

# LANGUAGING

A JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE TEACHING AND  
LANGUAGE STUDIES

Volume 3, October 2011

## Contents

	Page
1. Webquest with a twist: the application of Webquest in underdeveloped educational contexts ... <i>Tamas Kiss</i>	1
2. Understanding teacher cognition: implications for classroom practice and teacher learning ... <i>K Padmini Shankar</i>	17
3. Training Needs Analysis ... <i>Ajit Kumar P</i>	41
4. Under-representation of some rhetorical devices in writing descriptions by ESL learners ... <i>Lina Mukhopadhyay</i>	57
5. Teaching writing: what really happens after the training? ... <i>Ravinarayan Chakrakodi</i>	83
6. Facilitating ESL learners' awareness and comprehension of academic idioms: a study of low achievers ... <i>Rajakumar Guduru</i>	107

**TEACHING WRITING:  
WHAT REALLY HAPPENS AFTER THE TRAINING?**

**Ravinarayan Chakrakodi**

**Ravinarayan Chakrakodi** is a Lecturer at the Regional Institute of English South India, Bangalore. He has done his MA in TESOL, with distinction, from Lancaster University, UK. He is involved in pre- and in-service teacher education programmes, coursebook preparation, and materials production. His areas of interest are second language pedagogy, writing in English as a second language, testing and evaluation, and innovation in language education. He has presented papers at the IATEFL conference held in Cardiff in 2009 and in many UGC-sponsored seminars in India. He recently presented a paper titled 'Innovation in English Language Education: the Case of Karnataka' at the first international Teacher Educators conference organized by the British Council and EFL University in Hyderabad. He is currently doing his doctoral research on 'Portfolio assessment of writing skills'.

**e-mail:** [ravirie@gmail.com](mailto:ravirie@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Writing plays an important role in the social, professional, and academic contexts of our lives. We write for a wide variety of purposes and for a range of readers. However, producing an effective piece of writing is a difficult skill to acquire. We have to deal with many different elements such as content, syntax, grammar, mechanics, word choice, organization, and processes as we produce a piece of writing.

A variety of approaches to teaching writing have been developed based on the different views on how writing is learned and what elements need to be stressed in teaching writing (Raimes 1983: 6). Some approaches focus on the product of writing, some focus on the processes used to create texts, and others emphasize the social context of writing (Hyland 2002: 5).

This article seeks to explore the processes of writing as this has been a dominant paradigm in both L1 and L2 research contexts and pedagogy (Hyland 2002: 24). I look at the underlying principles and methods of process writing and elaborate on some of the classroom applications of this approach to teaching writing in an ESL context. I illustrate, with examples, how teachers implement process writing in their classrooms. Later, I turn to problems and difficulties that practising teachers encounter in applying theory to practice. Finally, I conclude with some suggestions and implications for teacher trainers and practising teachers.

## Teaching writing: what really happens after the training?

### 1. Introduction

The dominant approach that has been adopted recently in teaching second language writing is the process approach (Hyland 2003: 14). The process approach perceives writing as a 'non-linear, exploratory, and generative process whereby writers discover and reformulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning' (Zamel 1983 cited in Hyland 2003: 11). Hyland (2002: 24) reports that the process approach to writing is based on the theories and techniques of cognitive psychology and hence focuses on the cognitive aspects of writing. It views writing as a problem-solving activity. In such an approach, the writer's mental processes and higher-order thinking skills are of central importance (Johns 1990: 26).

Waters and Waters (1995: 90) observe that 'writing is first and foremost a *process*' (italics in original). They see the finished product as one of several stages involved in developing a text. The 'invisible' steps which come before the final result, according to Waters and Waters (ibid), hold the key to successful writing. White and Arndt (1991: 5) argue that though the main aim of the process approach is to arrive at the best product possible, the final product is not preconceived. They contend that writing in a process approach is divergent, with as many outcomes as there are writers.

The teacher's role is to guide students through the writing process, and while avoiding an emphasis on form, to help them develop strategies for generating, drafting, and refining ideas (Hyland 2003: 26). Thus, in a process-oriented class, the teacher has the following roles:

- (1) sets pre-writing activities to generate ideas about content and structure,
- (2) encourages brainstorming, outlining, and writing multiple drafts,
- (3) gives extensive feedback, seeks text level revisions, and
- (4) facilitates peer responses and delays surface corrections until the final editing.

Process writing, thus, helps the teacher to pay attention to individuals, which plays an important part in motivating learners. It also helps in carrying out

overt correction and explicit language teaching by way of the teacher providing feedback. Furthermore, Flower (1985 cited in Johns 1990: 26) argues that the teacher's goal in ESL writing classes is to produce good writers who will have a large repertoire of powerful strategies and will be aware of 'their own process to draw on these alternative techniques as they need them'. White and Arndt suggest that teachers should engage their students in the creative process of producing a text. They maintain that what is important is:

...to excite them [students] about how their texts are coming into being; to give them insights into how they operate as they create their work; to alter their concepts of what writing involves. What we have to get across is the notion that writing is *re-writing* [italics in original]; that *re-vision* ...has a central role to play in the act of creating a text, and is not merely a boring error-checking exercise; and above all, that evaluation is not just the province of the teacher alone at the final stage of the process, but it is equally the concern and responsibility of the writer at *every* [italics in original] stage. (1991: 5)

Hence, the teacher's role is to help students develop viable strategies for getting started, for drafting, for revising, and for editing (Silva 1990: 15). In this process, feedback is a vital component as it expands the opportunities for revisiting and revising each piece of writing.

Teachers need to be trained adequately in the process writing approach, otherwise they may not be able to help students in developing the strategies and skills required for producing an effective text. Hamp-Lyons (2006: 156) underscores the importance of teacher training by arguing that a thorough grounding in process writing principles and practice is crucial in an in-service teacher development programme. The section that follows shows how in-service teachers are trained in the process approach to teaching writing.

## 2. Process writing in the teacher training context

The in-service teachers who attend teacher development programmes at the Regional Institute of English South India, Bangalore are trained in process writing. Process writing is part of the writing component of the teacher development curriculum. The aims of teaching writing to the in-service teachers are two-fold: (i) enhancing their own writing proficiency and (ii) developing an awareness of process writing by training them in the process writing methodology. The following are some of the tasks used to teach process writing skills to the teacher participants:

- Introducing the co-participant
- Writing a report
- Reviewing a book/film
- Writing a letter to the editor of a newspaper
- Writing an advertisement

In the following discussion, I focus on one of these tasks and analyse the texts developed by a single primary school teacher participant to show how the process writing methodology was followed in the teacher training context. The task given to the teacher participant, as shown in Appendix 1, was to introduce her co-participant.

The teacher collected information about the co-participant by asking questions and discussing some personal details with him. Once the ideas were generated, she selected the most useful ones related to the topic and arranged them in sequence as shown in Figure 2.1 below:

Name Umesh K. Kar  
 Edu. M.A. Eco  
 Prof - LPS - 7.9 yrs  
 Family - 2 children, wife - teacher  
 hobbies playing volley ball, cricket, cricket  
 like moral qualities  
 dislike casteism  
 book Gandhi & Gandhivad  
 ambition education to children

Figure 2.1 Structuring ideas

Task 1

First draft

Mr. Umesh R is the gentleman I have been introduced to. He is a primary school teacher serving from Jaisalmer, Jaisalmer. His hobbies are playing volleyball and chat chatting with strangers. He is not in Economics. He likes moral qualities and dislikes casteism. He has a sweet family. His wife is also a teacher. He has a girl baby and his ambition is to give them good education. His favourite person is S. Bose, book Gandhi & Gandhi

- D As you have written in well manner  
 9 Some ~~of~~ points have been deleted.

Figure 2.2 First draft with peer feedback

The activities described thus far – discussing, focusing, and structuring – may be called ‘pre-writing’ although they are part of the writing process. The writer moved from the ‘pre-writing stage’ to actually writing the first draft by developing the ideas further. What we understand from Figure 2.2 is that peer evaluation has been carried out. The teacher worked with a partner, and got her to read what she had drafted. The partner made a positive remark on the draft and commented that some points had been deleted. This is in line with the process approach as the focus in the initial draft is on content and meaning, not on grammar and other aspects of language.

The second draft as shown in Figure 2.3 is an improved version of the first draft. We see that the trainer has responded to the teacher's ideas and their organization as well as the errors in grammar and the mechanics of writing. This has helped the writer draw attention to feedback on various aspects of her writing. Figure 2.3 also suggests that the trainer has used a set of symbols for drawing attention to grammatical features, such as 'P' for error in punctuation and 'WW' for wrong word.

It is my pleasure to introduce my friend, Mr. Umesh R, a primary school teacher serving in Hassan. He is M.A. in Economics. His hobbies are playing volleyball and chatting with strangers. He likes moral qualities and dislikes cartoon. His favourite person is Mr. Subhashandra Bhoore and his book Mr. Ambedkar's "Gandhi and Gandhivad".

He has a small family with two girl-babies. His ambition is to give them good education and build a building.

P.T.O.

His wife who is also a teacher helps him in all matters. In my opinion he is a gentle man with moral ambition.

Thank you

All the relevant details are there may be the family members can be mentioned first and then his hobbies & other things.

What exactly do you mean?

Figure 2.3 Second draft with comments from the trainer



Figure 2.4 suggests that the final step of editing involved in process writing is carried out by the writer herself. She has rearranged ideas as well as paid attention to surface details of grammatical accuracy and correctness of form. Comparing the first and the second drafts to the third draft, we can clearly see that the writer has worked hard on the content and detail in her text.

Ms Savita  
Final draft

Writing Task -1

It is my pleasure to introduce my friend, Mr Umesh R, a primary school teacher serving from nine years in Hassan. He has a small family with two girl-babies. His ambition is to give them good education. He also wants to build a house. His wife who is also a primary school teacher helps him in all matters.

To say more about him, he is a M.A in Economics. His hobbies are playing volleyball and chat-chating with strangers. He likes moral qualities and dislikes cartoon. His favourite person is S.C. Bose because he laid down his life for Indians. His favourite book is Dr B.R. Ambedkar's "Gandhi and Gandhism." He likes this book because in this Dr Ambedkar explains the social hierarchy and how the lower class people are suppressed by upper class. In my opinion, he stands for moral qualities.

Figure 2.4 Third and final draft

The final draft was assessed by the trainer for 20 marks. As a part of the process writing, the teacher had to write reflections (Figure 2.5) based on the guiding questions provided by the trainer, as shown in Appendix 2. Though writing reflections is not identified as a necessary step in process writing by researchers and scholars, it is, in my view, essential in a training context. Recording reflections helps teachers look back at their own experiences as writers as well as understand the principles and concepts of the process approach as teachers.

1. yes, I discussed the task with other participants in pairs. It helped me to know my friend's name, address, about his profession, family and friends. It also helped me to know about his more personal life i.e. his likes and dislikes, his ambition in life and his achievements too.
2. I utilized dictionary to check the spellings of favourite and gentle.
3. When I showed my first draft to my friend, he suggested me to add some more points like his ambition and his favourite book.
4. The teacher asked me to organize the matter still in better way. He also asked me to find out the reasons for my why do my friend like S.C. Bose.
5. I added some more points e.g. his ambition, favourite book and person. And as per my teacher's suggestion, I reorganized the matter and also found out reason for my friend's liking S.C. Bose.
6. I feel more confident about using English now.

Figure 2.5 Reflections recorded

From the data gathered and analysed thus far, we can arrive at a sequence of stages the trainer has followed in the training classroom, which may be shown as follows:

Discussion (pair)

Asking questions/making notes

Selecting ideas/establishing a viewpoint

Arranging information/structuring the text

First draft

Peer evaluation and response

Second draft

Self-evaluation/editing/proofreading

Final draft

Final response to draft

One of the virtues of process writing, as White and Arndt (1991: 124) identify, is that the writer tries to express her/his thoughts more clearly and appropriately and, as a result, the language of the final product as well as its overall coherence and effectiveness improves. The text we have discussed thus far provides some evidence of this. Furthermore, the reflections shown in Figure 2.5 demonstrate that the writer has benefitted from the process.

If we analyse the task itself, it is partly communicative in nature as there is an information gap and a meaningful purpose. The text developed by the teacher helps the trainer understand the background, the interests, etc. of the co-participant. However, there is no real audience to read the text except the trainer himself. Hence, the scope for considering ways of a good beginning to attract the attention of the audience and a good ending to give a sense of completion is limited in this task.

In the section that follows we will see how the ideas of process writing translate into practice in an ESL classroom.

### 3. Process writing in an ESL classroom

In this section, I look at texts developed by a single student. She is an average student studying in grade X (age: 14-15 years) in a government school. Before moving to a discussion of the texts developed by the student, I should state that the teacher who taught process writing to this student was not the one we looked at in section 1. This teacher is typical of a majority of government school teachers working in an ESL context. She has completed a pre-service course in education and has also done an in-service training programme. She has not specialised in teaching English and hence, has very limited proficiency in English. However, she was trained in the process writing approach at the Regional Institute of English South India, Bangalore. She included the following tasks to teach process writing skills to her students:

- Developing hints into an outline
- Writing a parallel paragraph
- Filling up forms
- Picture composition
- Writing a personal letter (clues given)

In this paper, I focus on one of the tasks and discuss how the teacher implemented the process writing methodology in the classroom. The teacher gave the student the writing task as shown in Appendix 3, i.e. developing the hints provided into paragraphs. The student was asked to expand the given outline. The student wrote the first draft developing the hints into paragraphs as shown in Figure 3.1. This draft was evaluated by the teacher. There was no peer evaluation of the first draft. It is clear from Figure 3.1 that the feedback was given only on the linguistic aspects of the text. The teacher did not make any comments on the content, organization, vocabulary, and style. Though the student included a title and expressed the moral of the story, the teacher's focus seemed to be on the linguistic aspects of the text.

The Greedy King

once there was <sup>a king</sup> ~~asking~~ his name was Midas. He was rich but very miserly. The king wanted more gold.

One day while Midas was sitting and counting the gold ~~win's~~ a fairy appeared before him. The fairy said that she would grant him a boon of his choice. So, the king asked her for a golden touch. The fairy granted him the boon. Immediately Midas touched many things. At once they all turned gold. So the king was very happy.

Soon he got hungry. When he touched the bread, meat, fruit and water, they all became gold. So he could not eat anything. He was very unhappy. The king was starving for many days. He was worried very much. So Midas prayed to the fairy to take back of the boon of golden touch. The fairy fulfilled his desire. There after the king was very happy.

Moral: Grasp all, lose all

Avoid mistakes,

Figure 3.1 First draft with comments from the teacher

Appendix 4 indicates that the student did not make any changes in the second draft. The second draft was the same as the first draft. This is an indication of the lack of adequate linguistic competence on the part of the student.

Figure 3.1, Appendix 4, and Figure 3.2 clearly suggest that the drafts were read and assessed only by the teacher. We also understand that the teacher was responding to the text as an evaluator, and not as a reader. The teacher was more concerned with the linguistic or formal features of the text, rather than the meaning and the purpose of the text. Also, the feedback given such as 'Avoid mistakes', 'Better than 2 drafts' are general rather than focused. Hence, we do not see much overall improvement and there are no instances of specific changes such as the enrichment of content or correction of grammatical errors in the drafts. The drafts have not been revised. All these observations seem to suggest that the student's lack of competence in writing results not only from a lack of competence in composing a draft but also from a lack of linguistic competence.

The Greedy King

once there was a king, his name was Midas. He was rich but very miserly. The king wanted more gold.

One day while Midas sitting and counting the gold coins, a fairy appeared before him. The fairy said that she would grant him a boon of his choice. So the king asked her for a golden touch. The fairy granted him the boon. Immediately Midas touched many things. At once they all turned gold. So the king was very happy.

Soon he got hungry. when he touched the bread, meat, fruit and water, they all became gold. So he could not eat anything. He was very unhappy. The king was starving for many days. He was worried very much. So Midas prayed to the fairy to take back the boon of gold touch. The fairy full filled his desire. There after the king was very happy.

Moral: Grasp all lose all.

Better than 2 drafts

Figure 3.2 Third and final draft

The sequence of activities carried out in the classroom may be indicated as given below:

Providing hints/giving a model  
 First draft  
 Teacher evaluation  
 Second draft  
 Teacher evaluation  
 Final draft  
 Final response to draft

It is clear from these activities that the student has not used the various strategies involved in process writing. There may be two possible reasons for this: firstly, the student's lack of competence in composing a draft as well as poor linguistic competence, and secondly, the problematic nature of the task itself. As the student did not correct the errors in spelling and punctuation and did not show any improvement from draft one to draft three, we could argue that she lacks competence in language as well as the composing process. Furthermore, the task does not lend itself to using all the process writing techniques. The guided composition task is obviously product-oriented as content is given and the student does not need to generate her own ideas. In addition, the purpose of the task and the potential reader of the student's text are not made clear. In fact, most of the tasks selected for teaching process writing focus on the finished product. Though the teacher claimed to follow the process approach to teach writing, the class was essentially a product-oriented one.

The data from the training context and the ESL classroom reveal that understanding the principles and concepts of process writing is as complex as implementing them in the classroom. Also, some of the findings from the data we have gathered and analyzed thus far may be summarized as follows:

- (i) process writing helped the teacher participant to develop her own writing competence,
- (ii) the final drafts produced by the teacher participant as well as the student were not error-free,
- (iii) the teacher's feedback on the student's writing concentrated on form at the expense of content and style,

- (iv) the task used was not suitable for teaching process writing, and
- (v) the L2 student was doubly disadvantaged as she lacked both composing competence and linguistic competence.

The section that follows focuses on these issues and discusses them in detail.

#### 4. Problems and issues

Hamp-Lyons makes an important observation regarding process writing:

...[S]tudies in many contexts – I am most familiar with the United States and Hong Kong – have shown that the concept of process writing often becomes sadly distorted and diluted when inadequately introduced to teachers in training and when used in hostile educational environments.

(2006: 142)

This is most true in the cases we have discussed in this paper. We understand that the teacher who has taught process writing to the grade X learner has not developed a strong sense of the meaning of process writing. As a result, process writing has not provided any opportunities for the student to revise her work. Moreover, the final draft is not free from errors. For example, mistakes in spelling such as 'setting', 'straving', 'full filled' and some punctuation errors (Figure 3.2) still persist in the final text. This is equally true in the case of the teacher participant where the final draft is not error-free [e.g. spelling mistakes such as 'hirarchy', 'chating' (Figure 2.4)]. The possible reasons for this situation may be: (i) the writer's inability to identify his/her own mistakes as in the teacher's case or (ii) a failure on the part of the writer to edit and proofread the final text adequately as in the case of the student. Hence, we cannot be certain that process writing helps in producing a fluent, accurate, and effective text.

Also, the goal of the process writing approach – 'to nurture the skills with which writers *work out their own solutions to the problems they set themselves*' (italics in original) – as claimed by White and Arndt (1991: 5) may not be realized in the ESL classroom. The second language classroom is, in many ways, different from the first language classroom, as discussed later in this section. We need to understand that L2 teaching and learning contexts are not the same as those of L1 and hence, as Krapels (1990: 39) observes, L1 research studies should not guide and determine investigations of second language writing processes.



It is interesting to observe that even within LI studies, researchers and scholars have identified problems in applying the theory of process writing to novice and unskilled writers. As Caudery (1997: 5) reports, the theory of process writing in the L1 context originated based on the way in which most 'expert' writers write and this idea was straightaway applied to novice writers. However, as Hyland (2003: 12) suggests, there are differences in the way in which skilled writers and novice writers approach a writing task. Novice writers 'plan less than experts, revise less often and less extensively, have limited goals, and are mainly concerned with generating content' (ibid). On account of these factors, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987 cited in Hyland 2003: 11) have argued that we need at least two process models, namely, knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming models, to account for the differences in processing complexity of skilled and novice writers. In a knowledge-telling model that applies to novice writers, '[the] main goal is simply to tell what they can remember based on the assignment, the topic, or the genre' (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1987 cited in Hyland 2002: 28). On the other hand, a knowledge-transforming model, as applied to skilled writers, 'involves actively reworking thoughts so that in the process not only text, but also ideas, may be changed' (ibid).

As far as L2 contexts are concerned, we need to consider specific problems that L2 students have with writing, which may be either connected with writing skills or language or both (Caudery 1997:18). Although some research studies (Zamel 1982; Jones 1982; Jacobs 1982) have found similarities between the writing behaviours of L2 and L1 writers, a study conducted by Raimes (1985, 1987 cited in Krapels 1990) pointed out differences between them. She also observed that L2 writers represented a variety of types, backgrounds, and needs. Campbell (1990: 224) also found some differences in the academic writing of L1 and L2 students. Furthermore, Silva (1993: 669) notes that 'L2 writing is strategically, rhetorically, and linguistically different in important ways from L1 writing.' He suggests that we need to consider:

- different linguistic proficiencies and intuitions about language
- different learning experiences and classroom expectations
- different sense of audience and writer
- different preferences for ways of organizing texts

- different writing processes
- different understanding of text uses and the social value of different text types.

Hence, we cannot simply transfer L1 teaching techniques to the L2 classroom. Raimes (1987 cited in Krapels 1990: 44) rightly suggests the adaptation rather than the wholesale adoption of L1 writing instruction.

Further, there are a few more issues that we need to take into account before implementing the process approach to teaching writing. First, let us consider the issue of language proficiency of L2 writers. L2 students may lack adequate linguistic competence to engage in the composing process. They may not be able to generate ideas, carry out peer evaluation, and edit their own texts without sufficient knowledge of vocabulary, syntax, grammar, and the mechanics of writing. Also, the idea of planning, focusing, reviewing, etc. may be completely new to them as the possibility of using these strategies in writing in L1 is remote in an ESL context. Hyland (2003: 34) has rightly observed that second language writers have difficulty in adequately expressing themselves in English. The most obvious difficulties are linguistic ones, particularly an inadequate grasp of vocabulary or grammar. Hyland points out some of the research findings (Silva 1993, 1997; Krapels 1990; Leki 1992) with regard to the differences in the writing processes of L1 and L2 writers. He summarizes these findings as follows:

- L1 writing strategies may or may not be transferred to L2 contexts
- L2 writers tend to plan less than L1 writers and produce shorter texts
- L2 writers have more difficulty setting goals and generating material
- L2 writers revise more but reflect less on their writing
- L2 writers are less fluent, and produce less accurate and effective texts
- L2 writers are less inhibited by teacher-editing and feedback, and
- Advanced L2 writers are handicapped more by a lack of composing competence than a lack of linguistic competence. The opposite is true for lower proficiency learners. (2003: 36)

Hence, writing teachers are faced with the dual task of developing language competence as well as developing composing competence among L2 students. Consequently, teaching procedures need to combine ideas from different approaches to meet the specific needs of L2 learners.

Second, there is the issue of designing tasks to develop process writing skills. White and Arndt (1997: 6) claim that the different operations, namely, generating, focusing, structuring, drafting, evaluating and re-viewing apply to the creation of any piece of writing, irrespective of text-type or subject matter. On the other hand, as we have seen in section 3, not all tasks lend themselves to following the various stages and using the different strategies involved in process writing. For example, leaving a note or writing a set of instructions, and controlled and guided writing tasks may not call for all the processes involved in process writing. However, teachers may need to administer such tasks in the classroom as these tasks may be included in the syllabus that is thrust on the teachers. In fact, a cursory look at the state syllabus reveals that some tasks focus on the product aiming at enhancing the language competence of the learner, some on the processes, and a few tasks are genre-based which take the social context into consideration. Hence, following the process methodology for all types of tasks may not be a wise decision for a teacher to take.

Third, as Harmer (2004: 4) notes, the process of writing may be affected by the content of writing, the type of writing, and the medium it is written in. For example, a writer may choose computer word files or live chat instead of pen and paper in which case he/she may not go through all the stages involved in process writing in order to produce something in its final written form. Also, how much attention a writer pays to the different stages of the process (and to recursion in the process) depends, to a great extent, on who he/she is writing to and for what purpose. To illustrate, if a person is writing a postcard to a friend greeting him/her on New Year, the writer may plan, draft, and edit very quickly in his/her head as he/she writes.

Finally, process writing is time-consuming. During an academic year, as students are required to do a number of writing tasks prescribed in the writing syllabus, working intensively on each task will take up too much time. Teachers may not be able to cover the syllabus. They may not get enough time to pursue the course of action involved in process writing. Moreover, students might find it frustrating to engage in all the processes when composing simple, short texts such as a guided composition or a postcard. Also, the practical difficulties

involved in giving feedback to pieces of writing in the context of ESL teaching where there are 50-60 students in a class need to be addressed. Responding to each individual's drafts, focusing on content and other textual features, may be time-consuming and much too difficult for teachers.

### 5. Conclusion

I have described some of the main theoretical principles and concepts involved in the teaching of writing with special reference to process writing. I have related these principles and concepts to ESL training and teaching contexts. Using a case study approach, I have analysed multiple texts created by a single teacher and a single student. Hence, it is difficult to generalize from the findings based on the limited data. Similar studies may be carried out in future drawing on large samples of data from teaching as well as training contexts. Also, as many L2 process writing research studies (Jacobs 1982; Raimes 1985; Cumming 1987 cited in Krapels 1990) involving college and university-level students have shown, there is a need to study the effects of process writing on secondary and lower grade learners.

This paper highlights the importance of training teachers in the process writing approach. A thorough grounding in the principles and practice of the approach is crucial in an in-service teacher development programme. Although training teachers in the pedagogical concepts of process writing is necessary, it is not a sufficient condition if process writing has to see the light of day in the classroom. Teacher training in process writing should have two dimensions: training teachers in the theories and principles of the process approach to teaching writing as well as developing their own writing abilities. This is crucial as the teacher's own language competence may act as a constraint on implementing the process approach in the classroom.

Learners can and do benefit in many ways from process writing but they need to make a strong sense of the meaning of process writing. They need to acquire the skills involved in planning and drafting a text and also knowledge of language, contexts, and audiences. An effective methodology for teaching L2 writing should incorporate not only the processes and contexts of text creation but also the purposes of writing and effective ways of expressing these through appropriate linguistic forms. Hence, it may not be a good idea to devote ourselves to any one approach at the expense of others. We need to draw techniques from various approaches as and when the context and the students concerned need them.

## References

- Badger, R. and G. White. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*. 54 (2): 153-160.
- Caudery, T. 1997. 'Process Writing'. In Fulcher, G (ed). *Writing in the English Language Classroom*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall Europe ELT. 3-23.
- Cumming, A. 1987. Decision making and text representation in ESL writing performance. Paper presented at the 21<sup>st</sup> Annual TESOL Convention, Miami, April.
- Flower, L. 1985. *Problem-solving strategies for writing* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. 2006. 'Feedback in portfolio-based writing courses'. In K. Hyland, and F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 140-161.
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to teach writing*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hedge, T. 2005. *Writing* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.). A. Maley (Series ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. 2003. *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, S. 1982. *Composing and coherence: The writing of eleven pre-medical students*. *Linguistics and Literacy Series: 3*. Washington, D. C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Johns, A. M. 1990. 'L1 composition theories: implications for developing theories of L2 Composition'. In Kroll, B (ed). *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 24-36.
- Jones, S. 1982. 'Attention to rhetorical form while composing in a second language'. In C. Campbell, V. Flashner, T. Hudson, and J. Lubin (Eds.). *Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*, Vol. 2: 130-143. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles.
- Krapels, A. R. 1990. 'An overview of second language writing process research'. In B. Kroll (ed.). *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 37-56.
- Leki, I. 1998. *Academic Writing: Exploring Processes and Strategies* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Raimes, A. 1979. 'Problems and teaching strategies in ESL composition'. *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*, 14. Arlington, Va.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva, T. 1990. 'Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL'. In B. Kroll (ed). *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 11-23.
- Silva, T. 1993. 'Toward an Understanding of the Distinct Nature of L2 Writing: The ESL Research and Its Implications'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 27 (4): 657-673.
- Water M. and A. Waters. 1995. *Study Tasks in English: Student's Book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White and V. Arndt. 1991. *Process Writing*. London: Longman.
- Zamel, V. 1976. 'Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 10: 67-76.
- Zamel, V. 1983. 'The composing processes of advanced ESL students: six case studies'. *TESOL Quarterly*. 17: 165-87.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Writing task: Introducing the co-participant



*Regional Institute of English, South India*  
*Jnanabharathi Campus, Bangalore-560 056*

#### Primary Teacher Development - Course 5

#### Writing Task -1

Introduce your co-learner by giving details such as:

- ☛ Name, address, place of work
- ☛ Family / friends
- ☛ Likes / dislikes (with reasons)
- ☛ Favourite person / book / place (reasons)
- ☛ Strengths
- ☛ Achievements
- ☛ Ambition in life



(Write a description in 100 - 120 words.)

### Appendix 2: Guidelines for writing reflections

#### Reflection Sheet - 1

1. Did you discuss the task (topic, theme, etc) with other participants - in pairs, small groups or the whole class? Did it help you? How?
2. Did you utilize other resources like dictionary, reference books, newspapers, etc? If so, for what purpose?
3. Did you show your first draft to the others? What was their reaction (for example have they commented on content, made suggestions for revision / rewriting or corrected errors)?
4. How did the teacher(s) respond to your writing?
5. What modifications / changes did you make to your first draft?
6. Do you feel more confident about using English now? Or are you still shy? What makes you feel so?

## Appendix 3: Writing task: expanding an outline

V. Pavithra  
8<sup>th</sup> 'D'

Develop the following hints

King Midas - very rich but very miserly -  
wants more gold - one day sits counting  
his gold - a fairy appears - says - she  
will grant him a boon - Midas asks - the  
golden touch - boon granted - Midas touch  
as many things - turn gold - very happy - gets  
hungry - goes to eat - bread, meat, fruit,  
water - all become gold at his touch - Midas  
strawing - prays to fairy - take back boon  
of golden touch.



## Appendix 4: Second draft

V. P. R. S. S.  
3<sup>rd</sup> D.

## The Greedy King.

Once there was a king, his name was Midas. He was rich but very miserly. The king wanted more gold.

One day while Midas was sitting and counting the gold coins, a fairy appeared before him. The fairy said that she would grant him a boon of his choice. So, the king asked her for a golden touch. The fairy granted him the boon. Immediately Midas touched many things. At once they all turned <sup>into</sup> gold. So the king was very happy.

Soon he got hungry when he touched the bread, meat, fruit and water they all become gold. So he could not eat anything. He was very unhappy. The king was starving for many days. He was worried very much. So Midas prayed to the fairy to take back of the boon of gold touch. The fairy fulfilled his desire. There after the king was very happy.

Moral: Grasp all, lose all.