

## Writing To Be Read Inside And Outside School: The Issues And Challenges Of Writing For The Teacher And An External Audience

\*Souad Benabbes<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of French, Faculty of Languages and Letters, University of Oum El Bouaghi, Algeria

### Abstract

This research investigates the influence of the reader's socio-cultural background on revising and rewriting an FLE text. The aim is to understand better how learners consider the expectations of the addressee when revising and rewriting their texts. Two contexts were established for revising an argumentative text on the impact of influencers in modern society : a first draft in a school context intended for the teacher and a second draft outside the school intended for readers with a specific socio-cultural status.

The results demonstrate that writers exhibit more excellent receptiveness to improve the quality of their writing and persuade their readers when engaged in authentic communication. Both secondary school and university-level writers made more revisions when addressing a reader who was less familiar with them and belonged to a culture different from their own.

**Keywords:** writing Culture, Recipient

### INTRODUCTION

With writing, social mobility develops through a system of achievement where learning and mastery of this skill confer a status in society and symbolic power. Furthermore, the advent of writing has led to the migration of literate individuals from rural areas to cities, promoting urbanization at the expense of subsistence agriculture. Writing is thus associated with power and prestige and symbolizes individual success. Over time, it has emerged as the means of cultural differentiation between the "ignorant" and the "educated," the "inferior" and the "superior," surpassing its mere function as a communication technology: " While in the past, even among peoples without writing, the mastery of writing was appreciated, it was never more than a secondary mode of communication. [...].Today, writing predominates widely in the social system; the illiterate of yesterday has become the illiterate of today" (Goody, 1994: 156).

There are various approaches to teaching writing. These include the controlled-to-free writing approach, the free writing approach, the paragraph-pattern approach, the grammar-syntax-organization approach, and the communicative approach, all focusing on different aspects of language. Traditional approaches to teaching writing emphasize a teacher-centered model and the final written product itself. Students are typically asked to produce a portion of writing within a limited time frame based on a given topic (Gezmiş, 2020).

Moreover, every act of writing encompasses the writer-subjects' social, personal, affective, and motivational dimensions (Bishop and Rouxel, 2007; Delcambre, 2007), which can impact their learning (Oriol-Boyer, 2002). Furthermore, as writing activities necessitate complex processes (Barré-De Miniac, 2002; Hayes, 2012), they often provoke anxiety among students, leading to discouragement and potential school dropout (Bouffard and Chouinard, 2007; Troia, 2002).

While students are expected to address someone other than their teacher when writing, in reality, their primary audience is often the teacher. Written productions are a response to a request and are indirectly aimed at the teacher, intended to demonstrate a certain level of competence. In these school assignments, the interaction between writer and reader is generally absent, resulting in the addressee being rarely considered. Often, the writer fails to empathize with the reader's perspective and understanding due to the absence of a real reader. The goals of reading are thus either absent or artificial. In authentic production activities, however, writers utilize their knowledge to select linguistic means that align with their intended expression and the reader's comprehension.

Therefore, writers who take their readers into account during revision possess what Smith (1982) refers to as a 'sense of audience.' A writer who understands their readers' characteristics can adapt the register of their discourse accordingly. Additionally, comprehensive knowledge of the addressee's production context and worldview significantly contributes to successful communication. Hence, the writer must consider the social, cultural, and ideological contexts and the recipient's knowledge, values, and biases. Incorporating these aspects enables the writer to produce a convincing and compelling text for the target reader.

Our study focuses on How individuals at different levels consider a specific addressee to enhance their initial written draft in FLE. What revision mechanisms do different writers employ to ensure message effectiveness and promote reader receptivity? These questions constitute our primary inquiry.

To answer these questions, we have formulated hypotheses that serve as guidelines for our research and may provide insights. According to our general hypothesis, writers would produce higher quality texts (choice, organization, and formulation of information, adherence to lexical and grammatical conventions, visual presentation) when addressing an unfamiliar reader with a distinct socio-cultural background compared to a familiar reader characterized by a well-defined socio-cultural status. This general hypothesis is further broken down into three sub-hypotheses, which explore three conceptual aspects:

- Writers enhance their writing when engaged in authentic communication.
- When revising for an unfamiliar reader with a specific socio-cultural status, writers produce higher-quality texts.
- "Expert" university writers make more significant changes than "novice" high school writers.

These hypotheses structure our study and enable us to investigate the various dimensions of interaction between writer and reader in revising and improving written production in FLE.

## **1. Learning to Write in Secondary Schools and Universities**

Writing activities in secondary classrooms often prioritize the outcomes of writing, neglecting the teaching and learning of writing processes (Piolat, 2004; Troia, Lin, Cohen, & Monroe, 2011), as well as the contextual factors surrounding these activities (Troia, Lin, Cohen, & Monroe, 2011; Troia, Lin, Monroe, & Cohen, 2009). However, numerous researchers and writing specialists have emphasized the importance of considering various individual and contextual factors in developing writing skills (Bucheton et al., 2014; Chiss, 2012).

These factors can significantly influence the development of writing skills, including learners' characteristics and the contextual aspects of writing instruction (Beminger et al., 2009; Jasmine and Weiner, 2007; Lefrançois et al., 2005, 2008; Lord, 2008, 2009; Prince, 2011). Over the decades, mastery of written language has become an essential skill for integrating and thriving in today's society. Students are confronted with demanding studies that require extensive learning over an extended period.

Since the implementation of the LMD system in 2004 and the subsequent restructuring of programs in Algerian universities, it has been observed that the allocated class hours for learning writing in the French department have significantly increased. On one hand, this is due to the need to condense a four-year program into three years (as compared to the traditional system). On the other hand, it is evident that "students entering university are not illiterate, but even for those whose native language is French, adapting to academic writing is not self-evident.

Previously, writing was taught in two modules at the university: "Systematic Practice of Language" (1.5 hours per week in the first and second year) and "Techniques of Written and Oral Expression" (a weekly session in the first year alternating between teaching writing and speaking). At Larbi Ben M'hidi University, the teaching of writing now spans four and a half hours during the first four semesters of the undergraduate program. The subject is "Techniques of Written Expression," where students engage with written language in reception and production. At the end of the program, students can take one and a half hours of "Comprehension and Written Production." The objectives of this subject aim to:

- Establish an interaction between needs, obstacles, and the development of writing competence.

- Foster writing workshops for literary texts and functional texts.
- Promote creative writing to destigmatize the act of writing.

Examining excerpts from the university curriculum demonstrates the keen interest of program designers in different discursive and academic genres: note-taking, summary, essay, report, synthesis, dissertation, and administrative writing. By "academic," we refer to the writing that « students are required to produce throughout their studies to validate their education, which includes both examination papers and writings that accompany their intellectual development » (Delcambre and Lahanier-Reuter, 2010: 24-25). Literary writings also have their place: In their third semester, students are exposed to reading and writing texts of various literary genres, such as plays, fables, and poems. In summary, we can say that upon entering the university, students encounter texts of different natures. They enter, in fact, the realm of writing par excellence, the territory of "foundational texts."

## **2. Revise Your Text for Better Writing**

In the 1980s, several researchers became interested in the writing process and developed models of text production to understand the various stages and mechanisms involved. Among these models, Hayes and Flower's (1980) model gained widespread recognition in the French-speaking world thanks to the work of Michel Fayol. In contrast to linear models based on the practices of professional writers, Hayes and Flower's model focuses on non-professional English-speaking adults and examines their reformulation behaviors during writing.

The model proposed by Hayes and Flower presents a more intricate perspective on the writing process, encompassing several dynamic sub-processes. The sub-processes encompass concept creation, planning, formulation, and local and global revision. This approach emphasizes the iterative aspect of the writing process, underscoring the ability of authors to engage in several rounds of revision. Furthermore, it underscores the writer's pre-existing knowledge, linguistic proficiency, and adeptness in employing writing techniques.

The model proposed by Hayes and Flower has made a valuable contribution to the comprehension of cognitive processes included in the act of writing and has exerted a substantial effect on research conducted within the domain of text creation. In their study, Hayes and Flower (1980) employed a methodology that articulates authors' cognitive processes (think aloud) to investigate and elucidate their writing processes. The cognitive model employed by the individual is reminiscent of a problem-solving methodology, and it encompasses three primary elements: the contextual framework of the task, long-term memory, and the writing process.

The revision process, essential in the cognitive model, involves the writer engaging in activities such as reading, evaluating, and modifying their content. However, in contrast to authors who create content in their first language (L1) and may possess professional expertise, these three activities are executed automatically through a control procedure.

Revision, a crucial component of the writing process, has been the focus of scholarly investigation in recent decades. Revision, often seen as only one aspect of the writing process, together with planning and editing, is now acknowledged as a separate and unique process involving several interventions to manage the output of written work. Roussey and Piolat also endorse this perspective, asserting that the process of rewriting has always been perceived as a means of enhancing written linguistic expression. It is now seen as a control mechanism for various writing processes, with planning processes also involved" (Roussey and Piolat, 2005: 351).

Revision is defined as a composite process comprising several sub-processes and guided by the objective of improving the text. It involves a control structure that determines the timing and order of interventions in the various sub-processes. Revision is no longer solely viewed as an activity to enhance written production but as a control mechanism for the different editorial processes, including planning. Therefore, revision is an activity that involves revisiting the text at all stages of the writing process. It draws upon a wide range of knowledge, depending on the revision strategy used, and requires varying cognitive investment based on the reviser's writing expertise, revision context, text type, and reader.

Despite the distinction between research on the writing process (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987; Hayes and Flower, 1980) and research focusing on learning to write, which emphasizes the motivational, cognitive, and metacognitive processes of writers (such as awareness of writing processes, explicit teaching of writing and revision strategies, modeling, scaffolding, discussions, and text critiques) (Troia, Graham, and Harris, 2011), a consensus is emerging regarding the most effective approaches and pedagogies. Empirical studies, such as those conducted by Berninger et al. (2009) and Graham and Perin (2007b) in primary classes with students facing writing difficulties, have demonstrated that an approach based on cognitive processes, explicit teaching, modeling, and scaffolding is more effective than traditional writing instruction.

### RESEARCH METHOD

The methodology of our study is based on a two-month experiment conducted with participants to examine the actual writing practices in Algerian schools, understand the mechanisms of "revision/rewriting" employed to improve a piece of writing, and compare the utilization of these strategies by individuals at different levels and in various communication situations.

For our research, we experimented with a diverse group of participants consisting of two groups differentiated by their levels of knowledge and writing skills. The first group (G1) comprised 45 secondary school students from Khenchela, divided into three sub-groups. The second group (G2) included 36 university students enrolled in the French department's 2nd year of a degree program. Like the high school writers, this group was divided into three sub-groups.

The primary objective of this experiment was to investigate whether the level of writing expertise could influence the consideration of the interactive "writer-reader" dimension in a text written in FLE and, if so, in what manner.

**Table 1: Sub-groups of Writers and their Readers**

Scriptwriters	Readers
G1a - G2a	Third-year secondary school pupils
G1b - G2b	Journalist, Journal l'EST
G1c - G2c	French teacher

The writing workshop comprised a series of twelve sessions, each lasting for one hour. The initial 10 sessions were centered on targeted exercises on examining reasoning, the writing process, and various revision procedures. Upon the conclusion of this experimental sequence, the participants were assigned to generate an argumentative discourse concerning the impacts of influencers on present-day society. Every writer was provided with a document with the assigned topic and detailed instructions to compose their initial draught using double spacing, facilitating extra room for later modifications.

The adjustment occurred 48 hours after the first composition. A total duration of forty-five minutes was allocated to this particular phase. Each topic received a separate folder with its initial version of the text and a document giving the requisite instructions for the revision process. The task of reviewing and editing the written texts produced by the participants in the two groups was undertaken by two educators. These instructors were tasked with evaluating both the substance and structure of the writings.

The revision occurred 48 hours after the completion of the initial draught. A total of 45 minutes were allocated to this particular segment. Each topic was provided with a separate folder containing their initial version of the text and a paper outlining the required guidelines for the revision process. Reviewing and editing the written texts produced by the participants in the two groups was undertaken by two instructors, who were tasked with assessing both the substance and structure of the writings.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Upon doing a textual analysis, it was seen that the adolescent authors in their third year of secondary school and second year of university had been revising their first draughts. This involved including a limited number of concepts and substituting words, both at a formal and semantic level. The individuals developed an awareness of the multitude of opportunities presented by the act of revising and acknowledged that a written work is the result of several selections and determinations made by the writer. Consequently, they allowed themselves to exercise choice and make decisions by employing strategies that facilitated appropriate rewriting of their texts.

### 1. Length of Written Work

To address the first objective of this research, we tallied the number of words, lines, and paragraphs to ascertain whether there was a disparity between the two versions of the text initially produced by all participants in a conventional school context, where writing was primarily directed towards the teacher. Subsequently, we examined how the writers revised their compositions in light of a new reader-addresser characterized by their level of competence and socio-cultural background.

**Table 2: Length of texts for the first sub-groups**

	N. Moy of words	Average number of lines	N. average of §	$\Delta M$	$\Delta L$	$\Delta \S$
Initial version G1a	170	14.31	3.90	17.06	01.89	0.9
Version revised G1a	192	16.06	3.99			
Version initial G2a	250	22	3.60	40.4	6.87	00
Version revised G2a	341	26.45	3.60			

The data analysis reveals that in the initial version of the text produced in a traditional school context, all participants had an average of 3.90 paragraphs. However, after revising to consider the new reader-recipient, the average number of paragraphs decreased to 3.99 for the first sub-group (G1a) and 3.60 for the second sub-group (G2a). Regarding the number of lines, there was an average discrepancy of 1.89 lines between the original and updated versions across all participants. The participants in the initial subgroup (G1a) exhibited a mean augmentation of 6.87 lines, whereas those in the subsequent subgroup (G2a) had an average rise of 3.60.

Regarding word count, the mean disparity between the original and revised versions was 17.06 words among all participants. The participants of the initial subgroup (G1a) had an average disparity of 16.06 words, whereas those in the subsequent subgroup (G2a) displayed an average disparity of 26.45 words. The findings indicate that the modifications made to fit the novel reader-recipient typically resulted in a marginal augmentation in the number of paragraphs, lines, and words inside the texts. It is worth mentioning that the first version of the first updated group (G1a) exhibited a more substantial augmentation in both line and word counts when compared to the original form, in contrast to the second subgroup (G2a).

**Table 3: Length of texts in the second sub-groups**

	N.moy of words	Average number of lines	N. average of §	$\Delta M$	$\Delta L$	$\Delta \S$
Initial version G1b	162.00	12.57	4.28	42.67	02.71	0.29
Version revised G1b	207.14	15.56	4.57			
Version initial G2b	258	18	4	29	02.50	0.25
Version revised G2b	285	21.09	4.25			

In the original iteration of the text generated within a conventional educational setting, the second subgroup exhibited an average of 4.28 paragraphs. Upon reevaluation to account for the intended audience, it was seen that the mean number of paragraphs experienced an increase to 4.57 for the initial sub-group (G1b) and 4.25 for the subsequent sub-group (G2b). The second sub-group had an average difference of 2.71 lines in text length when comparing the initial and updated versions. The initial subgroup (G1b) had an average disparity of 2.50 lines, but the subsequent subgroup (G2b) demonstrated an equivalent average disparity of 2.50 lines.

According to word count, the mean disparity between the original and revised versions was 42.67 words for the second subset. The initial subgroup (G1b) had an average disparity of 29 words, but the subsequent subgroup (G2b) demonstrated an average disparity of 21.09 words. The findings suggest that upon rewriting to accommodate the new reader-addressee, the texts in the second sub-group exhibited a marginal rise in the number of paragraphs, lines, and words. Nevertheless, the observed discrepancies are comparatively less significant when compared to the initial subgroup (G1b) across all the analyzed metrics.

**Table 4: Length of texts in the third sub-groups**

	N.moy of words	Average number of lines	N. average of §	ΔM	ΔL	Δ§
Initial versionG1c	181	11.10	3.50	27.83	03.40	1.16
VersionrevisedG1	183.83	14.50	04.66			
VersioninitialG2c	245.40	17.40	3.60	46	04.40	00
VersionrevisedG2c	291.40	21.80	3.60			

Examining the findings presented in Table 4 uncovers several noteworthy discoveries about the textual length within the third sub-groups. In the original iteration of the material generated inside a conventional educational setting, the third subgroup exhibited an average of 3.50 paragraphs. Upon reevaluation to account for the intended audience, it was seen that the mean number of paragraphs experienced a rise to 4.66 for the initial subgroup (G1c), but it remained unaltered at 3.60 for the subsequent subgroup (G2c). This finding suggests a notable rise in the mean number of paragraphs following the editing process within the first sub-group. Concerning the line length of texts, there was an observed mean discrepancy of 3.40 lines between the original and modified versions across all participants. The initial subgroup, denoted G1c, had an average discrepancy of 4.50 lines, while the subsequent subgroup, labeled G2c, demonstrated an average discrepancy of 4.40 lines.

The average disparity in word count between the original and updated versions was 27.83 words across all participants. The participants of the initial subgroup (G1c) exhibited an average discrepancy of 183.83 words, whereas those in the subsequent subgroup (G2c) had an average discrepancy of 245.40 words. These results demonstrate that revising the texts led to significant adjustments in paragraphs, lines, and words for the participants in the third sub-group, particularly for the first sub-group (G1c).

## 2. Review and Consideration of the Reader

In the first sub-group (G1a), Wissam added, "Influencers can educate and inform their audience about important subjects such as health, the environment, and human rights that interest them in their daily lives...". With Amine (G1a), we observe a replacement that encourages a genuine change of context. The writer was attentive to the new communication situation and involved the reader in the second version by replacing "since they like" with "since you like".

Among the academic writers, only five considered the requirements of the new communication situation. In Malek's case, we noticed the addition of "However, some influencers may exploit their audience's trust in exchange for remuneration or free products, even some journalists sometimes do this....." or the inclusion of "Overall, journalists and influencers play different roles in the media landscape. Journalists are responsible for providing objective and verified information, while influencers focus on creating content that appeals to their audience." at the end of the text.

The results of this study demonstrate that the instructions, which specified a pragmatic issue and the authentic setting of written communication within a framework of revision and rewriting involving interaction between the writer and the reader, helped the participants in our research focus on the clarity of their arguments and convincingly address their future readers. It is also important to note that the writers in the two groups did not approach the task similarly. Each of them, in their own way, paid attention to the new context of written production, which required them to adapt their text to the new reader and understand the reader's expectations and beliefs. Thus, managing the interactive dimension of writing engaged the writers in a strategy of re-elaborating their discourse with the aim of improvement.

When they revised their writing with a French teacher in mind, we observed that the same writers adapted their texts to suit the characteristics of this new reader. For example, in Rania's case (G1c), we noted the addition of the following instructive sentence: "Let us only focus on the positive aspects of our tradition and religion."

This highlights the importance of considering the specific characteristics and expectations of the reader in the revision process. The writers adjusted their discourse to address the French teacher directly, using formulations to guide and transform the reader's behavior. The injunction aims to influence the recipient's reactions beyond the discourse situation, going beyond mere agreement.

In Tassnim's case (G2c), we observe the addition of an implicit expression that refers to the reader: "*As a Muslim, it is important to bear in mind that we should not blindly follow all influencers. While some influential voices may carry positive values, others may promote Western behaviors or ideologies that are not in line with the principles of our religion*".

Whether the writer's level of writing expertise is a crucial factor in determining the degree of interactivity with the reader and the quality of the rewriting activity, it is evident that the texts underwent more or less significant changes between their initial and revised versions. Some changes involved rewordings or additions, while most focused on spelling or syntactic corrections for novice and expert writers. However, the changes between the initial and revised versions were more remarkable for the writers who addressed a French teacher, whether novices or experts.

Clearly, writers at the two levels approached their addressees differently and analyzed their socio-cultural characteristics before proceeding with the rewriting activity. However, it is essential to note that the level of expertise is not the sole determining factor favoring the quality of revision. Indeed, we observed that the writers in the secondary school subgroup (G1a) made significant changes in their revised versions, demonstrating their ability to fully engage in the rewriting activity even with a less advanced level of expertise.

The analysis results of our two datasets confirmed our initial hypotheses and addressed our research questions. Writers at both levels demonstrated that by considering the requirements of the new communication situation, improving their second draft during rewriting, and utilizing revision as a tool for improvement, they gained greater mastery of the writing activity. These results confirm the significance of the diversity of forms and functions of written production and the crucial role of social writing across all disciplines.

This study enabled the learners to construct new understandings of the writing activity by recognizing that knowing how to write implies knowing how to communicate. Furthermore, this research proved to be significant in enhancing our professional growth. The platform facilitated our participation in communicative writing exercises with genuine readers, although on a limited scale. Every cohort of writers effectively employed techniques tailored to their strengths and abilities, resulting in notable achievements.

## **CONCLUSION**

In summary, this study has provided evidence to support the necessity of rehabilitating writing activities by considering many types of written output and the importance of social writing in all academic disciplines. Furthermore, it has allowed learners to cultivate additional proficiencies in revision and rewriting, utilizing the revision process to improve the quality of their written works. Consequently, this research has contributed value to enhancing comprehension of the writing process and its pedagogy in acquiring French as a second language. The cultural background of the intended receiver dramatically influences the process of amending and rewriting work in FLE.

Although our study focuses on a limited aspect of this matter, it provides evidence in line with Christine Barré de Miniac's claim that creating varied forms of written discourse is essential for enhancing writing proficiency. Writing proficiency is enhanced through engaging in various forms of writing within diverse social situations. This method places significant emphasis on providing learners with genuine and diverse writing opportunities, considering the qualities of their intended readership in the future. Hence, despite the constraints inherent in our study, it emphasizes the importance of varied writing practices in acquiring writing skills and the imperative nature of integrating communication and rewriting as integral components within this developmental process.

## **References**

- Barré De Miniac, C. (1995), « La didactique de l'écriture: nouveaux éclairages pluridisciplinaires et état de la recherche », *Revue française de pédagogie* n° 113, p. 93-113.
- Barré-De Miniac, C. (2002). Le rapport à l'écriture. Une notion à plusieurs dimensions. *Pratiques*, (113-114), 29-40.

- Beminger, V. W., Garcia P. N. et Abbott R. D. (2009). Multiple process that matter in writing instruction assessment. Dans G. A. Troia (dir.), *Instructions assessments for struggling writer. Evidence based practices* (p. 15-45). New York : The Guilford Press.
- Bertier C & Scardamalia M. (1992). « Dos modelos explicativos de los procesos de composición escrita », *Infancia y aprendizaje*, n° 58, p. 43-64.
- Bishop M.-F. et Rouxel, A. (2007). Sujet-lecteur, sujet-scripteur, quels enjeux pour la didactique ? *Le français aujourd'hui*, 157(2), 1-4.
- Bouffard, T. et Chouinard, R. (2007). Motivation, soutien et évaluation: la clé de la réussite des élèves. *Programme de recherche sur la persévérance et la réussite scolaires*. Québec : Gouvernement du Québec.
- Bucheton, D., Alexandre, D. et Jurado, M. (2014). *Refonder l'enseignement de l'écriture. Vers des gestes professionnels plus ajustés du primaire au lycée*. Paris : éditions Retz.
- Chiss, J. L. (2012). *L'écrit, la lecture et l'écriture: Théories et didactiques*. Paris : L'harmattan
- Delcambre, I & Lahanier-Reuter, D. (2010). « Les littéracies universitaires : influence des disciplines et du niveau d'études dans les pratiques de l'écrit », *Diptyque*, n° 18, p. 11-42 (dir.), 2012, *Pratiques*, n°153-154, « Littéracies universitaires : nouvelles perspectives »
- Delcambre, I. (2007). Du sujet-scripteur au sujet didactique. *Le français aujourd'hui*, 157(2), 33-41.
- Gezmiş, N. (2020). Difficulties faced by the undergraduate students in the process writing approach. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(2), 565-579.
- Goody, J. (1994). *Entre l'oralité et l'écriture*. Paris, France: Presses universitaires de France.
- Graham, S. et Perin, D. (2007b ). *Writing next: effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools* (Rapport pour Carnegie Co, NY). Washington, DC : Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Hayes, J.R. (1996). « A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing ». In C. Levy, S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing : theories, methods, individual differences and application*. Mahwah : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 1-28.
- Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing [Communication écrite]. *SAGE Publications*, 29(3), 369-388.
- Hayes, J. R. et Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. Dans L. W. Gregg et E. R. Steinberg (dir.), *Cognitive process in writing* (p. 3- 30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heurley, L. (2006). "La révision de texte : l'approche de la psychologie cognitive". In S. Pétillon, F. Garnier (Eds.), *La révision de texte : méthodes, outils et processus*. Langages n° 164. Paris : Larousse/mand Colin. pp. 11- 25.
- Lusignan, G., Fortier., G. (1992), « Révision de textes et changement d'audience », *Revue Canadienne de L'Éducation*. p. 405-421.
- Oriol-Boyer, C. (2002). *Lire-écrire avec des enfants*. Toulouse: Bertrand-Lacoste. CNDP Midi-Pyrénées.
- Piolat, A. (2004). Approche cognitive de l'activité rédactionnelle et de son acquisition. Le rôle de la mémoire de travail. *Linx. Revue de linguistique de l'Université de Paris Ouest Nanterre*, (51), 55-74.
- Piolat, A., & ROUSSEY, J-Y. (1992), « Rédaction de textes. *Éléments de Psychologie Cognitive* ». *Langages*, n° 106, p. 106- 125.
- Roussez, J. Y., Piolat, A. (2005). « La révision du texte : une activité de contrôle et de réflexion ». *Psychologie française* n° 50. pp. 351-372.
- Troia, G. A. et Graham, S. (2002). The effectiveness of a highly explicit, teacher directed strategy instruction routine: Changing the writing performance of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35( 4), 290-305.
- Troia, G. A., Lin, S. C., Cohen, S. et Monroe, B. W. (2011). A Year in the Writing Workshop. *The elementary school journal*, 112(1), 155-182.
- Troia, G. A., Lin, S. C., Monroe, B. W. et Cohen, S. (2009). The effect of writing workshop instruction on the performance and motivation of good and poor Writers. Dans G. Troia (dir), *Instructions assessments for struggling writer: evidence based practices*. New York : The Guilford Press