Research proposal on revision essay

Revision by nature is not a predictable procedure but a strategic and adaptive process. In the past revision was viewed as a tiding-up, copy-editing activity and it is only recently that it has been viewed as a complex activity. Revision was aimed at doing away with grammar surface errors, spelling, punctuation, and diction.

Revision refers to the changes that occur once an essay draft has been completed and it is simply does not only look for errors in punctuation and grammar, but true revision is more than this. The reason why I chose the topic revision is because it is a subject that is perplexing. Everybody, including students who do not attempt doing it acknowledge its virtue. However a research on the topic brings about a split between the students' performance and the teachers' claims.

There is assertion by teachers that multiple draft practice is the only key to a good writing; revision is the method of choice for professionals. The goal of revision is defined as being a substantive change which can lead to restructuring, re-seeing and conceptualizing entire discourse and it is in itself a powerful generative process. The most difficult part of revision is a reviser developing a critical eye but this make one a better writer, thinker and reader.

It is therefore worth to consider carefully how one might learn to view own work with objectivity that is essential to self-criticism that is successful. Of late there has been extensive study on various writing process aspects and there has been a notable absence of research on revision. This could be due to the current models being directed away from revision. Most of these models separate the writing process into stages which are discrete.

Intelligent revision process for the real writers seems as if key variables are not on the kind of changes that are made by writers but basically on the way they adapt text to goals that they want to achieve. Sommer made demonstration of how writers with different abilities are able to come up with different revisions. She drew this distinction between writers that were skilled and those that were not according to the operation type and length of the changes.

However the present studies purpose is on presentation and application of a system that analyses revision effects on meaning. Theoretically, there are key variables that underlie expert performance; knowledge and intention and both need each other. Whenever a writer makes a choice of going beyond re-drafting, there is a heavy demand by revision on the writer's knowledge and intention.

First, the writer must be able to recognize the text's conceptual complex features like argument. Intention on the other hand determines if a reviser makes use of knowledge that he or she possesses. Intention enters in the form of initial problem representation and in form of goals and criteria that the reviser bears during evaluation.

If a given revision performance is dependent on a dynamic interplay between knowledge and intentions, there would be a gross description of behavior that would be eventually be qualified into oblivion and it would be misleading to have an analysis of only the final product. Example, a good reviser is not the one who makes more revisions, one who discovers new meanings, or changes macrostructure, even if these relatively difficult actions are valued.

One may actually think that revision is the easiest among the composing activities due to it leaving a record, but the record belies the revision complexity. In order to have an understanding of the complexity there is need to search an understanding of the complexity through examining revision effects and speculating on causes of revision. Successful revision does not come from the changes that a reviser makes but the degree to which such revision brings a text to closer fitting the situation demands. Revisions done by writers that are inexperienced do not often improve the text; their revision is local and there is ignorance of the situational constraints. An observation by Sondra Perl observed that revisions by inexperienced writers negatively affected the quality of the text. My main implication is that there is no way revision can be separate from other composing aspects especially when writers are faced with particular writing situation demands.

Ultimately revision success is tied to the planning and reviewing skills of a writer. Inadequacy in planning writing ends up forcing writers to come up with several drafts before discovering what they were to say. Poor conception of audience needs results to inadequacy in reviewing the working drafts extant. This prevents writers from having to revise their texts so as to suit the needs and wishes of the audience.

As students, we need to distance ourselves from what we have written and see it again and then revise the work, this will help a lot in avoiding altering the original text. If I had more time in my research work, I would continue with consideration of causes and effects of revision through exploring better revision methods. Writing situation is by itself an unnatural force, and there

is need to speculate on how an individual's composing behavior can be classified.