentences to thematic arrangements, which include analysis of the stem described, selection and specification of detail, dominant mood, showing versus telling, comparisons and analogies and organisations.

**Widdowson (1983)** brings about the relation between ‘usage’ and ‘use’. He prefers to teach L2 though subjects. So, he suggests the teaching of L2 based on interesting and real life topics so that usage can be converted into use. He focuses upon discourse elements like sentence, proposition and illocutionary acts, coherence, cohesiveness, cohesion, prepositional developments for cohesion, procedures of interpretation, deriving discourse from sentences, and deriving discourse by various types of arrangements. He insists upon the knowledge of conventions to achieve the final stage of cohesion. He also brings out activities associated with written language like comprehending, interpreting, choosing the medium, mode and manner. He presents the three basic types of exercise – completion,
conversion and transformation. Other features in writing like composing sentences into a passage, role of context, information transfer, integration and control are discussed by him.

**Willis, Jane (1983)** presents the means and methods to teach English through English. She suggests to start with vocabulary and structures already studied. She also discusses the stages from controlled writing to free writing practice. She suggests discussing a new item for familiarity before it is being taught. The physical conditions favourable for learning are presented by her. She presents the things like suitable text and tasks, which are essential for organised teaching. She stresses upon the need to give 'hints' while teaching guided writing. She warns against things like blind copying and memorising during group discussions. She wants to train the students in checking themselves with questions like 'what', 'when' and 'how' etc. She also advises the teacher to check himself if he is being properly understood. For this, she prefers oral discussions before writing tasks. She highlights the role of 'discussion questions' in eliciting information from the learners. While discussing teaching the art of describing a process, she suggests to start with simple tasks like street-directions, instruction for driving a car etc., then proceed to complex ones like describing an experience or an ambition. She also discusses the production stages of a piece of descriptive writing, starting from spelling to variation in normal sentence patterns. She includes referential words, linking devices, organising information logically, using discourse markers for change of tone and special
vocabulary to convey complex attitudes and meanings. 'Expansion' of an idea, jumbled sentences and combining sentences with evitable connectives are some of the tasks suggested by her to develop skills in descriptive writing.

She also presents different types of questions like comprehension questions, specific questions, questions to test grammar relations and cohesive devices and questions to test inferred meanings and attitudes. She also stresses upon the need to develop motor skills of handwriting like clarity and speed beforehand. She feels that wrong pronunciation leads to wrong spelling. She prefers simple, meaningful tasks with clear instructions.

David, Jolly (1984) categorises descriptive writing with reference to place and position, measurements, shapes and patterns, colours and textures, materials and substances, technical vocabulary, use and value. He also focuses upon verbs predominantly found in describing changes and verbs, which restrict meaning etc.

Dechant, Emerald. V. (1984) stresses upon listening. Listening and reading develop the learner's thinking process and thus lead to better writing. He compares listening and writing on one hand and reading and writing on the other. He also suggests skills like note making, and outlining to improve comprehension skills. He recommends synthetic and analytical methods to develop meaning.

He also warns that errors may get fossilized if the teacher feels that they will disappear by themselves. So instant rectification is
needed. He presents areas of difficulty like subject-verb coordination, use of right tenses and using right prepositions.

He gives a list of strategies to elicit responses like questioning, (what, where, why, where, how etc.) and writing in first person. Developing the subject by the learners must be treated as learning a game.

**Flower, Linda (1984)** recommends Vygotskian concepts to the teachers to help the students develop the habit of 'inner speech'. This will enable them to plan, organise and control their writing activities. Later this will be develop by itself into 'analytical thinking'. Thus, stored information can be retrieved with associations. She also feels that the selection elaboration and relating relevant information by a writer is often based on his intuition as well as on his experience. She also discusses minor problems like writer following speech conventions in writing and fragments used in the place of complete sentences.

**Hendrickson, James. M. (1984)** offers guidelines for correcting composition errors by implementing 'discovery learning' methods. He also suggests the teachers to be aware of error types and frequencies and recommends both direct and indirect correction treatments like specific location of errors by the teacher and the learners locating the errors by themselves with the use of text books, dictionaries and grammar books respectively.
Kroll, Barry M., and Schafer John C. (1984) suggest focusing on the process – why errors are made. They suggest to use, “contrastive analysis hypothesis” to identify and rectify them. To them, errors are good and they show specific areas of difficulty. These errors are not only the result of learning difficulties but also are the result of caused by overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete rule application and hypothesising false concepts by the learners. They feel that not all errors will disappear.

Little Wood, William (1984) tells how to train students to use structures in real situations. He feels that structural view and functional view must lead to communicative view. He says that students must develop the ability to interpret linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge for specific functional meaning. He presents models for effective writing like reconstructing story-sequence, pooling information etc. He presents the use of large-scale simulation activities involving unpredictable factors. He also discusses the role of the teacher in forming the right sequence of teaching using his own intuition, experience and observation. He suggests starting with teaching simple structural patterns. He also discusses pre-writing activities like Q/A, discussions etc., and post-writing activities like oral and written feedbacks etc.

Raimes, Ann (1984) discusses the attempts made to reinforce oral patterns into the written form. Every writing enables the students to focus equally on meaning and manner, thus, cohesive and
coherence can be attained. She suggests that language courses might be grouped with courses in other disciplines. A reader-dominated approach is preferred by her. Once the concept of a powerful outside reader is established, it would be easier to generalise the suitable forms of writing and teach them in prescriptive patterns. She discusses the need to recognise 'students diversity' before going ahead with the above strategy.

Shankar, Uday (1984) lists the learning problems like changing emotional attitudes, excitements, depressions and distresses. He presents the learners tips for retention and revealing by improving reviewing and recognising.

Taylor, Barry. P. (1984) is against the established notion that there are only a limited number of supposedly correct ways to organise. He accepts that often students struggle to decide what exactly is that they want to say. He recommends 'brainstorm' sessions to help them to connect their observations, thoughts and facts and thus enable them to can get a clear idea of what they wish to say. Students often cannot see problems in their own writing. So on the spot corrections and feedback followed by re-writing is recommended.

Weiner, Eva. S. (1984) presents problems in writing like run-together words, run-on sentences, errors in punctuations and many kinds of incomplete sentences. Her list includes kinds of errors under
the heading of spelling, tense, meaning, logic, and communicative aspects.

**Weissberg, Robert and Suzanne Buker (1984)** analyse the grammar and rhetoric of describing a scientific process involving stating the problem, and purpose, discussing a theory with illustration describing an apparatus and reporting the results. They recommend low generic use of articles, verbs of report, citation conventions, hypothetical and comparative tenses, statives, passive voice, and verbs of procedure.

**Wilkins, D.A. (1984)** suggests teaching only of those forms in actual use. He feels that there is no need to teach complex structures, as the students will learn them by themselves later by reading a variety of books. He says that semantics can be studied in isolation, but not syntax or language forms. According to him, 'intuition' helps the students in identifying and studying parts of speech. He prefers a textbook for controlled writing as it contains well-designed lessons. He also brings out the difficulties in teaching tenses as one tense is used to refer to an action happening during some other time. He also discusses the infinite choice of verbs to express a single idea. Teaching structural relations is focussed upon by him. He asks if students learn only and completely what is taught. He suggests starting with teaching of transitive sentences. He questions the possibility of keeping an inventory. According to him, practice alone makes the rules-producing mechanisms familiar. He
says, “Learn responses by responding.” He is for learning rules and making structures simultaneously and in his opinion ‘errors show the limits of a rule’

He also wants teaching to be done in a controlled manner-step by step, item after item in sequential order by comparing and contrasting what is already learnt. He wants bilingual dictionaries used for teaching both denotative and connotative meanings. He is of the idea that communicative function mostly decides the form. So, rules and sentences are learnt simultaneously. He warns that not always correct answers indicate correct learning. According to him, the best way to each L2 is through subjects. He says ‘imitations’ and ‘repetitions’ are needed in the beginning. To him ‘rule governed creativity’ is the final goal in learning. He warns against “unique unforeseen operational complexities” like message adjustment, borrowing L1 rules while learning L2 (loan shift)/(code switch). He also says that by situational analysis, the students get communicative expertise and thus become communicative-competent. He warns against the type of ‘spontaneity’ without adequate learning by evolving one’s own rules and strategies. He suggests growth from LIG – Low Input Generator, which is demand-oriented to HIG – High Input Generator, which is creative and varied.

**Zamel, Vivian (1984)** highlights the role played by linking devices in a coherent passage. They (linkers) prepare the reader to anticipate ideas. These connectives signal as set of relations. They
also signal what has been preceded. She suggests many kinds of exercises like sentence completion and sentence combining to train the learners to master the use of linkers.

Bowen, Donald. J. (1985) presents possible means of evaluation like team absorbs, class discussions in addition to usual tests, and assignments. Simple statistical evaluation is recommended by him for language tests. He also explains how a fairly wide spread of scores indicate a good test procedure.

Littlewood (1987) discusses the need for "frame work" before attempting to start writing. He rules out 'habit formation' as a language acquisition device. To start with he suggests the teaching of 'functional words' and 'simple operating principles' like shorter sentences and less 'range of vocabulary' in order to avoid anxiety. He takes 'errors' as a means to study the students' developing process and the effectiveness of the techniques adapted by the teacher. He discusses the homogeneity in learning sequence, "universal order" of learning. He is not against the teaching of pre-fabricated patterns but wants this to be done along with studying forms and meanings put together. He prefers explanations during drills. He sets, "Unconscious free writing" as the final goal - Peak performance. He is not against memorising words and pre-fabricated patterns. He wants the teacher to identify the silently confused but competent students. He considers, listening, speaking, and reading, as pre-skills to writing.
Longman, John (1987) insists upon the need for specific reasons and details in descriptive writing. He shows how to write a passage in descriptive mode, beginning with a point or thesis in a single sentence to the last sentence which sums up. He includes elements like specific details, transitions made with the help of signals etc. He also shows how a piece in descriptive writing can be evaluated with special reference to unity, support, coherence, and sentences producing skills.

Kane, Thomas (1986) explains the final goal in writing a good descriptive passage by linking successive sentences and paragraphs logically so that the passage becomes coherent. He suggests the use of short and uncomplicated sentences of the balanced type for this. He also suggests variety in vocabulary and sentence types to avoid monotony.

Aoju, Li Xi (1990) is of the opinion that grading which goes often outside grammar and lexical items is a problem. So she is against Structural Syllabus as each student has his own individual pattern of learning which poses another problem. L1 interference can be minimised by comparing L1 & L2 characteristics. She also advocates an integrated method, which includes all the four skills.

Cambel, Cherry (1990) informs that actual composing begins along with summarisation and expansion of the written ideas, followed by imitation of style and finally synthesis. These are the stages that a beginner has to pass through. She feels that proficiency is directly associated with planning on organisation, content, audience along
with revisions for solving syntactic and lexical problems. Background reading will enhance the teacher to produce essays of better quality.

Cohen, Andrew, D. and Marilda Cavalcanti, C. (1990) present the differences between what the teachers give and what the students like to get. They feel that a teacher’s oral clarification as feedback is just not enough. So teacher questionnaire, student verbal protocol, student checklist, student questionnaire are needed for a more reliable kind of feedback. In this manner minimising of discrepancies between the teacher’s emphasis on content and organisation conflicting with students’ perception that “the teacher emphasis only grammar and mechanics” can be possible.

Eisterhold, Joan Carson (1990) says that writing quality is directly associated with reading experience. Better readers tend to produce more syntactically mature writing than poor readers. So he recommends the reading – to – writing directional models, which enables the writers to encode and decode more efficiently.

Erickson Hill, Carolyn (1990) argues strongly against protecting the learners from anxiety-provoking encounters and situations as she feels them to be powerful ‘stimulants’ to write by opening the closed minds. She lists the difficulties in descriptive writing ranging from lack of unity and coherence to lack of a dominant impression. He also includes tense - change for changing viewpoints. So he welcomes teacher’s interference to create purpose and generate content. According to him, descriptive writing has both expressive
and expository features. He says that human experiences cannot be isolable and atomic as they are time-bound. He also explains the relationship between composing and writing on one side and reading and comprehending on the other. Reading helps to predict how others will observe one’s writing. He also stresses upon the role played by assumptions along with observations on descriptive writing.

Hamp-Lyons, Liz (1990) brings out the problems involving reliability and validity of the scoring procedures. She warns against face validity as often produced by direct tests. She advocates for construct validity in addition to content validity. In spite of the difficulties involving validity and reliability in scoring procedure, comparable scores can be achieved by using different researchers assessing a same piece if proficiency is given the primary importance.

Harold, Allen B. (1990) insists upon the need to discuss tasks and problems faced by other teachers – both L2 and subject teachers. He also suggests the teachers to exploit their instinct to improve teaching as a mother does. He points out that ‘errors’ indicate difficulties in learning. So he suggests ‘learning writing, by writing’. He presents the ways to stimulate the ‘closed minds’ by using ‘lead’ and ‘inferential’ questions after making them think and reflect by placing them in exciting situations. He also recommends old grammar books as they contain ‘verified’ tasks and drills. He thus expects the teacher to make use of dictation for penmanship and spelling.
Johns, Ann. M. (1990) believes that L2 learning theories must be based on L1 theories. So relevant components must be selected from L1 theories and a comprehensive L2 theories can be made. She feels that startling, good topics are powerful prompts, helping the learners to focus, plan and generate ideas and go for self-discovery by writing. She recommends specific vocabulary for the beginning stage.

Krapels, Alexandra Rowe (1990) believes that lack of competence in writing in English results more from the lack of composing competence them from lack of linguistic competence. She does not rule out translation drills, as she believes that it is a good starting point to improve the composing skills. She feels that whenever there are L1 switches, the written pieces are of better quality in terms of ideas, organisation and details. So she suggest for a deep comparative study of L1 & L2 composing processes.

Kroll, Barbara (1990) recommends sentence level syntactic analysis and a global level essay analysis. The latter deals with limitation of the topic, consistance in focussing on topic throughout the essay, consistancy in point of view, logical sequencing of ideas and artful use of transitions, noticeable irrelevancies, lack of clear sense of purpose, shifting points of view, etc.

Richards, Jack (1990) insists upon the need to develop the ability to get round unknown words and forms. For this, he suggests the need to focus upon ‘specific contexts’ and ‘tone’. Thus, ‘prepositional’ meaning and ‘functional’ meaning are differentiated.
He also focuses upon purpose and attitude, which determine what detail is to be excluded, what must come first etc. in descriptive writing. Thus, the ability to predict what will come next can be developed. From this, the ability to process a person, situation can be developed. Then vocabulary, sentence types and structures can be chosen to suit the above process. According to him, this skill can be developed by training the learners to predict responses to known situations.

Silva, Tony (1990) compares controlled, guided and free composition tasks. According to him, controlled compositions are based upon oral based behavioural psychology - patterns learnt by imitation, focussing on accuracy and correctness. Guided tasks are based on transformations and expansions. Free compositions contain more free ideas and are expression based, which are a writer-oriented discourse. Any composing process, he feels, must be non linear and exploratory as writer discovers new meanings while writing. A collaborative workshop environment will enhance these.

Yule, George and Gillan Brown (1994) compare and contrast writing with speech. As in speech, the writer has no paralinguistic cues. They discuss the two main functions of written language - storage and shifting oral to the visual domain. Written language is more refined with less repetition of same syntactic form. Unlike in speech, the textual record means is determined by the reader's interpretation of what the writer intended it to mean. This is because
the writer cannot observe his interlocutor and modify what he is saying to make it more accessible and acceptable. So they strongly favour students be trained to survey, locate, read, evaluate and choose from outside information sources and later use it in their own writings.

They also discuss how to describe lists, tables etc. They feel that density of information need not be a must. They also discuss rules vs. regularities, product vs. process in the light of context, reference, implications and inference.

2.2. RESEARCH WORKS

It is surprising to note that only a few studies are conducted on developing “Writing skills in English” in India.

Ramadevi. S. (1977) is concerned about evaluating writing as a ‘thinking process’. She insists upon relevant rules combined, taught, recalled and used. She discusses the need, for writing at the U.G. level in relation to the students’ ability and what is expected in that area. She is of the opinion that consistency is lacking in teaching and learning writing. She also focuses upon forward and backward movement with the help of conjunctions to express intended feeling, idea etc. She presents different ways of guiding students to write better, like improving their ability to exploit the available resources like prior knowledge, post writing discussions etc.

Chaurasia. M. (1978) thinks that the ‘discovery methods’ will initiate the unwilling. Then, these students will probe, and explore
the possibilities of solving a problem. He takes Foley's 'table of specification' as a good model, which takes ideas, organisation, style, mechanics and vocabulary as the right sequence. He says that sentence combining without formal knowledge will affect the rhetorical aspects of writing. He is for reading before writing - creative writing from derived experience. He is for more controlled writing before guided and full writing for restricting errors. According to him descriptive writing can be effectively taught by writing different types of reports on a same process, and different descriptions of a same place etc. He presents different kinds of drills like filling up the blanks, match the following, jumbled sentences, T/F, note making, summarising.

**Bamatwala, Ayesha (1979)** brings out the aims in teaching writing - ranging from enabling the students to write with oral guidance, making them aware of the principles of paragraph construction, and linking devices, writing a cohesive paragraph using a few hints and following directions. She presents the strategies used to accomplish these, like oral questions to elicit responses for initial guidance, supervision, reinforcing rules of writing and group discussions and group writing. She also presents situations where correct responses made without knowing the functions like link words being used correctly by the students without knowing the rules. She suggests group correction with self-explanation by other fellow-students.
Eapen, Rachel L. (1979) discusses aspects of functional writing. She presents different approaches, methods and classroom techniques used in composition sessions in South India. She compares and contrasts the aspects of writing and speaking. According to her any writing that is related to academic, social or professional demands is functional. She says that writing skill can be achieved by developing the learner's skill in refocusing, and re-writing. She says that writing is not a teachable series of action, but more complex. She believes that self-learning can be acquired through listening, reading and even by speaking. Frequency and immediate feedback improve quality in writing. She believes the role played by context in controlling grammar and vocabulary range.

Arunachalam. R. (1983) focuses upon the need to teach cohesive devices. He presents different types of cohesive devices and methods like lexical items and grammatical cohesion. He discusses textual references like anaphoric and cataphoric references and extra-textual references like homophonic and anaphoric. He presents three types of references-personal, demonstrative and comparative and he brings out the role played by substitution, ellipses, conjunctive-adjectives in making a piece cohesive. He presents different types of tests like re-arranging jumbled sentences to test the skill in connecting sentences within and beyond.

George. K.K. (1984) thinks that vague objectives like learning ad hoc writing for exams hinders teaching and learning writing. He is
for guided writing for the college students in which context is clearly defined. He believes that open-ended questions during discussions motivate the students. He says qualities like searching, reflecting and revising must be developed among students to enable them to write better, which can be done by 're-articulating' the thoughts from the learners' memory. He thinks that with their existing knowledge of rules, better writing can be performed. He says that the mode must be decided before writing. He recommends reading related writing as it is interesting and easy to comprehend and the learners' own 'personal matrix' evolves out of this.

**Mukherjee, Ranajit (1986)** brings out various writing activities and has formed a general methodology to teach writing. He presents stages in writing process starting from choosing a topic to final draft and discussions. He discusses how practice can be designed leading to functional goals. He presents a flexible research design and problems in sampling and criteria for grading. He presents the merits of using teaching strategies based on experience approach. His study includes the need to stimulate earlier learning from the mind of the students.

**Reddy, Deepa (1986)** compares traditional and modern ways of teaching writing at college level. She identifies guides sold in the markets as a threat, which prevent students from learning writing. She is for evaluative textbooks in the place of present prescriptive ones as the latter lack direction and purpose. She is for special
assignments to improve writing skills among students. She focuses upon pre-writing activities like choosing the subject, outlining, selection of purposeful details etc. She also thinks that most of the students could not identify errors and mistakes committed by them by themselves. So she advocates a kind of 'remedial work', which must also include reading, observing, recollecting, note-making etc. She strongly believes that teachers who teach writing must write the same beforehand to predict difficulties.

**Baskaran Nair. P. (1987)** gives importance to psychological interactive process between the teacher and students as between a mother and her child. This will lead to natural learning of rules to, "mean through meaningful sentences". He wants students to be exposed and trained in producing meaningful units, which are combinations of semantics, syntax and pragmatics. So inborn potentialities of the learners should be exploited before hand.

**Singh, Rohtos (1993)** discusses the role played by the teacher in planning the topic, choosing ideas, organisation and presentation and thus improving long-term memory of the learners. He says that sometimes goals are generated by writing 'Syntactic maturity' must be the main aspect that leads to effective writing. He presents the components of a good task from objectives to evaluation. He also discusses how tasks can be effectively implemented with ease. 'Feasibility' of the task decides the range of success. He recommends
tasks to be implemented only after interaction and negotiation with the students.

2.3. JOURNALS

Martha, Mary (1977) presents various types of errors like errors in the structure of the verb phrase, lack of co-ordination at the word order level like dangling modifiers, omission of adjuncts, spelling errors and at the lexical level.

Bissex, Glenda. L. (1981) informs how teachers who write along with their students share the same writing problems and seek external assistance. She describes the characteristics of a good writer. A good writer, according to her, focuses first on meaning and only later on correctives and neatness. She says that important, right and concrete words and structures will automatically emerge if the writer is clear of the meaning.

She also recommends natural flow in writing without touching grammar elements in the beginning. She focuses on editing in guided writing. She suggests other modes of discourse to be taught for fluency. (argumentation, narration, etc.).

Smith, Frank (1981) brings out the popular myths and facts about the nature of writing. He is of the opinion that writing is not always for the transmission of information but mostly to create experience and to explore ideas. Thus, writing is not always for external communication as the writer is the first reader, who writes for his own exploratory purpose. He says that writing can create
ideas, which may not have existed in the mind. He discusses the
notion that a writer is a special kind of person—more intelligent,
sensitive, disciplined and so on. He does not accept the notion that
writing is a silent activity as a lot of, ‘sound and fury’ takes place in
the mind of the writer while writing.

discuss various kinds of tests to measure the ability to perform a
particular task. They prefer the essay test, as it is most practical to
accommodate any number of tasks. They say that topics must
accurately discriminate between good and poor writers. So abstract
topics like ‘religious beliefs’ which may be difficult to evaluate must be
avoided. They say that scoring must be economical using speediest
methods.

Grigby, Lucy (1982) says that writing must make the students
to learn about themselves. She says that testing students’ writing
cannot always help to arrive at judgements about effectiveness of
instruction. She focuses upon instructions, which help the students
to recollect feelings and experiences while writing. So teachers must
compare their judgements with those of others. She suggests
evaluating classroom activities through observation also by colleagues.
She also insists upon the questions a teacher should ask himself
before judging writing, as the students not always know for sure what
they are expected to do.
Heidi, Dulay (1982) presents a list of errors frequently committed by learners like mis-ordering, omissions, copula, double markings, which can be global as well as local. She recommends language elicitation techniques with task mode and task focus. She discusses elements like mean sentence length, number of T’ units, number of descriptors, and degree of grammar correctness. She also discusses language acquisition order, acquisition sequence, affect, concrete referent, contrastive analysis and empathy.

James, Raymond. C. (1982) is of the opinion that it is still not clear what is to be evaluated in writing-editorial skills or semantic intentions. Another problem is that performance is not stable as language is not an object but an unstable set of fluid relationships among symbols and subjects. So he insists upon a sound rhetorical framework with a statistical design. Otherwise, he says, “it (teaching) will be used by any one but its inventors.”

James, Collins. L. (1982) talks about the first draft, which normally lacks sufficiency of content. So appropriate topic sentences must be developed. Then words and phrases will automatically evolve later in the paragraph. Describing people and places will be a good start to look for patterns of errors. The organisational problems can be solved by describing the relationships between objects and occupants.

Kelly, Lou (1982) explains how writing can develop various intellectual skills and stimulate sensory organs. She lists out a
variety of forms and functions like prose for expressing thoughts and feelings. She discusses how to read and respond to the writings of students with the help of probing questions that help students to clarify and reshape their expressions. For her writing must be a way of learning and hence must be studied in relation to other disciplines. So prospective and active teachers must be well informed in other areas.

**Krvupa, Gene. H. (1982)** says that the teacher should have a clear framework consisting of goals, strategies, methods, and reactions, before teaching. She focuses more upon interactions of various kinds while a teacher teaches writing. The teacher should be non-judgmental till the problem is completed.

**Purnel, Rosentene. B. (1982)** brings out the steps in evaluating competency in writing. Steps are complex as attempting to get clear and consistent standards offers the most serious challenges leading to abuses of testing. So even the levels of mastery of certain minimum skills becomes difficult.

**Stephan, North. M. (1982)** brings out the phases in writing, starting from intention or discovery to mete-conference. The problem with teachers according to him is that they are looking for signs of their success in the wrong places. This is because they just stop with editing and repairing. They must listen and respond. So he says that a teacher must also be a tutor.
Selinker, Larry and Russell Tomlin, S. (1986) discuss how skill integration and separation will lead to more systematic teaching of writing. They are of the opinion that separating the four skills is like separating water; it flows back together. They bring out the difficulties involving in deciding when the target skill is fully achieved. They conclude that there is lack of substantial evidence to form any principle in this regard.

Windy, Ball, E. (1986) focuses on handwriting. She says that students do not instinctively use visual clues such as spacing. They need training to position the information. Otherwise, writing process may become slow, painful and inaccurate with information gaps. The desired gaps between letters and words must be taught so that all students can keep pace with each other. A less controlled exposure to graphic structures may be of much help like scanning for information with the help of signs and symbols.

Conner, Ulla (1987) focuses on writing processes, strategies, audience, purpose, context, aims and modes of discourse. He stresses upon the functional sentences which are important for the teaching of coherence in writing – ‘wholeness in its meanings’. This is possible, according to him, by teaching the right semantic relationship between sentence topic and discourse topic. Clear focus on discourse topic is needed during revision. He also discusses ‘know how’ topics which are helpful to teach how to build meaning through parallel, sequential or extended parallel progression methods.
Zamel, Vivian (1987) brings out the complexity in composing sentences. So writing is still taught according to reductionist and mechanistic models. She discusses the need to integrate writing behaviour with writing pedagogy. She says that the teacher should become researcher by himself to investigate the relationship between teaching and writing developments in his own classroom.

Eldridge, John (1988) recommends teaching writing without modelling. It may throw the students in at the deep end, make them struggle but will be more rewarding. This also enables the teacher to assess their capabilities and adapt his teaching accordingly. A simple discussion beforehand is enough. Working groups is preferred. Then the teacher may proceed towards guided writing. Extra time thus spent will be well invested. They may able to choose topics and go ahead accordingly.

He also suggests parameters for selection of material and methodology like the need, language ability, interests and attitudes. He recommends single activity for a day.

Fulcher, Glenn (1988) argues that context is the most important aspect of any written piece. This is the reason why professional writers are continually re-writing their works. He says that the teacher merely corrects grammatical 'errors', ignoring the content aspect very often. So the teacher should focus upon essay writing to achieve mastery over content as well as over vocabulary and syntax.
Braine, George (1989) focuses upon non-exam writing tasks like brief article summarise for macro prompt. Further readings in the topic will help the learner to expand information already discussed into guided writing. He warns the teachers to note that the students are not perfectly informed and well prepared for the tasks as the teachers are. So the teachers must be favourable enough to be patient and expert perform in the re-written possesses.

Brooke, Robert (1989) is against the idea that teaching writing should help students to control their writing process. The learners must also be ‘monitors’, concerned with the dynamics of composing. Thus, writing processes may become the writers’ toolkit. Conscious intentions, unconscious process and situational influences play vital roles here. So, he says that teaching writing should directly address strategies inherent in the writing process. Students may be allowed to go out of control and still can be brought back. ‘Planning’, according to him, makes the process of writing less a struggle. Planning must be done only after the wandering, focussing, exploring and formulation of ideas in the mind of the learners are complete. Plans are discovered both by conscious efforts and unconscious processes. He says that the more control is sought, the more it is lost. The best tool to have clear thinking is writing itself.

Carolyn, Hearn. O. (1989) focuses upon students who possess imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, spell or write. She says that most of the college teachers fail to recognise these signs in
student writing. This is because, for most students, writing has been a source of frustration and humiliation as writing has to be done quickly without any chance to proof read. So she suggests the need for more time and attention to overcome these.

Leki, Ilona and Joan Carson. G. (1994) believe that interest in vocabulary development and grammatical accuracy are not related to language conventions in writing. They also conclude that students do better, if they could read and write faster. So they (students) must be trained in picking information quickly and use it effectively as illustration in their own writing.

They also recommend illustrative tasks. They also recommend the teachers to use model sentences and familiar phrases at the early stage. Writing, according to them, must be a habit to attain fluency and perfection.

Atkinson, Dwight and VAI Ramanathan (1995) discuss how learners with closed minds can be motivated. Methods include not only the attitudes and behaviour of the students but also that of the teachers during the process of learning and teaching. The focus is on developing concepts, which are to be used later in writing. Thus, writing must help thinking logically and innovatively. So organisation, editing, revision after well-supported arguments with formal and stylistic conventions of writing are preferred. Thus, students are trained to see and structure their experience with these tacit rules.
Harmer, Jeremy (1995) feels that there has been too much teaching and not enough learning. So techniques like ‘discovery’ for grammar teaching are advocated. He also says that immediate correction is not necessarily be the more effective way as it would embarrass the student before others. This may make the learner to stand in awe and fear and vulnerable to the temptations of resigning.

Harris, Muriel (1995) insists upon the need for the teacher to function also as a tutor while teaching writing. Tutors are favoured by students. Tutors acquire the information needed by the teachers from the learners by picking up clues from watching closely and listening to the students. Most students insist on writing what they like in their own way. They can be helped more effectively by tutors who also have the feel for such students. Thus the gap between the teacher and students can be narrowed down.

Newton, Jonathan (1995) stresses upon the need to train the students to read and retell and ask and answer, which may lead to negotiation of meaning and vocabulary acquisition. He says that any acquisition should not stop with usage but lead to use.

He also suggests starting teaching to write self-portraits with simple ordering. He discusses how to expand the principal topic. Then, he discusses the use of balanced sentences for sharp contrast, repetition for emphasis and for reminding, intrusive sentences for classification. He discusses how to divide on object event into parts
and rearrange them in some order for effective description. He also recommends expressionism to shock and intensity details.

**Spaulding, Cheryl. L. (1995)** classifies writers who write to please other from those who write to please themselves. He says that the latter stage must be the final goal, as it requires self perceived control and competence. He also warns that the teachers must be more careful as their beliefs, interpretations, practices and style influence the learners to a greater extend.

**Harrower, Alan (1996)** discusses task-based methodology in which tasks are aimed at eliciting target language discourse production. She prefers small-scale content-based questions for this goal. So follow-up-programs must be carefully designed.

**Jacobs, George. M. and Jessica Ball (1996)** discuss group works and a range of related functions like guidance and encouragement from the teacher. Tasks must be prepared to suit group works. Enough time must be offered for interaction. Interdependence and individual accountability must be developed simultaneously. They strongly recommend small groups. When the teacher is satisfied with the overall group activity, greater autonomy may be given.

**Giacobbe, Jorge (1996)** brings out the role played by L1 in L2 acquisition process – How L1 influences the hypotheses being used to construct a linguistic scheme in L2. He believes that L1 influence is most restricted to transfer. Exploring L2 aspects cannot happen
without the knowledge of L1 aspects. So success in the L2 discourse activity demands that the learner develop a genuinely bilingual competence. Thus, he brings out the complex system of L1 influencing the students acquiring L2 competence.

**Trahey, Martha (1996)** is of the opinion that the processes of L1 and L2 acquisition are essentially the same. She says that it is enough that simple sentence structures like (SV, SVO, SV+ infinitive, SV + that clause, SVO \(_{\text{indirect}}\) + O \(_{\text{direct}}\), SVO + that, etc.) can be taught and other complex structures will be learnt by the students by themselves later from extensive reading.

**Ting Yen-Ren (1996)** says that all modified L1 composing strategies can be transferred in to L2 and produce the same effects in L2 writing. She explores the L1 writing processes. She focuses on the purpose of editing which is to sound natural to the reader. According to her, editing does not hamper drafting and is not always grammar based.

**Eckman, Fred. R. (1997)** discusses the amount of grammar teaching while teaching writing. He questions if L2 competence is just grammatical competence. He says that sufficient grammatical competence already exists among student as they can produce and interpret L2 sentences.

**Bonsly, Chrissie (1999)** stresses upon the need to reconsider, clarify and revise thoughts. The writer must anticipate and consider viewpoints other than his own. This is because in wiring, propositions
cannot be prompted and clarified as in speech. So links must be made by the writer himself. She suggests that group work can assist the writer in this regard.

Graham, Steve (1998) focuses upon the need for explicit instruction for improved penmanship, and for developing fine motor co-ordination. Thus, grasping while copying or listening could be improved.

Jožzen, Joy and Fredericka Stoller. L. (1998) discuss the phases between reading and writing. They start from discussing how the reader can form an idea about the text topic and end with the final written draft. The phases include organisation, checking the material, making a mental mode, checking for break-ups in his own comprehension, developing a deeper understanding of the topic, knowing what to expect, paying attention to connecting ideas and self-evaluation of his own written piece.

Dorobish, Sherry. A., and Richard Walls (1998) stress upon the need to develop storage and retrieval abilities among students. They discuss the process of encoding and decoding of information. They present the inter relationship among word structure, word sound and formal meaning. They compare these processes with reference to L1 and L2 acquisition.

They believe that students take more time to become self-directed. They recommend aiming at one specific achievement at a time. They warn that some problems cannot be observed. They
believe that group works keep the spirits of the learners up and also leads to self-correction.

*et al.*

**Hidgers, Thomas. L. (1999)** insists upon context realisation by the students, which will help them to form a suitable framework. So when students are given topics from their chosen fields, they are made aware of the body of existing knowledge and the conventions in the fields while they research and write. But, they are not aware of the ways in which they have to present them. So writing must be viewed as solving problems and seeking goals.

**Chimbagna (2000)** feels that most beginners often try a kind of intermediate language between L1 and L2 – an approximative system to meet the L2 needs and acquire this transitional competence. This is achieved by message reduction, message adjustment and by over generalisation. This problem can be solved by topic restriction and by topic illustration. Popular topics, with shared knowledge must be given. Thus, linguistic competence and organisational skill can be developed simultaneously.