

**LANGUAGE IN INDIA**  
**Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow**  
**Volume 7 : 5 May 2007**

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.  
Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.  
Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.  
B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.  
A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.  
Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.  
K. Karunakaran, Ph.D.  
Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.

**PROCESS OR PRODUCT:  
AN EXPLORATIVE AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF  
ESL/EFL WRITING BEHAVIOURS**

**Ismail Baroudy, Ph.D.**

## **PROCESS OR PRODUCT: AN EXPLORATIVE/COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ESL/EFL WRITING BEHAVIOURS**

**Ismail Baroudy, Ph. D.**

---

Due to disenchantment and disillusionment experienced with product writing, a paradigm shift in the writing pedagogy all of a sudden entreated attentions to focus on process writing. Despite a historic event as such, the L1 or L2 writing classrooms are reported to have been primarily conducted in the absence of process activities or procedures. Unluckily, student-writers are still noticed to be debilitated with a deflecting product advocacy. This is found to be evidently due to serious lack or loss of awareness among the writing teachers about how those innovative process requirements can be practically met in classroom settings. To address this problem analytically, this study chose to capitalize on Bosco and Dipietro (1970) as well as Krashen and Seligers' (1975) conceptual analysis of methods yielding sets of universal features.

In fact, based on these features, all methods and approaches in second or foreign language teaching are consistently described, analyzed and compared. Those features, if technically applied to the skill of writing, are thought to provide a contrastive analysis of process and product writing schemes significantly, as well; thus, promoting teachers awareness to help their student-writers acquire the the necessary skills within the new enterprise. A comparative

study as such is expected to specify an adequate number of contrastive clues and details about the process and product trends of writing to grant successful implications for instructional and pedagogical purposes.

### **Preview**

The process/product controversy is incessantly going on without any decisive resolution to be anticipated on the adjacent horizon. The writing teachers despite their recent awareness about the movement in vogue; the process paradigm, are still crippled with the debilitating procedure of faithfully modeling or precisely reproducing schemes in the so-called product- oriented classrooms.

Needless to say, this depressing situation is eventually seen to have arisen partly due to the absence of hard evidences as well as solid referents to come up with sharp orientations about the true nature of such an innovative trend in the world of writing. Writing teachers are, admittedly, believed to urgently need intimate sessions of familiarization attendance and conscious-raising schemes about the delicate furrow specifications of process techniques and procedures that can be concretely actualized in the second or first language classroom context.

This shift has been theoretically proposed and recommended via multiple essays, published books and various seminars. Unfortunately, it has not been practically and adequately realized, assimilated or implemented. Rather, it is still an almost non-existent component in all English second/foreign language writing contexts, and first/second language learning settings.

---

Based on the process approach, the writing teachers as such, are advised to shift their student writers' attention from product to process, to train to adopt this new approach content. Likewise, student-writers are expected, in this sense, to find out to themselves how a text is evolved and created. (Raimes, 1985), to capture the process they undergo and to achieve what they unconsciously do know (Emig, 1971). In short, they are supposed to 'expect the unexpected' (Murray, 1989), to have thinking and composing, 'creating and criticizing' (Elbow, 1981) coexist peacefully so as to have the writing processes faithfully acquired and mastered. Writing to student-writers, in fact, should serve nothing but quite genuinely a dynamic process of discovering meaning (Zamel, 1982).

Accordingly, a qualitative/explorative research is inquisitively embarked on to inform and convince writing teachers of the inevitability of an indispensable procedural evolution they should willingly and wholeheartedly submit themselves to in the domain of the writing pedagogy. This enterprise has capitalized on Dipietro and Bosco's (1970) universal, distinctive features, eight of which are counted psychological, and the remaining three being of linguistic category. Besides, a couple of indicative features out of a set of eight delineated by Krashen and Seliger (1975) are also selected and incorporated as part of the research in the accumulated corpus.

Needless to say, all approaches and methods in second/foreign language teaching, can unbiasedly and systematically be analyzed,

described and compared, by the verisimilitude of those plausibly universal features.

So as to have the writing teachers as well as the student-writers awareness about the minute ingredients of the innovative/alternative process writing paradigm get intelligently promoted, the above set of thirteen features is functionally transcended and exploited in the domain of the writing skill. This is done to consistently denominate and to distinctively characterize what process writing in essence is and besides, how it contrastively differs from its counterpart: the model-based/product-oriented approach.

An academic advocacy as such is optimistically expected to help bringing about the successful actualization of a trendy vogue scheme in writing. This, admittedly, will conducively allow ESL/EFL writing classrooms to achieve new standards. By the same token, process-writing efforts in such contexts are expected to readily motivate student-writers' to do their best by making use of their untapped inner endowments.

### **Background**

Writing is a complex process and a privilege, which is acquired, in later stages of the learning process. It is commonly conceived as a three-stage process: prewriting, writing and rewriting. In the past, writing teachers are mainly concentrated on the end of the second stage i.e. after the writing had been done. They did not see how they could intervene at the prewriting and writing stages. Rewriting played no crucial role but imply constituting a stage of correcting nothing but the surface mistakes-

---

local errors. Now, unlike what used to be done in the past, successful student-writers are expected to master the process by participating in it rather than exhausting themselves with analyzing and describing the product. They are in fact engaged in thinking and composing, knowing all about how the text at hand is being created.

Above all, within such a dynamic and revolving paradigm as that of process writing, a set of principles is seen to have evolved and developed. Successful student-writers are observed to have craved arduously for exploring and discovering to themselves what processes they are functionally and meaningfully dealing with. They are said to have been wholeheartedly complying with process assignments creating a well-developed written product.

Accordingly, in compliance with the emerging paradigm, student-writers who are supposed to abide by the process writing procedures, as Zamel (1987:708) asserts, to acquire growth and development, “unlearn in order to learn in this new way, to discard all approach and expectations, to take on a new kind of student role and attitude.” Student-writers are invited to “break with a cycle of instruction” which deprives them from making improvements due to reinforcing “counterproductive and mechanistic models of writing”. Based on most studies reviewed in this respect, student-writers are more likely to develop efficiently in a writer-based scheme (Flower and Hayes, 1977). They are granted numerous opportunities to accomplish the unexpected (Murray, 1984).

This can be fulfilled if they are encouraged to take risks, if they are apprenticed in a “community of writers” (Zemelman and

Daniel, 1988), if trust is established, if sharing of choice and authority is allowed and if writing is viewed as “a meaning making event” (Zamel, 1987). The least skilled research subjects of Zamel (1983) are reported to have viewed writing as “a static transcription of a series of parts, words, sentences, paragraphs” caring to segregate language into components, rather than creating a “whole discourse”.

In this study, an understanding of the nature of written discourse and the characteristics of effective writing as well as the strategies are diligently tapped. The writing teachers are required to employ, to instruct, to direct, and to inform student-writers as busy helping themselves get fully oriented with the details of processes their students-writers undergo. They are supposed to get mastery over extrapolating and to transcending the emulated strategies to deliver them to a community of student-writers. The process writing teacher is thus accounted for serving “both as a source person for novice writers, and as an investigator of the writing processes” (Richards, 1990:115); processes according to which both activities and rewards of teaching writing can be sensitively realized and practically tapped.

Process writing, then, as an innovative approach, is found biased towards humanistic learning and teaching if compared to the earlier product-focused approaches, since it allows the student-writers to explore and develop a personal approach to writing. Endeavours, in this regard, are not directed “to reduce the teaching of writing into a set of formulas or turn the process approach into a ‘method’ cuffed with prescribed techniques and stipulated

---

practice”(Richards, 1990:114). What decides a teacher to serve as an influential writing teacher is not the aptitude of developing a method but the initiative of creating an affective environment for student-writers to effectively develop their own writing abilities. Novice writers for whom favorable conditions were reported to have been provided are seen to have been empowered to readily and non-threateningly explore the true nature of the writing they have been long unconsciously missing. As such, their superiorities and inferiorities as writers can be delicately specified to engender intelligent awareness about the writing processes. To support the awareness accomplished, promoted and developed as far as the writing process is concerned, the roles of writing process teachers, the roles of writing process learners and the role of the instructional materials and activities should be curiously detected and meticulously negotiated. So, in dealing with the process predicament, discussing academic profiles as successful and unsuccessful writers, learner training, self-directed learning individualized learning and learner autonomy. This looks forward to conforming the theoretical underpinnings advocated by the pioneers as tenets in this domain to have the writing trend in question honestly and scholastically manifested.

Recent research on teaching and learning writing, unfortunately, has yielded conflicting findings and generated limited success regarding student-writer training particularly by the unsuccessful ones in contrast to what they report doing. Obviously, internalizing such a kind of productive, generative body of knowledge is capitalized on to serve as an honest gesture on part of



those diligent writing teachers spending brainy efforts. This will, of course, motivate unsuccessful student writers to give up their unproductive writing behaviours and adopt in place the dynamic and generative ones that will hopefully result in successful performances. Both, writing teachers and student writers are justifiably expected to overwhelmingly benefit from such advantageous process accountancy.

### **Process or Product Writing:**

#### **Description, Analysis, and Comparison**

Ulla Conner (1978:667) quotes Hairstone (1982) mentioning that the process theory of writing is “diverse, flexible and still emerging”. Hence it is quite anticipatory and predictive to come up with some new untapped orientations in reference to such an approach. There is little doubt that more and more explication, denotation and elaboration are urgently required to shape, confirm and stipulate the practitioners’ keen understanding and there may still be more and more underway. Some writing teachers have flung themselves hanging in suspension, moot in between process and product, or product and process due to the fact that no convincing and illuminating instruction or conductive guidance by means of which to have their composition classes monitored have been made available to them. They may thus feel incapable of relinquishing their undecidedness, to faithfully embark on on a single unitary type of instructional discipline. In fact, both writing teachers and student-writers are seen to essentially require to be deeply informed and institutionalized regarding the concrete realizations and practical applications of such an approach. It is also evident that

---

such an unstable rocking-swinging pendulum may result in a series of adverse effects of which a hasty, uncompromised or haphazard eclecticism is inevitably a natural outcome that is apparently hard to avoid. Such hazardous by-products cannot be reluctantly overlooked; therefore, an immediate need for more speculative or intuitive illustrations about the process theory of writing is seen to have been invariably rendered unquestionably and indisputably quite indispensable.

Concurrently, within such a dynamic, revolving and unleashed paradigm, a set of principles is said to have been evolved and developed. Based on these principles, student-writers are seen to be inclined to discover themselves in a meaningful manner what their, extemporaneous, on-the-spur-of-the-moment feelings, ideas and thought to be put in writing are. They are expected to learn abiding by the process assignment wholeheartedly. Of course, this can facilitate the task of bringing about a beneficial shift, a shift from the expository mode of writing to an expressive communicative one; from being a style adherent to a timed quick writer. The newly emerging paradigm also facilitates turning away from mimicking modes to one of creating meaning; from uncreative duplication to generative production; from a quality-bound writer to a quantity-affiliated manufacturer. Moreover, student-writers are encouraged to convert from being an outliner into a brainstormer (Reid, 1984), from focussing on the text to the activity (Arndt, 1987), or in general from being a product- oriented writer to a process-wise initiator..

“The winds of change” (Hairstone, 1982) did not blow without being justifiably explainable and explanatory in terms of a natural phenomenon. In 1980’s and still in 1990’s and even in the third millenium new teaching methods due to the shortcomings suffered by the already unbearable deflecting existing ones, were reacted to as unsatisfactory, unstimulating and invariably lagging behind. Besides, instrumental motivations injected in and imposed upon the public by the global needs to acquire a second/foreign language in the best way possible. In the mean time, to save time, money and energy, innovative/alternative approaches and methods were brought into existence. Those newly introduced methods being backed by the modern psychological and linguistic findings were adopted and assimilated on a more rational and scientific basis when scientifically justified and supported their use. In consequence, the new methods proved to be more efficient to bring about far more favorable outcomes than the former ones have yet had. It is believed that the process theory of writing is one of the by-products brought about by those “changing winds and shifting sands” (Kuhn, 1970 cited in Brown, 1987:12). Such an attitude led to the eventual demise of Audiolingualism and heralded the eruption of a spectacular emergence era of Communicative Approach which embraces the view that natural functions of language are best realized in functions of real-situational contexts.

To reduce the gap in-between and to minimize the logical divergences inherently residing among the methods of teaching, a conceptual feature analysis of methods have been developed and conducted by scholars and researchers in various styles and

---

fashions such as those of Bosco and Dipietro (1970) and Krashen and Seliger's (1975). They have provided two sets of universal distinctive features in terms of which all methods and approaches are rendered analytically describable and contrastively comparable. In allocating universal features to each method or approach a tendency to stress markedness as plus (+) or minus (-) values, as it has been found quite consistent in practically stipulating the significant distinctive phonological features, has been functionally exploited.

Eleven universal properties eight of which are psychological with the remaining three being linguistic have been efficiently and systematically worked out and introduced by Bosco and Dipietro (1970). They are carefully applied here to categorize the characteristics of the process and product approaches to writing. These features are expected to provide a basis for a comparative study of the process and product oriented schemes to writing. Further, it will enable those involved with writing, both teachers and students to gain insights into the natures of products vs. process writing. Such a type of analysis will hopefully raise student-writers/writing teachers' consciousness and will certainly alert them the underlying foundations of such an academic trend. Moreover, psychological and linguistic background of both schemes can be explored which contributes to an analytic understanding of the theoretical roots of these approaches. Needless to say, such a project is shouldered to develop a sharp determinant power of will and judgement which will provide writing teachers and student-writers the lucky chance of unshackling and releasing themselves

form the stigmatizing, stifling and whirling dilemma of process or product with flying colors. Writing teachers by having the convincing end-results of such a feature analysis assessed and reviewed will evidently lead themselves to submit themselves confidently to a justifiable act of choice or integration, one way or another. In this sense, writing teachers can in fact readily recognize what paradigm they honestly and intelligently are to be affiliated with. Additionally, this may signify the right path to the stimulation, awakening and development of their student-writer's dormant skills, which have not yet been adequately tapped and harnessed.

The universally applicable distinctive features proposed by Bosco and Dipietro (1970) are going to be presented as listed and defined by Stern (1983:486-487). To carry out a precise feature analysis of the process oriented and the product-based approaches of writing, all the eleven features introduced by the above scholars whether psychological or linguistic are critically described and roughly elaborated on below. This is hoped will serve our salient purpose, neatly categorizing and contrasting process and product approaches.

**A) *Psychological features***

1. Functional versus non-functional: Whether the goal is communicative or it is aimed at understanding the linguistic structure.

The process oriented approach to writing, as a point of fact, is explored to locate and spot and actualize the characteristics it

---

manifests so as to have the student-writers, capacities successfully nucleated, entertained and developed; thus enabling them to write communicatively. The student-writers following this mode, will discover to themselves that the communicative practice requirements are involuntarily observed and adequately accomplished. On complying with the true nature of process writing they themselves would find that they have something meaningful to say, have an audience to reach, too. They will find that they are cooperating and collaborating in a small group. Besides, they behave unpretentiously; quite natural in the context of real writing. Thus, all the objectives of the communicative language writing are seen to have been met within the procedural inventory of process oriented approach to writing. By the same token, process writing is seen to have been tuned to target at communication rather than getting engaged, as it is with the product oriented approach to writing, in accurately understanding the linguistic structures. Raimes (1991:408-9) is documented to have asserted that whereas product approach to writing ignores considering communication as one of its sincerest goals by intensively focusing on form, it provides student-writers with the opportunity of exploring some available syntactic options. Here, it can be readily inferred that process oriented writing is of [+functional] category due to its emphasis on the facilitative communicative factors while developing the writing skill.

2. Central versus Non-central: whether the method is psychologically directed to 'central' cognitive processes or to 'peripheral' sensorimotor conditioning.

The process approach to writing depending on the principles advocated by its proponents is known to be a free, liberal and democratic method to which the student-writers react positively and with which they cooperate willingly. The approach provides a non-threatening, unconditional and stress-free writing context in which the student-writers are privileged to practice their own skill of writing optimistically so as to have it systematically developed and promoted. The student-writers without being dictated by a didactic teacher are given their rights, undebated alternatives to choose their favorite topics at their free will. Additionally, student writers are left unrestricted by time limitations to write perfunctorily aiming unintentionally at “unfettered open interpersonal communication” Brown (1987:118), without being hampered by the unjustifiable fear of committing errors which they may be unfairly blamed for. On the basis of this, process theory of writing is reasonably inferred to be psychologically directed to central cognitive processes. Such a claim is well supported by Flower and Hayes (1981:366), on having asserted that, “writing is best understood as a set of distinctive thinking processes which writers organize or orchestrate during the act of writing”. The product-oriented approach to writing, on the other hand, propagates the idea of recreating or duplicating stipulated models or finished products as a main source of developing the writing ability. It supervises the writing assignment with a great amount of exhaustive interference and perverse control, seeking to reward details to be minutely and atomistically captured in the artificially reproduced text. White (1988:5-6) draws our attention to the veiled

---

nature of such a regressive, dampening theory on having stated that in the product-oriented approach to writing, the emphasis is laid on the correctness of the formal aspects of language and blind adherence to copying models, both of language and text. The mimicking surface writer caged inconceivably and unexplainably in those intimidating unacademic demands will naturally have no choice but to resist to accept being ruthlessly directed by the non-creative depressing peripheral sensorimotor conditioning.

In short, the process approach to writing accordingly, is smoothly inferred to be purely of a [+central] category due to its intensive appeals to cognitive processes. The process approach is plainly distinguished to have been psychologically directed whereas the product approach is simply identified as [-central], simply due to the fact that it ignores the humans' emotional side. Student-writers, in this sense, are seen to have been exhaustively and excessively involved in exquisitely paralleling finished written products.

3. Affective versus non-affective: whether the method stresses the affective domain or not.

Process theory of writing is said to be thought of as an inherently affective approach promoting techniques and procedures by means of which writing as a practiced assignment can be successfully supervised and conducted. Stressing the affective domain in second language acquisition Brown (1987:101-2) is quoted to mean "the emotional side of human behaviour, and it may be juxtaposed to the cognitive side". To this effect, he asserts that "in second language acquisition the learner needs to be



receptive both to those with whom he/she is communicating and to the language itself". Additionally, he/she has to be "responsive to persons and to the context of communication and to place a certain value on the communicative interpersonal exchange".

Teachers who are trained to applying the process approach have learned to supervise the act of writing professionally with affective care and tending. In fact, the process proponents are invited to open themselves to the realities of the pressure academic life and the protocol needs just as they have open themselves to the realities of their learners' affective and developmental needs. To fulfil the affective requirement, teachers roles have been reduced to minimum interventions and the student-writers are left with their internal experiences as to discover the their own selves i.e. to attain self-actualization, to succeed in the process of self-discovery on being involved in "spontaneous exchange in unplanned discourse . . . in communicative language use and not modeled language use" (Marton, 1988:38). The product approach on the other hand by attending to some predetermined, packaged forms and models which have to be faithfully emulated to reproduce is seen to be deliberately ignoring the individuals' cognitive, creative and strategic potentialities; those furtively found embedded in them. An approach as such can not be classified as that of a non-affectively directed one, and hence, affective supervision in producing parallel versions of a finished product is virtually non-existent. Accordingly, process approach to writing is opportuned to be [+affective] whereas the product oriented one, due to its

---

mechanical, non-mentalistic and prescriptive procedures, is identified to be generically of a [-affective] type.

4. Nomothetic versus non-nomothetic: whether language rules are explicitly brought into focus or not.

Process theory of writing as an inductive approach along with its technical advocacy and as an initiative propagating a teaching-learning communicative scheme is evidently specified to abide by an implicit perspective. It is seen to handle and manage the language rules within a liberal curriculum. Marton's (1988:38) elucidation on adopting a communicative teaching stance briefly implies that:

The structure of the target language is not taught explicitly at all, so that there are no grammar explanation and exercises, no drills of any kind, no grammar tests. Grammar is supposed to be acquired in a non-deliberate way, as a by-product of participation in various communicative activities in class. Only when there is a complete block in communication caused by wrong use of a language form, can the form itself become an object of the learners' conscious attention and the teacher may try to explain somehow, other than in metalinguistic terms, the meaning of this form".

Teachers who are process-oriented are in fact witnessed to focus on how writing is produced than on what the finished product as language segments aggregated by means of focused rules look like. In such an approach, writing is considered as process "whereby the writer discovers meaning instead of merely finding

appropriate structures in which to package already developed ideas” Chaudron, (1987:673-674).

Student-writers, working under the product-centered paradigm will be non-deliberately debilitated, as bogged in with attending to the surface structure of their writings at the cost of penetratively considering the significance of exploring the ideas they are industriously involved writing about.

The process approach based on the principles advocated is conclusively identified to have been granted the privilege of being [-nomothetic] whereas the product-centered paradigm due to emphasis laid on rules to be explicitly exposed is correctly rendered [+nomothetic]

5. Ideographic versus non-ideographic: whether the method encourages learners to develop their unique style of personal expression or not.

Actually, the strong commitment of a student-writer is supposed to honestly and ethically abide by the writing activities practically performed. Based on the principals and techniques strictly and cumulatively developed to meet the process-oriented approach goals and objectives, the student-writer is characterized to have biased to practice mainly writing personal, expressive texts. Brown (1988) as expounding on Carl Rogers humanistic psychology documented to have been contributing to a redefinition of educational process, promulgates that in adapting Rogers (1951, 1961) ideas about language teaching and learning, we need to see that “learners understand themselves and communicate this self to others freely and non-defensively”. Rogers believes that the

---

direction of behaviour is determined by a tendency driving student-writers toward self-actualization. Self-actualization, as a matter of fact, involves a continuing effort to achieve the maximum development of an individual's potentials.

The most important education-related implication of Rogerian theory is that in order to promote full, healthy functioning acting man, schools, then, should adopt a student-centered policy. Advocating a student-centered policy means building the curriculum in the class with and for the students (Nunan, 1988 cited in Rigg, 1991:527). A major aspect of the 'whole language' view is seen to typically grant full respect to each student with all that entails as respect for the student's language, home and culture. So having what has been put forward fully considered in process-oriented classes via relearning and developing literacy-acquired skill of writing, student-writers are accordingly seen to have been equipped with such a strong impetus to write for significant personal purposes (Raimes, 1991:41). Hamp Lyons (1986) in this sense patronizes supporting such a viewpoint as regarding writing, as well. In her view, student-writers in this regard in fact can write to learn or to display in writing that can effectively serve them as a tool, that is pragmatically manipulated to invent and discover meaning.

Obviously, student-writers within the process writing scheme are granted unrestricted timeouts in a natural setting to have their writing potentials critically operationalized in the absence of deterring, intrusive or non-developmental surface feedback. Naturally, conducting such a policy entertains the student-writers

though the prototype process is in utter consideration, to have their unique type of writing process styles worked out. Process writing is readily distinguished to conform to or to serve as a natural extension of the intact, the original and the authentic, conducive specimen. Student-writers are witnessed to cherish their own, private unparalleled and unexpected ramifications and inferences of a theoretically demonstrated caste of process writing. Here, such a trend in writing will be academically taken for granted that student-writers will furtively and stealthily discover and acquire the unconscious skill to discover or create a unique, unforeseen and individualized style of personal expression. Research on the writing of school children (Atwell 1987, Calkin 1983, Graves 1973) has convinced many writing teachers that it is the process, not the product of writing that deserves attention. At present, in “whole language” classes, student-writers are witnessed to have been successfully enabled to “select their own topics, their own audiences and write for their own purposes and to their own standards” (Rigg 1991:525).

On the contrary the product model is reported to have dictated some type of predestined route on student-writers to exercise the writing skill through honest imitation and faithful duplication or reproduction of models provided. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, they will be inevitably alienated with their personally acquired or inherently possessed nature of writing. Thus, Student-writers forcefully or impulsively fold themselves to prepared or ready-made frames which will eventually end up with the absorption of a cluster of unidentified symptoms and clues quite

---

weird not conforming, indicating or alluding to their unexplored untapped and undiscovered self.

Reluctantly, the process approach to writing is seen to have been privileged with the strategy of facilitating student-writers efforts to enhance evolving their own personal style and promote their awareness. The product model, on the contrary, having been under the influence of the inflexible mechanism of parroting techniques is seen to have no choice but to suppress and deconstruct such growth-oriented tendencies on practicing writing. Process-oriented writing is happily seen to have been based on facts formerly mentioned to boast the genre of being [+ideographic] whereas the product paradigm is accorded with the distinctive property of [-ideographic].

6. Molar versus non-molar (molecular versus non-molecular): whether the method encourages a synthetic or integrated (analytic) view of language and its expression i.e. whether the language is presented to serve predominantly as an inventory of separate molecule.

Evidently, the process approach to writing, so as to meet its communicative ends is seen to have undertaken coaching an integrated view of the language in use. Zemelman and Daniels (1988:33) supported such an academic stance on having addressed the student-writers, stating that:

If you practice the process model of writing in its pure form, you will inevitably be drawn into a more integrated, whole-language approach to teaching, you will be designing and conducting class activities that are not just writing, but that

weave writing together with reading, speaking, listening, literature and language study. You will be creating integrated, holistic language activities that naturally implement many of the principles.

To be more in pursuance with fact-findings that has been advocated regarding the process approach in features five and six, they may be well subordinated and coordinated. Zemelman and Daniels (1988:239) will be once more quoted as elucidating that, “integrated activities share a number of essential characteristics”. All are inductive experiences that provide a progressive piercing engagement with the material at hand. All involve a rhythmic alternation among various classroom groupings, cognitive processes, purposes and modes of language use. While the writing teachers may provide the content, student-writers are helped to personally find significant connections and implications in that material. Students’ writing may range from expressive to transactional to poetic within a single activity.

On the other hand, we may refer to one characteristic forwarded by Emig (1976) cited in Zemelman and Daniels (1988:18) in reference to model-based product-oriented approach. It is specifying succinctly that in product paradigm “writers must be taught atomistically, mastering small parts and sub-skills before attempting whole piece of writing” whereas in process approach, the four modes; speaking, writing, listening and reading, are inseparably and interdependently supportive. They are in fact not artificially segregated in the classes supervised. The conclusion worked out, inherently, contributes that the product-oriented

---

approach to writing, “encourages the acquisition of discrete-specific skills”, whereas the language skills in the process paradigm are treated in an “undifferentiated manner” (Stern, 1983), abiding by the policy of integration in treating language. This, of course, strictly manifests itself with reference to Krashen and Seligers’ (1975) defining universal feature termed “multiple channel” approach that stresses attending to an indivisible combination comprising listening, speaking, reading and writing, as well.

To sum up, the process-oriented approach to writing through technical practices virtually undertaken is seen to prove being [-molar]; [-molecular] whereas the product paradigm by giving in to an atomistic approach on treating and handling language is convincingly categorized to be of a [+molar]; [+molecular] adherent.

7. Cyclic versus non-cyclic: whether the method in question intermittently returns to previous points of learning or does it reluctantly proceed from point to point in a quite linear fashion.

Apparently, as it has been conclusively researched by Emig (1971) Zamel (1982, 1983) Raimes (1983, 1985, 1991), the process-oriented approach treats writing as a recursive, cyclical or spiral type of an activity shuttling back and forward till that unexpected, finished or temporary product is meaningfully manufactured and manifested.

Tony Silva (1990), from a process perspective, is quoted to have stressed that “writing is a complex, recursive and creative process or a set of behaviours”. It needs to be internally



habitualized as to experience from time to time the protruding, lagging behind, taking over, retarding, for and rear nature of writing. Flower and Hayes (1981) precedently contributed to the non-linear perspective of acquiring such a skill by exposing the processes of writing as “to be hierarchically organized with component processes embedded within other components”. To define a hierarchical system, it is one in which a large working system such as that of composing can subsume other less inclusive systems, such as generating ideas which in turn contains still other systems. Unlike those in a linear or syntagmatic scheme, the events in a hierarchical process are not inflexibly and rigidly stipulated to operate functioning in a non-pliable or non-revisable manner. Consequently it is quite common to find a given process to be recalled upon at any time and to be inserted or embedded within another instance of itself. Naturally and quite predictably, the processes, which are known to be hierarchical, admit recurring as embedded sub-processes. Since it is powerful and diverse in its implementations and owing to the privilege of flexibility and elasticity, it potentially displays infinite possibilities and variations. Obviously, it provides student-writers with countless likely and unlikely operations and technicalities to have the sub-processes swingingly, cyclically and rotatively multiplied. Basically, such an unleashed and generative process enables the process-writers to try honestly to exercise the skill, which can be worked out through concurrent oft-occurring systematically overlapping triplet processes of planning, translating and reviewing. Revision, accordingly, depending on what has been stated so far, can not be

---

postulated to be a solitary or an alienated activity packed within a single phase in the act of composing. On the contrary, it is accounted for to serve as a composing/thinking enterprise comprising generation, assessment and criticism processes that may be rewound and reverted to any time student-writers make up their minds to recapitulate and make up for their developing texts. Summing it up, this type of writing strategy in which an entire process is embedded within a larger or a smaller instance of itself is technically known to comply with 'recursion' as it generates writing in progress.

Conversely, the product-centered paradigm with its biased emphasis specifically laid on isolated fragmentary and syntagmatic linearity of the trilogy of writing activity denies the proscriptive, introspective and retrospective generative nature of the writing processes and sub-processes. Such a writing orthodoxy will, of course, get indisputably finalized ending up with non-hardened non-tenderized and immature, rough type of a textual product. Needless to say, the written product; the manufactured output for which a non-retrospective forward with no backward linearity is inevitably undergone betrays more ruts and loops due to having ignored the rehabilitating, the reconstructive, the recursive cyclical treatments, without attending to taxonomies of criticisms and evaluations. In fact, abiding by the genuine nature of writing, some minor and major stages are occasionally seen to require double, triple or even multiple attendance in unspecified and non-discriminated sessions to have the evolving text matured, manifested or perfected. Murray (1989:3) unconsciously describes

his own writing behaviour highlighting the inherent significant role of a sub-process as revision admitting that, “ I rarely read what I write and when I do I usually feel total despair or a compulsion to revise. I cannot type my own final drafts, or would change everything”.

The last point here, in fact, evidently implies that the process-oriented approach to writing can be announced to have won the label of [+cyclic] while the product-based one due to its non-paradigmatic linearity is inevitably of a [-cyclic] nature.

8. Divergent versus Non-divergent: whether the method encourages the acquisition of discrete-specific skills or treats the language skills in an undifferentiated manner.

Performance channel  $\pm$  is seen to have been manipulated by Krashen and Seliger (1975) as a distinctive feature by means of which the separation and the combination of listening, speaking, reading and writing skills is specifically implied. Process approach is identified to demand and stress a ‘multiple channel’ perspective rather than showing tendency for a single channel preference. This advocacy is assumed to coincide with that of Dipietro and Bosco’s (1970) distinctive feature denominated as  $\pm$  divergent. The product approach as it has been characterized to be in favor of allowing students acquire ‘discrete specific skills’ rather than treating language holistically in an ‘undifferentiated manner’ (Stern, 1983:487). The product-wise type of writing is categorically classified to win [+divergent] membership. But, the process scheme is seen to handle the writing skill as to have been inherently integrated with other skills. ‘The writing skill’ is then assumed to

---

non-discretely and inseparably cooperate and interact with the remaining skills.

All phases of writing; prewriting, writing and rewriting are documented to have been invariably undergone in the presence of listening, reading and speaking. Even writing itself is accounted for to vigorously undertake the assignment of stimulating, provoking and generating thoughts and ideas. Writing is claimed to create thought to be converted into language framed as product (Chastin, 1988); in other words, writing writes (Graves, 1973). The prewriting stage is specifically supported to win embarking on some thought-provoking techniques such as those of quick writing, group writing, free writing, focused free writing, journal writing, list writing, and scratch outline, outlining, cubing, looping and drafting, as well.

As far as process writing is concerned a different approach to the design of instructional activities is dramatically needed. The activities developed to fit a process-focused approach to writing are specified to embrace the different stages in the writing process. They may be found focussing on prewriting/rehearsing phase. In so doing to help student writers develop ideas, generate plans serve initial stimuli for writing and provide motivation, specific activities immersed, diluted and merged in the four skills are enthusiastically adopted and implemented. Such an experience is mainly manifested via brainstorming, asking questions, interviewing, monologues, survey talking, fantasizing, oral writing, silent reading, debating, thinking aloud without writing, role playing, and sleeping on a subject, as well.

In fact, such type of technical activities prepare the student-writers to “affectively and effectively” (Widdowson, 1990) shoulder the task of writing. The task of writing/drafting also requires specific activities to be carried out in collaboration with other skills other than writing. This non-divergence prejudice can be practically realized when student-writers appeal to strategic questions or submit themselves to instances of group drafting.

Seemingly, following the phases of prewriting/rehearsing and writing/drafting, the phase, which entertains revising/rewriting, emerges into being. All along this phase, some skills-oriented activities such as those of peer feedback and group-correction are prioritized to be manifested in typical writing classrooms.

All the activities referred to are crucially capitalized on as strategies accounted for to significantly serve an advantageous role in provoking thought, generating information and stimulating background knowledge, thus facilitating immediate retrieval on reasonable demand.

Process writing, to conclude, is accordingly allocated a [-divergent] identity whereas the product bias due to the divisiveness it exerts on language skills is labeled to be [+divergent].

***B) Linguistic features:***

9. General versus Non-general: whether the method analyses the second language as an example of universal features, or does it treat each language as something specific, particular or unique.

Luckily, as far as process theory of writing is concerned what the researchers have embarked on or have done to date, is said to

---

have gone so far in pinpointing, framing and promulgating some strategic details concerning the universals of writing. Almost all the properties of process writing constitute mechanisms indicating explicitly those writing universals to turn potentially realized existent and virtually noticed present in the act of writing of all languages of the world. The idea that the writing cycle is purely recursive is not a property that can be privatized, or monopolized by a particular language. In fact, the writing skill is inevitably, whether consciously or unconsciously exercised, automatically operates in a non-linear shuttle back and forward manner. Such a crucial feature is an inherently non-detachable criterion by which writing in all languages of the world are found to abide unanimously by. This premise can be undoubtedly settled and manifested when the universals of writing are realized as have been engaged within the unconscious processes undergone (Emig, 1971). Moreover, the process approach attends to writing as a skill that can be found best supported and developed by following unsystematically the non-graded, nonconsecutive, multiply jumbled, haphazardly stepped stages of prewriting-drafting-revision sequence, an obligation all writers voluntarily or involuntarily in a cyclical, spiral and convoluted process unavoidably comply with.

The product-oriented approach, on the other hand, by focusing on the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of structures of written language undertakes the position of treating language as something unique, specific and particular that must be contrastively observed. Due to the fact that the product-oriented approach is termed a

“parallel writing model” (White, 1988), it naturally encourages the analysis of the texts to find out the features of form, content and organization; say, of English, Urdu or Farsi to let a model get genuinely reproduced. The concern in such a model-based approach is to capitalize on diverse, almost uncontrollable details of each mode. It is seen to have been deposited within the contrastive details of “a language” not “language” (Lyons, 1988:2). Hence the body of instruction extended to teachers is distinguished to fail being of a universal category binding up unanimously and indiscriminately all the languages human beings interacting with. Rather, they explicitly exercise distinction highlighting the discriminating specificities and distinguishing particularities dominating “a language” (Lyons, 1988:2). Consequently, from the viewpoint of such an approach to writing, these points can be conclusively inferred: first, writing is nothing but a matter of arrangement. Second, learning to write patronizes the performance of identifying, internalizing and implementing specifically the denominated patterns in the products recreated based on models provided.

Quite expectedly, in line with such assertions, process approach to writing is proudly privileged to enjoy the prestige of being a universal attendant, a pro [+general] scheme. By contrast, the product oriented approach as adopting, acting, and complying with the particularists’ attitude toward language is justifiably recommended to be of [-general] entity.

- 
10. Systematic versus Non-systematic: whether the method suggests an ordered system of linguistic analysis or it deals with linguistic features without observing any order.

Researchers embarking on process writing theory are documented to have empirically validated allowing “students time and opportunity for selecting topics, generating ideas, writing drafts and revision, and providing feedback” (Raimes, 1991:410). In product-modeling approach; on the contrary, topics are assigned by the teachers since the method capitalizes on enabling student-writers to produce correct sentences at the outset rather than orienting them with how sentences and paragraphs convey meaning. In process writing as a writer-dominated approach, the student-writers frequently do choose topics themselves. They are witnessed to jot what concerns them down using their personal experiences. Student-writers on having been involved in such an unfettered, open-ended and creative experience get rid of being delimited within a supposedly sensitively selected, orderly graded and systematically designed course. This, of course, is due to its hostility with inhibitions and since it moves adversely against the objectively speculated benefits of an easy-flowing academic program.

Ironically, the term ‘syllabus’ refers to a “form in which linguistic content is specified in a course or a method” (Richard and Rogers 1987:2). The term is found to be more affiliated with product-oriented methods than those, which are labeled as process-oriented. The product-modeling approach is distinctively identified to abide by ‘a priori syllabus’, which is usually prepared and



determined in advance. It necessarily follows: an organized systematic pre-programming in selecting, grading, sequencing, presenting, and repeating the relevant subject matter to be virtually utilized in developing language skills, namely writing. In other words, needless to say, this can be accomplished by a ladder deductive strategy so as to have the skill of writing explicitly approached.

'Syllabus' as a term, on the contrary, is rarely used in process-oriented method in which a secondary role is allocated for language content. In process, neither the linguistic content nor subject matter is specified in advance. Practitioners are granted their true chances to experience "expecting the unexpected"(Murray,) in the act of real writing.

Student-writers are left free to choose their own topics, not strictly abiding by the exigencies of an orderly sequence, but reasonably governed and monitored by the obligations of the emerging needs to fulfill the task of writing to meet 'real purposes'. To find out what linguistic content is in fact generated and practiced during a course is what really concerns the process approach, which is geared to a 'posteriori' approach in syllabus design. The 'syllabus' is accordingly seen to have been derived from and determined by examining the lesson or the session protocols i.e. "a course is prepared after it has been taught as record of the language and activities used in the course". (Richards, Platt, and Platt, 1992:21). The process approach in the light of what has been mentioned is intelligently inferred to have been conforming

---

itself to an implicit, inductive, retrospective procedure in displaying material and assigning tasks within the framework of its educational policy.

Moreover, in terms of theories of language, the product-modeling approach observes a structural view in monitoring teaching and learning language via stressing grammatical units: clauses, phrases and sentences, or grammatical operations: adding, shifting, joining, and transformation, or lexical items: structure and content words. Process approach, on the other hand, is strictly dominated by an interactional view of language according to which language is treated as a medium of interpersonal relations to initiate and enhance the performance of social interaction between/among student-writers as individuals. In compliance with such an approach, the content of writing program is written and organized and it may be left unmentioned or unspecified but restricted, adapted and adjusted to learners' or interactors' interests. In fact, it can be intuitively derived and accumulated from an inventory comprising patterns of exchange and interaction.

As it has been formerly ascribed to, process approach to writing is considered a 'whole language' program satellite particularly in the case of extending to each student-writer a total kind of respect. Such a humanistic type of intention which eventually involves student-writers pinpointing and determining their own private curriculum by themselves is coupled with respect for the students and teachers (Rigg, 1991:527). This phenomenon has led to interactive performances engaging students and teachers in administering collaborative activities governed by undirected,

non-prescribed, unpredictable content, while simultaneously altered to be adequately responsive to immediate, not looked-forward to, real class needs. Besides, the full-respect allocated for the students and teachers as researchers and syllabus designers, the process approach advocates sharp awareness as regarding students' diversity, the clear understanding of which calls for an individual grasp of students needs, styles and purposes. This view presupposes that not all approaches and procedures might be applied to ESL/EFL (Raimes, 1991:421-2) of which the skill of writing is not an exception.

Assisted by hard evidences as such, process is identified to be [-systematic], but violating systematically and purposefully orderliness by resisting and denying sequential gradation on rationing language content for its trainees whereas the product-modeling paradigm is conversely schematized to observe a strict sequential conduct in its writing classrooms. That is why it behaves as a pro [+systematic] guardian in the act of writing.

11. Unified versus Non-unified: Whether the method attempts to build up a total structure of language or it deals with each rule in isolation.

Process theory of writing is claimed to have been developed out of a global understanding of language rather than messing up with local fractions of particular interests. One of the major aims undertaken by this approach is to liberate the student-writers from remaining shackled to dealing with the segments of language. They are motivated to trespass boldly the borders of writing conventions in embracing or segregating the syntactic structures. They are

---

invited to relieve themselves in writing at the sentence or the discourse level from activities which demand student-writer's "adhering to precise rules for writing" which has proved to be more of a hindrance than help in actual generation of a text (Arndt, 1987:262). Teachers are well advised to extend their assistance to student-writers to define through the written medium their own communicative purposes and to "select appropriate writing tasks and introduce relevant modes for stimulus, guidance and support" (Watson, 1982:13). Apparently, Zamel's (1983) least skilled research subjects view writing as static transcription of a "series of parts, words, sentences, paragraphs" rather than the creation of "whole discourse". (Sommer, 1982:151).

Hence, process approach to writing entertains evaluation via responding to composition i.e. a "method of evaluating writing in which the composition is viewed as a whole rather than as distinct parts" (Richards, Platt, Platt, 1992:167).

As a conclusion, it can be allegedly pledged that the process approach be readily identified as embracing a holistic approach in considering language whereas the product version is atomistic in its bias caring to chop language into components. Consequently, the feature [+unified] is logically allotted to the former and the [-unified] to the latter.

Ultimately, mainly based on Bosco and Dipietro's (1970), dichotic categories symbolized by (+) or (-) values, eleven features are substantiated of which eight features are of psychological and the remaining three of linguistic nature. These

features in their totality are expected to facilitate the arduous task of orienting the writing teachers as well as the student-writers with the minor and major details of the qualitative and quantitative specificities of the two paradigms: process and product already discussed.

As a curtain line, the process approach accordingly satisfies the criteria of being +functional, +central, +affective, -nomothetic, +ideographic, -molar, +cyclic, -divergent, +general, -systematic and +unified whereas the product enterprise seems to exhibit the features -functional, -central, -affective, +nomothetic, -ideographic, +molar, -cyclic, +divergent, -general, +systematic and -unified writing project. Table (I) below exhibits comprehensively the features (+) or (-), attributable to the approaches: -

**Table (I)**

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Psychological</b>	<b>Linguistic</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Process</b>
<i>Functional</i>	+	-	-	+
<i>Central</i>	+	-	-	+
<i>Affective</i>	+	-	-	+
<i>Nomothetic</i>	+	-	+	-
<i>Ideograph</i>	+	-	-	+

<i>ic</i>				
<i>Molar</i>	+	-	+	-
<i>Cycle</i>	+	-	-	+
<i>Divergent</i>	+	-	+	-
<i>General</i>	-	+	-	+
<i>Systematic</i>	-	+	+	-
<i>Unified</i>	-	+	-	+

In addition to, Bosco and Dipietro's (1970) inventory of features, universally exploited consistently to analyze and describe the process approach, Krashen and Seliger (1975), too, passed on their octagonal frame of features regarding methods of teaching language. They have introduced a cluster of eight features; a schematic plan according to which the common properties of methods and approaches of teaching language are accurately and systematically categorized and developed; thus intelligent awareness in this regard can be instantly acquired on demand. Some of the features proposed by Krashen and Seliger (1975) are found to be partially or totally overlapping with those put forward by Bosco and Dipietro's (1970). Corresponding to Bosco and Dipietro's categorization, the cluster of eight features documented in Krashen and Seliger's (1975) list, on close detection, is seen to have been classified as psychological and linguistic in category. Cited in Stern (1983:488-91), the eight features worked out by Krashen and Seliger (1975) are found to have been marked with (+) or (-) values shown as below:

<b>1) Discrete point</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>2) Deductive</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>3) Explicit</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>4) Sequence</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>5) Performance channel</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>6) Exercise type</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>7) Extent of control</b>	<b>±</b>
<b>8) Feedback</b>	<b>±</b>

As it has been mentioned by Stern (1983:488-91), most of the features provided on both lists, Bosco and Dipietro (1970), and Krashen and Seliger's (1975) are well observed to suffer from overlapping redundancy. The overlapping detected on both lists are displayed in Table (2) below:

**Table (II)**

	<b>Krashen and Seliger's features</b>	<b>Nature of Relation</b>	<b>Bosco and Dipietro's features</b>
<b>1</b>	± Discrete point	OLW	Divergent vs. Non-divergent Unified vs. Non-unified Molar vs. Non-molar
<b>2</b>	± Discrete point	OLW	Nomothetic vs. Non-nomothetic
<b>3</b>	± Explicit	OLW	Nomothetic vs. Non-nomothetic
<b>4</b>	± Sequence	OLW	Systematic vs. Non-systematic
<b>5</b>	Performance Channel Multiple vs. Single	OLW	Divergent vs. Non-central
<b>6</b>	Exercise type: focus on vs. focus away	OLW	Central vs. Non-central
<b>7</b>	Extent of control: error avoidance vs. error tolerance	NCB	-----
<b>8</b>	Feedback: error corrected vs. error ignored	NCB	-----



OLW: Stands for “Overlapping with”, NCB: Stands for “Not covered by”

Krashen and Seliger’s (1995) model for universal feature analysis of approaches and methods depicted in Table (2) which displays the overlapping can also be utilized to have both process and product writing schemes contrastively analyzed and described by quite a different set of ELT jargons.

Consequently, the process approach to writing, based on Krashen and Seliger's (1975) set of eight distinctive features, can be described as:

- 1) – **Discrete point**
- 2) – **Deductive**
- 3) – **Explicit**
- 4) – **Sequence**
- 5) + **Multiple performance channel**  
– **Single performance channel**
- 6) + **Focus on exercise type**  
– **Focus away exercise type**
- 7) + **Error tolerance extent of control**  
– **Error avoidance extent of control**
- 8) + **Error ignored feedback**  
– **Error corrected feedback**

In contrast, the product scheme complies with a set of features diametrically opposed to those characterizing the process approach:

- 1) + **Discrete point**
- 2) + **Explicit**

- 
- 3) + **Deductive**
  - 4) + **Sequence**
  - 5) + **Single performance channel**
    - **Multiple performance channel**

*Exercise type:*
  - 6) + **Focus on exercise type**
    - **Focus away exercise type**

*Extent of control:*
  - 7) + **Error avoidance extent of control**
    - **Error tolerance extent of control**

*Feedback:*
  - 8) + **Error corrected feedback**
    - **Error ignored feedback**

Accordingly, Table (3) shows a sharp contrast between the features assigned to the two approaches:

**Table (3)**

	<b>Krashen and Seliger's</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Process</b>
<b>1</b>	Discrete point	+	-
<b>2</b>	Explicit	+	-
<b>3</b>	Deductive	+	-
<b>4</b>	Sequence	+	-
<b>5</b>	Performance channel: Single performance channel	+	-
	Multiple performance channel	-	+
<b>6</b>	Exercise type: Focus on	+	-
	Focus away	-	+

7	Extent of control:		
	Error avoidance	+	-
8	Feedback:		
	Errors ignored	-	+
	Errors corrected	+	-

As a result of such a kind of contrastive matching accountancy of the two sets of features formerly demonstrated in Table (3), and due to overlappings observed in both inventories and in order to arrive at a consistent and solid set of features, six out of the eight features proposed by Krashen and Seliger (1975) are justifiably overlooked and deleted. Two additional significant features: ‘extent of control’ and ‘feedback’, are reasonably added to Dipietro and Bosco’s (1970) list, raising the items on their list to thirteen.

The reconstructed list of thirteen features is pragmatically utilized so as to describe process writing as compared with product-type of writing. Although the feature feedback (error corrected vs. error ignored) is not classified by Krashen and Seliger (1975) as a significant distinguishing factor, it has been justifiably included. Such a feature can be utilised to serve as a crucial determinant in classifying process theory of writing and dramatically comparing it with the model-product version in question. The couple of features ‘extent of control’ and the ‘feed-back’ due to their affective appeals are counted as of psychological category to be attached to the previous set of eight universal features found on Depietro and Bosco’s (1970) list. This shows how ESL & EFL teaching and

---

learning, and obviously writing as a derivative skill, are radically serving to indispensably provide the convenience of a psychologically oriented writing assignment.

With such an inventory of combined sets of features (Dipietro and Bosco 1970, Krashen and Seliger, 1975) which can concisely and specifically describe each method or approach and their role in second/foreign language teaching and learning, controversies that naturally arise due to diverse scholastic viewpoints, can be impartially resolved.

Luckily, the combined inventory of features has been examined to test its relevancy describing and isolating unique properties of both process and product approaches to teaching and learning writing. This has been carried by scholars who have used the procedure of 'markedness' objectively and empirically to explore and implement the properties of the two approaches to teaching writing. Undoubtedly, this unspeculative but explorative style of interpreting the two approaches to writing accommodates theorists, scholars, teachers as well as student-writers with new choices and options to define and to assess the real situation of the writing craft as far as approaches and methods of teaching are concerned. The whole project has been initiated and developed to overcome and suppress "the separateness and restrictiveness" (Stern, 1983:482-91) imposed on the methods and approaches in language teaching and learning. As the two methods discover the essential common features underlying all language pedagogy, they are significantly functional in alluding to separateness and restrictiveness of both model-product and cognitive process

paradigms, as well. It is expected that the application of the two sets of universal features collapsed in one, though both are judged to be partly unsystematic by Stern (1983:482-91), to provide a coherent and comprehensive background. This combined approach, of course, is seen to work out enabling the writing teachers and student-writers to evaluate more realistically the terms of language teaching including the dichotomy of process/product writing.

But, as far as the purpose of this study is concerned, the combination of these two sets of features is expected to disclose a sharp contrastive gap between a couple of unexplored, contradictory approaches to the teaching of a complicated skill as that of writing. That gap will be hopefully bridged, as the two approaches to teaching writing will be shown to be complementary rather than irreconcilable.

The couple of non-overlapping features elicited from Krashen and Seliger (1975) list are 'Extent of control' and 'Feed-back'. These two features due to their being significantly non-redundant are added to demonstrate a discussion unveiling how process and product as two contrastive approaches to teaching and learning writing based on such feature analysis enterprise can be consistently characterized and assessed.

12. Extent of control: whether the possibility of learners' errors is avoided or not. i.e. a 'focus on vs. a focus away' dichotomy.

Luckily, the studies undertaken in reference to 'error analysis' and 'interlanguage' brought about a positive outlook on the 'significance of learners errors' (Corder, 1967). It has been

---

assumed that without allowing for errors, the second language learners can not develop their own internalised standards of correctness (Stern, 1983:490). Process theory of writing in adopting a cognitive stance in dealing with language teaching sets the stage for more freedom to the students. They, accordingly, experience their creativity, and in doing so, the golden chances of learning by errors are correspondingly increased. In 'free writing' student-writers are strongly encouraged to practice in classrooms embarking on composition courses so as to provoke ideas and to gather the amount of information required mainly employed during the prewriting stage to lower student-writers hard labour so as to get readily started. Student-writers while involved in the process of writing are advised to write unconditionally and non-defensively, giving up most of the reservations that might hamper them from writing freely. They are encouraged to take the golden opportunities provided, to have the sweet dreams of writing creatively fulfilled in the form of an unpredictable original text. On the contrary, the product-oriented approach is believed to observe correctness standards strictly toward the creation of unrealisable error-free ideal type of a text. In a process-sympathetic course, student-writers involved in free writing are encouraged not to "plan, organise, revise or proofread" when they are busy writing (Man and Man, 1989:5). Clouse (1992:13) reminds the student-writers to "remember the emphasis in free writing is on free", so they have not to be sidetracked with "grammar, spelling, logic or neatness." In fact, by inviting the student writers to free write, they are stimulated to reflect on their opinions using the opportunities

they will be granted, with the possibility of making errors that inevitably do occur. Actually, most of the thought-stimulating techniques such as brainstorming, clustering, cubing, looping besides free writing let such constructive opportunities occur, resulting in records advantageous rewarding errors. Attracting the scholar's attention to "the significance of learners errors" (Corder, 1967) is said to enhance the development of the writing abilities. Process theory of writing fosters a kind of viewpoint that privileges student-writers to exercise their abilities globally, mainly aiming at uninhibited, unimpeded meaningful communication. In this sense, accordingly, errors are not looked upon as hindering agents which is in the best interest of student-writers' should be avoided. A writing program as such, propagating non-blocking, non-detering strategies and policies, can not be affiliated with an error avoidance academic advocacy. On the contrary, student-writers complying with the process agenda have been encouraged to exercise all types of freedom in time and topics thus inviting them to get involved in real, interactive communicative activities without being scheduled to minimize, lower or escape the significant possibility of making errors.

13) Feedback: whether to what degree errors are corrected or ignored i.e. error corrected vs. error ignored dichotomy.

The feature in question, due to its inconsistency as a discriminatory factor, has been denied the privilege of being accounted for as an absolute property. But it has been considered and included in our process approach feature analysis list due to the fact that it is capable of functioning as a significant denominator in

---

coming up with a comprehensive appraisal of such an approach. The sub-topic of feedback is a salient factor according to which both approaches: process and product can be explained and contrastively analyzed. Feedback, when treated as whether ‘errors corrected’ or ‘errors ignored’ indicators, can distinctly delimit and demarcate the two approaches in terms of unoverlapping exclusive properties.

Zamel (1985) is said to have repudiated teachers attending to surface-level features of writing; those that seem to read and react to a text as a series of separate pieces of sentence level or even clause level rather than as whole unit of discourse. In fact, they are so radically distracted by language-related problems that they often fail realize that there is a much larger meaning-related problem worthy of being deeply addressed and considered. Some scholars expressed their worries about some other writing teachers approaching student texts as final products. Such teachers base their evaluations of student texts on perceived and fixed notions about good writing (Sommers, 1985). Although it cannot be absolutely asserted that process writing completely ignores emerging errors, it is extremely radical abiding by a biased strategy as to have all errors indiscriminately overlooked. Process agenda verifies such an assertion when readers are referred to statements proclaiming that “a premature focus on correctness and usage gives students the impression that language form, rather than how language functions may discourage them from making further serious attempts” (Zamel, 1983). The composing process is identified in every book concerned as non-linear, exploratory, and



generative and dynamic mechanism, whereby student-writers discover and formulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning. Hence, “if we prompt the writers’ control by ignoring intended meaning in favor of formal and technical flaws, we also remove the incentive to write and the motivation to improve skills” (Branon and Knoblauch, 1982 cited in Zamel, 1983). This profound allusion supports process writing in its quite humanistic implications when we are referred to student-writers are not blamed for, thus avoiding there being or hampered from achievement meaningful communication. Actually, they are appreciated for their privilege to systematically exercise attending to an ever-evolving approximate language demonstrated and manifested in the creator’s L2 interlanguage system.

Brown (1987) tried purposefully to illuminate the inevitability of an error-oriented agenda, which cannot be compromised at all, when he asserts that:

Human learning is fundamentally a process that involves the making of mistakes . . . children learning their first language make countless mistakes . . . Many of these mistakes are logical in the limited linguistic system within which children operate their writing abilities, but by carefully processing feedback from others, such children slowly but surely learn to produce what is acceptable speech in their native language. Second language learning is a process that is clearly not unlike first language learning in its trial-and-error nature. Inevitably, learner make mistakes in the process acquisition, and indeed will even impede that process if they do not commit errors and then benefit in turn from various feedback on those errors.... There is a

---

danger in paying too much attention to learners' errors". While errors are indeed revealing of a system at work, the classroom foreign language teacher can become so preoccupied with noticing errors that the correct utterances in the second language go unnoticed. In our observation and analysis of errors for all that they do reveal about the learner we must beware of placing too much attention on errors and not lose sight of the value of positive reinforcement of clear, free communication. While administering of errors is an important criterion for increasing language proficiency, the ultimate goal of second language learning is the attainment of communicative fluency in a language. (Brown, 1987:169-71)

Likewise, the process of writing in its guiding principles, openly alludes to ignoring errors in order to have a higher level of accomplishment secured, i.e. a discourse grasp of language, an objective the negligence of which frustrated for long the experience of language teaching and learning. As a result of negligence, the development of the writing skill turned out to become unwittingly a discouraging experience. In a similar vein, Raimes (1991:410) asserts that "where linguistic accuracy was formerly emphasized from the start, it's now often downplayed, at least at the beginning of the process, delayed until writers have grappled with ideas and organization". Process writing can be discussed as one of the extensions of a more general umbrella school of educational thought known as 'whole language' (Zemelman and Daniels, 1988:14-7), most of tenets of which have been relevantly derived. Such a rewarding cumulative tendency caused the new emerging process paradigm to flourish to inaugurate a humanistic chapter within the domain of teaching and learning the writing skill.

Having been inspired by the ‘whole language’ patronage ‘the writing workshop (process) approach is seen to postpone the correction of errors to the republication step of editing; this, of course, frees both student-writers and writing teachers to concentrate on matters of content ‘organization and style’ (Rigg, 1991:526).

To sum the whole discussion up, the process-oriented approach for humanistic and affective reasons to show bias towards ignoring errors. Thus, letting the curriculum bestow its assistance upon the student-writers, furnishing them with the favorable opportunities to assess the fit between their plans and the products (Perl 1979, Sommers 1980, Flower and Hayes 1981). The product-modeling approach on the contrary is found to be exclusively biased toward highlighting surface-level errors of local consideration, thus ignoring great expectations with global achievements. Needless to say, these tendencies with the product-modeling approach forces the student-writers to intentionally or unintentionally “rescan large segments of their work” (Raimes, 1983:230). The detailed story of product/process feature analysis is worked out in Table (4) showing comprehensively the contrastive enterprise. This time, both Dipietro and Bosco's (1970), and Krashen and Seliger's (1975) features, are combined to embrace the whole gamut of what the process/product explorative/comparative discussion includes.

**Table (4)**

	<b>Feature</b>	<b>Psychological Feature</b>	<b>Linguistic Features</b>	<b>Product Oriented</b>	<b>Process Oriented</b>	<b>Bosco &amp; Dipietro</b>	<b>Krashen &amp; Seliger</b>

---

1	Function al	+	-	-	+	+	-
2	Central	+	-	-	+	+	-
3	Affective	+	-	-	+	+	-
4	Nomothetic	+	-	-	+	+	-
5	Idiographic	+	-	-	+	+	-
6	Molar	+	-	+	-	+	-
7	Cyclic	+	-	-	+	+	-
8	Divergent	+	-	+	-	+	-
9	General	-	+	-	+	+	-
10	Systematic	-	+	+	-	+	-
11	Unified	-	+	-	+	+	-
12	Extent of Control: error avoidance error tolerance	+	-	+	-	-	+
13	Feedback: error ignored error focussed	+	-	-	+	-	+

***Conclusion***

Having the set of thirteen features practically worked out to describe process and product approaches to writing so far examined, one can readily perceive the primacy of the psychological factors overshadowing linguistic ones. Apparently, ten out of the thirteen features exploited in the analysis and description of approaches as regarding teaching and learning the skill of writing are purely psychological whereas the remaining three are linguistic. The predominance of psychological features whether plus or minus is manifest. Process approach is found to be [-molar, -divergent, -systematic, -error avoidance, +error tolerance -error focused]. These features when interpreted in details are found to serve as positive indicators the process approach is proudly privileged with. For instance, process does not develop a program in which the possibility of error occurrence will be reduced to nil since absolute correctness is not entertained as an essential factor in developing writing competency. Accordingly, errors in process writing are not avoided and student-writers are not controlled to prevent them from making errors. The process approach to writing on the other hand, is bestowed structural correctness whether it is marked by (-) or (+) value detectors. As a conclusion, product based approach to writing is described as [-functional, -central, -affective, -nomothetic, -ideograph, +molar, -cyclic, +divergent, -general, +systematic, -unified, -error tolerance, +error focused]. On the other hand, the process approach to writing gloriously boasts the privilege of having being features designated as [+functional, +central, +affective, +nomothetic,

---

+ideograph, -molar, +cyclic, -divergent, +general, -systematic, +unified, +error tolerance, -error focused].

The features capitalized on so far in describing both approaches: process and product, can not be accounted for as commonly shared characteristics. Process and product do not possess similar or identical characteristics. They are in fact absolutely contrastive in properties, a case that makes bystanders believe that the concurrent integration of the two paradigms is almost impossible. Despite such hasty judgement, no efforts will be spared to let these two trends coherently meet complementing each other. Besides, the study attempts to help the writing teachers to complement economically each other and to assimilate integratively the whole writing dichotomy; thus, enabling themselves even to spot their stances in the domain of writing, whether they are affiliated to a product or a process genre.

In this way, the clan of writing teachers, on being enabled to systematically get process oriented, can, of course, willingly and enthusiastically commit themselves to a working hard for liberation. This strongly implies a departure from the demotivating, inhibiting shackles of product recommendations to the non-threatening, the uncritical and the non-defensive atmosphere of the unpredictably operated process. In this new atmosphere, student-writers can focus on creating a writing that has form and structures; the composing processes competent writers undergo i.e. the means rather the ends.

Process-wise student-writers who develop conducive awareness in the process particulars, being exposed to such

accurate, objective and contrastive canons can convincingly facilitate the historic shift to a genuine process focused classroom. In fact, a shift from language- focused activities to learner centered tasks in which student can admittedly assume greater control over what they write, how they write it, and the evaluation of their own writing is supposed to occur.

Accordingly, in tandem with a supportive and plausible body of inference, process approach to writing is justifiably in a position to recommend a purely humanistic, affective and cognitive treatment for the enigma of writing. This is expected to run academically in strict compliance and conformity with true human nature and the immediate demands dictated by the exigencies of the contemporary age, and even the long-term requirements and the great expectations of the recently inaugurated third millennium, as well.

## REFERENCES

---

---

Arndt, V. (1987) Six Writers in Search of Texts: A Protocol-based Study of L1 and L2 Writing. *ELT Journal*, 41:257-265.

Atwell, N. (1987) *In the Middle Writing, Reading and Learning with Adolescents*. Upper Motelair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Bosco, F. J. and Dipietro, R. J. (1970) Instructional Strategies: Their Psychological and Linguistic Bases. *IRAL*, 8:486-91.

Brannon, L. and Knoblauch, C. H. (1982) On Students' Rights to See Their Own Texts: A Model of Teacher Response. *College Composition and Communication*, 33:157-166.

- 
- Brown, D. (1987) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Calkin, L. M. (1983) *Lessons from a Child: On the Teaching and Learning of Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, Educational Books.
- Chaudron, C. (1987) Analysis of Products and Instructional Approaches in Writing: Two Articles on the State of the Art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21:673-675.
- Clouse, B. F. (1992) *The Student-Writer: Editor and Critic*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York.
- Connor, U. (1987) Research Frontiers in Writing Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21:677-715.
- Emig, J. A. (1971) *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. Urbana, ill: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Flower, L. and Hayes, J. R. (1981) A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32:365-387.
- Graves, D. H. (1973) *Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypothesis*. University of New York at Buffalo.
- Hairstone, M. (1982) The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in Teaching of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 3:76-88.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1986) No New Lamps For Old Yet, Please. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19:790-797.
- Krashen, S. and Seliger, H. (1975) The Essential Contribution of Formal Instruction in Adult Second Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9:173-83.
- Lyons, J. (1988) *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Man, R. C. and Man, P. M. (1990) *Essay Writing: Methods and Models*. Belmont, Ca.: Wardsworth Publishing Company.
- Marton, W. (1988) *Methods in English Language Teaching: Frameworks and Options*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Nunan, D. (1988) *The Learner-centered Curriculum: A Study in Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raimes, A. (1983) Tradition and Revolution in ESL Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17:535-552.
- Raimes, A. (1985) What Unskilled Writers Do as They Write: A Classroom Study of Composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19:299-258.
- Raimes, A. (1991) Out of the Wood: Emerging Traditions in Teaching of Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16:407-430.
- Reid, J. (1984) The Radical Outliner and the Radical Brainstormer. A Perspective on Composing Processes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18:529-33.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (1986) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1992) *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman Dictionaries.
- Rigg, P. (1991) Whole Language in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25: 520-542.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951) *Client-centered Therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961) *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Silva, T. (1990) Second Language Composition Instruction. In B.

---

Kroll (Ed) *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sommer, N. (1980) Revision Strategies of Student-Writers and Experienced Adult Writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31:378-388.

Stern, H. H. (1983) *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watson, C. B. (1982) The Use and Abuse of Models in ESL Writing Class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17:165-187.

White, R. V. (1988) Process and Product. In P. Robinson (Ed) Academic Writing. *ELT Document*, 129:4-16.

Zamel, V. (1982) Writing: The Process of Discovering. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16:195-209.

Zamel, V. (1983) The Composing Processes of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17:165-16.

Zamel, V. (1985) Responding to Student Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19:79-101.

Zemelman, S. and Daniel, H. (1988) *A Community of Writers: Teaching Writing in the Junior and Senior High School*. Heinemann: Portsmouth, NH.

**Ismail Baroudy, Ph. D.**  
**Department of English,**  
**College of Foreign Languages,**  
**Shahid Chamran University,**  
**Ahwaz, Iran.**  
[Ibaroudy2006@yahoo.com](mailto:Ibaroudy2006@yahoo.com)