



From exercise to writing competence: An analysis of teaching practices in high school

DEMBRI Naima

Higher Normal School-Assia Djebar,
Constantine, Algeria

Email : dembri.naima@ensc.dz

ORCID iD: 0009-0005-6465-3953

Abstract

The reference to the model of the editorial processes provides a structuring framework for the organization of the didactic intervention and can represent, for the teacher, a relevant support in the planning of activities aimed at learning the editorial skills. It allows a shift of the attention from the analysis of the finished product to the consideration of the editorial process and, consequently, to question the teaching practices of written production.

Keywords : Editorial processes- professional practices – revision- rewriting- written production

De l'exercice à la compétence en écriture : une analyse des pratiques d'enseignement au lycée.

Résumé

Le recours au modèle des processus rédactionnels constitue un cadre structurant pour concevoir l'intervention didactique et offre à l'enseignant un appui pertinent dans la planification d'activités visant le développement des compétences en écriture. Ce modèle favorise un déplacement du regard du produit fini à une prise en compte du processus rédactionnel dans ses différentes phases et incite ainsi à une réflexion sur les pratiques pédagogiques en matière de production écrite.

Mots-clés : Processus rédactionnels – pratiques professionnelles – révision – réécriture – production écrite

Introduction

The teaching of written production confronts teachers with a plurality of sometimes contradictory expectations. On the one hand, they are responsible for preparing students for the normative requirements of the various written tests ; on the other hand, they must promote the development of a more autonomous and thoughtful writing. In this dual perspective, teachers mobilize various pedagogical approaches : training exercises, model text analysis, collective correction sessions.

However, this diversity of practices does not seem to meet the students' heterogeneous needs or overcome their difficulties in writing. Among the obstacles frequently encountered, there is a difficulty in organizing and structuring complex thinking, insufficient mastery of textual coherence as well as lexical and grammatical deficiencies hindering a clear expression of ideas. There are also emotional barriers, such as lack of inspiration or self-confidence, which hinder the fluidity and relevance of writing (Barré-de Miniac, 2000 ; Bore, 2000).

At the same time, teachers are faced with structural constraints that hinder their pedagogical action : limited time for individualized support, and pressure of the programs. In this context, the teaching of written production at high school is part of a complex framework, marked by cognitive and didactic issues.

From this perspective, the hypothesis advanced in this article is that the students' difficulties with writing are partly due to the inadequacy of an explicit teaching of cognitive and metacognitive strategies of writing, especially as regards planning, the structuring and revision of texts. The objective



will then be to question current practices of teaching writing and to examine to what extent they allow or not to develop in students an autonomous and effective writing skill.

1. The theoretical foundations

1.1. The theories of writing

Since the 1980, much research has led to a better understanding of the mechanisms underlying the teaching and learning of writing, particularly the editorial processes. Among these works, the psycho-cognitive model, influenced by the cognitive approach, has allowed a better understanding of the cognitive and pedagogical dimensions that shape the approach and development of writing in individuals. This model helps to structure the teaching of written production, focusing on editorial processes rather than the finished product (Garcia-Debanc, 1986 ; Garcia-Debanc & Fayol, 2002).

Thus, written production, according to Hayes & Flower, is seen as a complex activity, structured around three fundamental processes : planning, writing and revision which itself subdivides into two main operations : critical reading, identifying errors, and focusing on correcting these errors to enhance the clarity of the text (Garcia-Debanc, 1986).

The review is therefore a process that occupies a central place. It is not limited to a simple correction, but involves a dynamic back and forth between the different stages of writing (Fayol, 1984). The objective is to improve both the form and content of the text, gradually adjusting and refining each part of the work written. It becomes an essential tool to refine the consistency and clarity of writing,

contributing both to the enrichment of the text and to the management of the cognitive processes involved (Halte, 1981).

This process, which is essential for written production, may occur at different points in the writing process, sometimes even before the initial formulation of certain sentences, and is mainly intended to alleviate cognitive overload by addressing a specific task at a time (Fayol, 1997). This also highlights the particularly demanding nature of writing, emphasizing that it is based on the simultaneous management of multiple cognitive processes. The writer, even in the earliest stages of his development, is led to plan his ideas, put them into words, organize his speech, respect linguistic standards and continuously revise what he produces (Hayes & Flower, 1980).

For novice writers, this multiplicity of tasks - which involve working memory, attention, language and discursive skills - represents a major challenge. The absence of automation in certain sub-processes—such as transcription or syntactic formulation—considerably heightens cognitive load, thereby reducing the resources available for other aspects of the task (Bessonnat, 2000). Cognitive overload can hinder textual coherence, fluency, and revision, thereby complicating the production of effective writing. This highlights the importance of targeted pedagogical support to help young writers gradually develop strategies for managing such complexity.

In addition, Hayes's (2012) model of skillful writing development emphasizes the central rôle of personal engagement and the learning environment in building scriptural skills. If cognitive processes - such as planning, writing or reviewing - are essential dimensions of scriptural



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

activity, the model pays particular attention to motivational elements. The perceived value of the task, the perception of competence (Viau, 1994), the learner's personal goals, his or her self-esteem as a writer and the the emotions associated with writing strongly condition his or her involvement in the activity (Hayes, 2012).

The development of these skills is part of a broader social, cultural and educational framework. As such, the professional practices of teachers play a decisive rôle : the nature of the didactic devices proposed, The quality of the support provided and the evaluation methods directly influence student engagement and the consolidation of their writing skills (McCutchen 1988 ; Hayes & Flower 1980 ; Hayes 2012). In short, scriptural development cannot be considered independently of the educational context and the interactions that structure it.

1.2. The explicit teaching of editorial processes

In his revised model (2012), Hayes emphasizes the need for explicit and structured instruction on writing processes, especially for novice writers who struggle to simultaneously manage the multiple dimensions of this complex activity. This perspective joins the work of Scardamalia and Bereiter (1986), who defend the idea that scriptural expertise does not develop spontaneously, but through the progressive teaching of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Thus, the implementation of explicit didactic approaches, such as teaching the planning, writing and revision phases, allows students to better understand the task requirements and approach them in a more controlled way (Graham & Harris, 2005). In addition, a gradation of the requirements, taking

into account the level of development of the students, makes it possible to limit cognitive overload by temporarily lightening some components of the task to better support others (De La Paz, 1999). These approaches promote not only improved writing performance, but also the development of commitment, autonomy and confidence as writers (Graham et al., 2013). Far from being reduced to the transmission of techniques, this structured support aims to equip students so that they gradually become able to mobilize, independently and thoughtfully, the various processes necessary for the production of effective writings.

Hayes (2012) emphasizes the importance of organizing writing instruction in a way that supports students in simultaneously managing the different processes involved, while preventing cognitive overload. They suggest reducing this burden by focusing on specific sub-processes, while allowing students to practice through a variety of writing situations and assessment criteria. The use of feedback, especially from peers, can also improve the text by providing an outside perspective.

It is in this context that the explicit teaching of written production strategies takes on all its importance. Researchers such as Rosenshine (2012) and Archer and Hughes (2011) highlighted the effectiveness of explicit teaching. Which is to teach in a clear and systematic way the strategies and skills necessary for successful writing. By providing learners with concrete tools to plan, write and review thoughtfully, explicit teaching breaks down these complex processes into clear and affordable steps. For example, by guiding students through pre-writing strategies (such as developing detailed plans), revision (such as critical reading) and reformulation, teachers help learners focus



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

their attention on specific aspects of the text, reducing cognitive overload. This approach is also supported by research on the explicit teaching of reading and writing strategies, such as Swanson and Hoskyn (1998), which have demonstrated that the implementation of structured and explicit teaching promotes student autonomy while improving their ability to manage cognitive processes efficiently (Fayol,2002 ; Fabre-Cols,2002). In addition, this explicit teaching also includes the integration of motivation as a key factor, encouraging students to actively engage in each stage of written production and to become aware of the importance of their own learning process (Duhamel, Leclaire, & Neumayer,1981 ; Bucheton,2000). Thus, the explicit teaching of writing strategies, in conjunction with the principles of the Hayes model, provides a systematic and thoughtful approach to support students in their development of skillful writing.

1.3. The constraints of young writers

Young writers are forced to deal with three main constraints : prior knowledge that is not directly accessible and usable ; the conventions and rules of written production, and rhetorical problems (Hayes & Flower, 1980). On the other hand, the difficulty for the young learner-writer lies not only in knowing where to start, but also in managing language errors, identifying misunderstandings, dealing with grammatical problems and lack of clarity, and assessing the extent to which the text aligns with the intended goals. This often places the learner in a state of cognitive overload" (Fayol & Gombert, 1987). So, how can

we help young learners manage these writing and rewriting operations ?

Again, the acquisition of written production and its mastery would be based much more on “better management of memory resources.” Chanquoy & Alamargot, 2002). These cognitive resources represent the mental energy mobilisable by an individual in the performance of a given task but they are limited because, given its reduced capacity, memory is unable to maintain and manipulate them at the same time if they become too numerous, too complicated» (Foulin, J & Mouchon, 1998). Therefore, to reduce its impact on the entire system, Hayes & Flower propose not to simultaneously treat all dimensions involved in writing in order to reduce cognitive overload, which can lead to significant improvements(. Roussey, & Piolat, 2005). Moreover, the implementation of “procedural facilitations” could also ease the task for students while leaving them to face it in its entirety (-Garcia Debanc, & Fayol.2002). This is made possible through various writing situations, training exercises and the development of evaluation criteria that enable to activate and mobilize this or that under editorial process, while relieving students of other tasks in order to foster self-control of scriptural activity.

The proofreading/ evaluation, « which implies diagnosis, the selection of a correction strategy, modified or not, is a very important and operative injunction in the review process, but can also be ineffective because one cannot read over everything at the same time. »(Fayol, 1997). So, to make it more effective, students are taught to re-read successively on different aspects: global organization, structural or semantic, interphrastic organization, construction of such textual area, management of such problem... etc. (Reuter,



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

1996) Finally, the «feedbacks» provided by an interlocutor in the context of a text revision can help the learner to appreciate the clarity of his written production. (Fayol, 2002) Indeed, if a peer helps a novice writer through questions and comments, the resulting dialogue allows the writer to have a different attitude towards his text and his written production can be improved.

2. Methodological approach : observation of teaching practice

In the context of this article, we planned to conduct a classroom observation in a secondary-level French class, with the aim of concretely analyzing the teaching and learning process of written production. This approach seeks to describe and analyze the course of the sessions, to identify the place given to rewriting by the different participants, and to better understand the pedagogical practices implemented as well as the dynamics of interaction between the teacher and students around this competence.

The classes selected for this study belong to general secondary education in the Constantine wilaya. The sample consists of two mixed-class groups : one in grade 3, specialty Letters, and the other in grade 2, specialty Sciences. The pupils concerned are enrolled in public secondary schools and follow an ordinary school curriculum.

The observation was carried out in collaboration with three French teachers working in different high schools of the wilaya of Constantine. To ensure their anonymity, they will be designated throughout this study by the letters A, B and C

The first teacher, referred to here as Professor A, holds a Bachelor's degree in Literature and has acquired substantial experience, having taught in secondary education for fifteen years. Professor B, who also holds a Bachelor's degree, has been working in the same field for seventeen years, demonstrating both professional stability and proven pedagogical expertise. As for Professor C, with ten years of professional experience, he possesses a solid understanding of teaching practices and the specific challenges of the educational environment.

The observed sessions were not scheduled in advance; their timing was determined by the availability of the participating teacher. Despite several attempts to engage other teachers, most declined to collaborate, which resulted in an eight-month gap between the initial observations and the final session. In total, three writing preparation sessions were observed, focusing on the production of argumentative and expository texts, in line with the annual curriculum progression for the third-year level (January–February) and the second-year AS level (October–November).

2.1. Observation method

No recording devices were used during the observation. We adopted a discreet presence in the classroom so as not to disrupt established routines. Our approach consisted of direct observation and note-taking, guided by a grid specifically designed to systematically follow the progression of each session, objectively describe the behavior of participants throughout the lesson, and assess whether teachers were adhering to official pedagogical guidelines or continuing to rely on traditional practices. We were also interested in determining whether teachers



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

encouraged students to use rough drafts and engage in multiple stages of rewriting before producing a final version, or whether the process remained limited to writing and immediately copying the text in its final form.

2.2. Evaluation Grid

In order to avoid passive observation and ensure a rigorous and structured analysis, we used an observation grid largely developed from the work of researchers who have explored the assessment of written production. This method particularly inspired by those proposed by specialists such as Brown (2004), who emphasized the importance of clear and objective criteria for evaluating students' written productions. The framework thus designed allows for a systematic follow-up of the sessions, objective descriptions of the behaviors and interactions of participants, while assessing whether teachers are applying current pedagogical recommendations or continuing to favor more traditional teaching methods. Furthermore, the grid allows us to observe whether teachers encourage the use of rough drafts and successive revisions, or whether they favor a more linear process, consisting simply of writing and then copying the final version.

2.3. Analysis of the observation results

The experience we had while attending written expression sessions with the three teachers gives rise to an overall impression : despite the changes made in the official curricula, the approach to teaching writing still follows the old method. In other words, writing is not mastered as such but is practiced under the constraints of a model that does

not place the student in a real production context. Written expression is treated as a simple 'magical synthesis' exercise (Reuter, 1996, p. 15), based on neither theory nor any real learning of writing. It is viewed as an imitation exercise focused on morphology, grammar, and vocabulary.

2.3.1. Overview of the phases involved in the writing production session

Professor A begins the two-hour session by reviewing the argumentative text model, explaining to the students that the goal is to write a short argumentative text following the models previously studied. He encourages motivation by asking students to suggest topics, before choosing one that he had already prepared: 'Television has many benefits. Support this thesis with some illustrated arguments.' He emphasizes the importance of planning, stating that every writing task should begin with a work plan, which he writes on the board, outlining the three key parts: Introduction, Development, Conclusion. He then explains that the introduction should present the topic and position, the development should provide ideas supporting the topic (in this case, the benefits of television), organize them, illustrate them, and connect them using logical connectors.

The teacher presents the students with a summary chart designed to guide them in organizing their arguments and examples. He provides specific expressions to introduce each step of the argumentation. For the first argument, he recommends using phrases such as 'First,' 'In the first place,' or 'At the beginning.' To introduce subsequent arguments, he suggests expressions like 'Next,' 'Furthermore,' 'On the other hand,' and 'Finally.' Regarding the introduction of examples, he highlights phrases like 'Indeed,' 'This is how,'



or 'Namely.' In order to encourage student participation, which seems to be relatively low, the teacher engages the class in a question-and-answer game, through which he helps them develop some key arguments. These include propositions such as: 'Television allows us to entertain ourselves,' 'It provides essential information,' and 'It brings culture to our homes.' Furthermore, he emphasizes the importance of the conclusion, which he defines as the moment when the student must summarize the points developed in the body of the text in order to close the essay coherently. At the end of this preparatory phase, the teacher invites the students to begin their writing, clarifying that he will collect their work, written on double sheets, at the end of the session. The students, who are very unmotivated and even bored, immediately begin writing. Some students write directly in a clean copy the idea that comes to their mind, while others try to come up with ideas by discussing among themselves, asking the teacher to write certain terms, and then copying the sentences, one after the other, into a clean version of the text.

Professor B begins the writing production session by recalling Project (2), « Organizing a Debate of Ideas ». He defines the debate as an exchange of viewpoints between two opposing theses, where each party attempts to convince the other. He announces that the objective is to write a short argumentative text on the theme of progress. Before starting, he emphasizes the importance of carefully reading the topic to avoid misinterpretations, off-topic responses, and omissions.

The topic, written on the board, revolves around the following debate : « *Some parents send their children to work*

under the pretext of teaching them responsibility. A debate on this subject has taken place in the school newspaper. Write your contribution to this debate by using irony to critique the reasons these parents might give.» The professor then guides the students in analyzing the topic, introducing the key question: 'Should children be forced to work or not?' He highlights that there are two possible viewpoints: some believe that children should enjoy their childhood, while others think they should work to become responsible.

The teacher guides the students in writing their argumentative text by outlining the structure to follow: an introduction to present the topic and pose the question, followed by a development divided into two parts. He advises limiting the arguments to three and using logical connectors, markers of cause and consequence, as well as opinion verbs. In the first part, students are instructed to defend child labor by citing examples, particularly from developing countries, emphasizing the benefits for the child, such as responsibility and strength. For the counterargument, the teacher encourages students to address the arguments against child labor, such as the importance of education and play. The text concludes with a statement of the student's position. The teacher stresses the importance of clarity, the use of simple sentences, both main and subordinate clauses, and adherence to grammatical rules. He then asks the students to write the text at home and bring it to the next session.

Professor C begins the writing session in a positive atmosphere by providing instructions for the explanatory essay: 'Today's task is to write an informative or explanatory text. In this type of essay, you need to present and describe a phenomenon, object, or issue, and possibly



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

analyze its causes and consequences in an objective manner.' He writes the topic on the board: 'You observe that, nowadays, nature is sacrificed for the development of human activities. Explain why this phenomenon is intensifying year after year.' The teacher reminds students to create an outline, emphasizing that the introduction should briefly introduce the topic and inform the reader about how the topic will be developed. After the students remain silent, he offers a suggested introduction: 'With progress and development, nature suffers continuous degradation that worsens every day. What are its causes?' He continues, explaining that the development should describe the phenomenon, explain the causes, and, if relevant, outline the consequences. The teacher advises the students to keep their writing objective, avoiding personal pronouns ('I' or 'we'), and recommends using definitions and paraphrasing to clarify concepts. He stresses that sentences should be short, clear, and free of unnecessary elements. Finally, he reminds the students that the goal is to inform; they should write in the present tense, include data and dates, and make comparisons.

According to the teacher, the conclusion should wrap up the essay by either providing solutions or considering the future. Unlike the others, Professor C recommends that students read relevant documents related to the topic and complete the assignment at home.

2.4. The limitations of these pedagogical practices related to writing

The observation of the teaching practices adopted by the instructors allows us to highlight some shortcomings.

- The topics proposed by the three teachers immediately place students in situations of producing complex texts, based on vague instructions (write, contribute to this debate with irony, explain the phenomenon...) that lead to cognitive overload (see the first section), as they have not been prepared for the writing process. We believe that studying the instructions a teacher gives to students before asking them to write is essential. As mentioned in the first section, a « productive » (EVA Group : 103), coherent, and precise instruction indicates clear directions for the task, establishes a manageable assignment, and allows for a step-by-step focus on the different levels of the text (planning, drafting, rewriting...), with the aim of reducing the overall cost of the task and minimizing cognitive overload.

- The teachers attempted to recall the thematic characteristics of the texts, as well as the use of connectors and linkers, in order to support the students. While this approach is necessary, it remains insufficient. Indeed, to succeed in written production, students must not only master the structure of the text but also possess an in-depth understanding of the theme they are writing about. To better prepare students for this task, the teacher could, either at the beginning of the session or after the first draft, provide varied documents and texts related to the theme (Petitjean, 1981 ; Reuter,1996). This approach would not only make the topic more accessible but also foster deeper reflection on the content, while contributing to the correction of substantive errors and reinforcing their understanding of the subject.

- We observed that all three teachers mention the importance of developing a plan, yet the concept they refer to does not align with the planning model proposed by Hayes and Flower. The latter emphasizes understanding the



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

purpose of the text (why ? For whom ?) and creating a guiding framework for writing by activating and organizing ideas. This planning process is essential for supporting students in developing the writing process itself. However, for Professors A and C, the term 'planning' refers more to the school-specific structure of a text, understood as a rôle juxtaposition of sections (introduction, body, and conclusion), rather than as a dynamic process of constructing a coherent written work meant for a reader (not a corrector). This, in our view, limits students' ability to engage in the writing process effectively. As for Professor B, 'planning' refers solely to the text model, which provides little help to students in accomplishing the writing task.

- In terms of idea formulation, the students we observed expressed difficulties, with some stating they had no ideas, while others filled the page with a stream of incoherent words. This reflects, without a doubt, the consequences of inadequate preparation and the lack of a structured planning process.

This planning phase, which should ideally help students set a goal, activate prior knowledge, and prioritize ideas, is not effectively carried out. As a result, students who are unable to plan and who must generate ideas that may not already exist find themselves blocked. They are also required to adhere to spelling, grammar, and vocabulary choices, which demands significant cognitive energy. The formulation of ideas is a fundamental aspect of content development. What should students do when they are not taught how to use a draft and are not asked to rewrite their texts using one ?

- The use of revision seems to be completely neglected, or rather ignored. We observed that the students do not know how to draft a rough draft. They make no corrections or modifications, except for spelling errors. Some even prefer to leave empty spaces rather than cross out words, and then ask the teachers how to spell or translate certain words, which they later write directly on their final copy to avoid 'spoiling' it. Others, less inclined to make an effort, choose to write directly in a clean copy. As for the teachers, they do not seem to recognize the importance of a rough draft in the process of acquiring writing skills. They never mention the use of rough drafts, do not require them, and do not ask students to proofread or rewrite to improve their work. For example, Teacher (A) merely helps students translate certain terms or formulate sentences, without ever encouraging them to rewrite or fully engage with the rough draft. However, the reality of writing clearly shows the opposite : there is no successful writing without revision ; there is no progress without rewriting, and there is no rewriting without a rough draft.

Conclusion

We think the students are showing little enthusiasm because, as we have seen, they don't know how to write, what the actual act of writing is. They ignore the value of the draft and the rôle of rewriting in scriptural practice. In turn, the teacher projects practices inherited from the school tradition onto the pupils. That's why we join Elizabeth Bing and Garcia-Debanc, (1989) in saying that a profound transformation in teachers' practices is indispensable to the



application of a pedagogy of writing success. And for this, we believe that a professional training of teachers is essential and «must above all contribute to the development of capacities for setting up and managing written production situations in the classroom which promote the construction of writing skills among pupils» (Garcia-DEBANC, 1989 :26).

And to enable teachers to better analyze the writing tasks they give their students, understand the difficulties they impose on them and question the practices usually adopted, Garcia-DEBANC proposes to test teachers in a complex writing task. Indeed placed in situations of writing unpublished (Yves Reuter made teachers write plagiarized polars, or erotic novels) (Garcia- DEBANC, 1989 : 41) Teachers can challenge writing situations that the traditional method has taught them, which may cause favourable changes in professional attitudes and practices.

We also believe it is important that the teacher :

-Teach the operations of the editorial process to his students, to enlighten them on the mechanisms of writing, through the practice of the draft (Bore, 2000). And here we insist on the importance of time as an essential factor in allowing students to think-write for themselves (Charolles, 1986 ; Bucheton, 2000).

-Applies the technique of procedural facilitations with its students, relying on precise basic instructions, to allow them to learn and master each operation of the scriptural process.

- The teacher should demonstrate through practice the purpose of drafting and rewriting : the draft is a crucial tool that enables the creation of a high-quality final product through a continuous process known as rewriting (Foulin, & Mouchon. 1998). The act of crossing out or revising is not a

sign of failure but rather a transformative gesture that generates meaning. Writing is a process that requires time, effort, and patience.

- The teacher must also take on a rôle similar to that of a supportive parent with a sufficient level of education—someone capable of offering effective guidance to a child. This means stepping down from the traditional authoritative position to adopt a more empathetic and reassuring stance that inspires student confidence. By offering individualized support (Fabre-Cols,2002), the teacher helps foster a serious and productive approach to writing, which is essential for meaningful progress.

- Furthermore, it is important to question whether the time allocated to foreign language instruction—especially writing—is sufficient to allow for genuine learning and practice of written production activities (Anis,1988). Without adequate time and structured support, the development of writing competence is inevitably hindered.

Références bibliographiques

1. Anis, J. (1988). *Writing : Theories and description*. De Boeck-Wesmael SA.
2. Barré-de Miniac, C. (2000). *The relationship to writing : Theoretical and practical aspects*. Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
3. Bessonnat, D. (2000). Two or three things I know about rewriting. *Pratiques*, (105-106), 5-22.
4. Bore, C. (2000). The elusive draft : An object of study. *Pratiques*, (105-106).



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

5. Borgognan, M. (1998). *Writing with a word processor : Literature review*. CVRP.
6. Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment : Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.
7. Bucheton, D. (2000). Becoming the author of one's text : A quiet revolution. *Le Français dans tous ses états*, CNDP, (43).
8. Chanquoy, L., & Alamargot, D. (2002). Working memory and text composition : Evolution of models and review of early studies. *L'Année Psychologique*, 102, 363–398.
9. Charolles, M. (1986). The analysis of writing processes : Linguistic, psycholinguistic, and didactic aspects. *Pratiques*, (49).
10. Clesse, C. (1979). Learning to read by speaking. In *From Speaking to Reading : Interaction Between Adults and Children* (L. Lentin, Ed.). Paris : Éditions ESF.
11. Coste, D. (1974). Reading meaning. *Le Français dans le monde*, (109), December.
12. Duhamel, B., Leclaire, A., & Neumayer, M. (1981). Did you say school failure ? *Pratiques*, (29), 107–119.
13. Fabre-Cols, C. (2002). *Rewriting at school and in middle school : From draft analysis to guided writing*. Paris : ESF Éditeur.
14. Fayol, M. (1984). The cognitive approach to writing : A new perspective. *Repères*, (63).
15. Fayol, M. (1997). *From ideas to text : Cognitive psychology of verbal, oral, and written production*. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France (PUF).
16. Fayol, M. (2002). *Learning to write*. Paris : Hermès Science.

17. Fayol, M., & Gombert, J.-E. (1987). The author's return to their text : A provisional overview of psycholinguistic research. *Repères*, (73), 85–95.
18. Foulin, J., & Mouchon. (1998). *Educational psychology*. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France (PUF).
19. Garcia-Debanc, C. (1986). The relevance of writing process models for a pedagogy of writing. *Pratiques*, (49).
20. Garcia-Debanc, C., & Fayol, M. (2002). Contributions and limits of writing process models for the didactics of written production : A dialogue between psycholinguists and educators. *Pratiques*, (115–116), 37–50.
21. Halte, J.-F. (1981). To change writing. *Pratiques*, (29), 39.
22. Hayes, J. R. (1998). A new framework for integrating cognition and affect in writing. In A. Piolat & A. Pelissier (Eds.), *Text Writing : A Cognitive Approach*. Lausanne : Delachaux et Niestlé.
23. Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing. *Written Communication*, 29(3), 369–388.
24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088312451260>
25. Odile, & Veslin, J. (1992). *Grading papers, assessing to support learning*. Paris: Hachette Éducation.
26. Petitjean, A. (1981). Writing, describing. *Pratiques*, (29), 92.
27. Piolat, A., & Roussey, J.-Y. (1990). On expression and revision strategies. *Lis tes ratures*, (10).
28. Piolat, A., Roussey, J.-Y., Olive, T., & Farioli, F. (1996). Mental workload and the activation of writing processes: An examination of Kellogg's procedure. *Psychologie Française*, 41(4), 339–354.
29. Py, B. (1975). On some recent publications on error analysis. *Bulletin C.I.L.A.*, (22), Neuchâtel.



Soumission : 15/02/2025 Acceptation : 08/04/2025 Publication : 15/08/2025

30. Reuter, Y. (1989). The teaching of writing: History and issues. *Pratiques*, (61), 68–90.
31. Reuter, Y. (2000). Roundtable on rewriting: Contribution by Yves Reuter. *Pratiques*, (105–106), 222–224.
32. Roussey, J., & Piolat, A. (2005). Text revision: An activity of control and reflection. *Psychologie Française*, 50(3), 351–372.
33. Viau, R. (1994). *La motivation en contexte scolaire [Motivation in the school context]*. Québec, Canada: Éditions du Renouveau pédagogique.