

The Implementation of Process writing: Writing-teacher roles

Ismail Baroudy, Shahid Chamran University, Iran

L1 or L2 writing classrooms are regretfully reported to have been undergoing a frustrating experience in developing student-writers' abilities. This is basically due to the fact that a historic paradigm shift; as that of from product to process writing, has not yet practically occurred in L1/L2 writing pedagogy. In fact, a depressing case as such is readily recognized to be stemming from writing teachers deprived of systematic orientations with the design of such an innovative trend. Writing teachers, to actualize their prospective expectations in this regard, are distinguished to urgently require rich and full acquaintance with process teachers' labeled roles. This study is accordingly conducted to help writing teachers comprehensively conceive and smoothly emulate the indexed roles justifiably allocated for process writing teachers to actualize in the act of teaching writing. Consequently, the teaching/learning writing contexts are expected to successfully celebrate witnessing process oriented teachers sincerely abiding by their process roles and enthusiastically implementing genuine process procedures; thus helping their student-writers to eventually undergo experiencing the skill of writing as a meaning making event.

Keywords: Process Writing; Teacher roles; Writing Roles; EFL Composition; Language Teaching; Teacher Education.

1. Introduction

A paradigm shift in the writing pedagogy is reported to have been recently brought the process theory of writing which capitalizes on successful writing behaviours into bold focus. Writing then is gradually identified as nothing but a process of concurrently thinking and composing, creating and revising. This, in effect, has changed the tone and sphere of first/second language writing arenas.

Formerly, writing teachers were mostly concerned with the final product. Compositions were stipulated to strictly observe accurate grammar, rhetorical patterns, and traditional organization. On the whole, student-writers were encouraged in vain to honestly emulate copying a typical model of writing.

Admittedly, to facilitate a paradigm shift to occur in first/second language writing classrooms, teachers as well as student-writers are intimately invited to intelligently join this newly emerged community of writers. To this effect,

process writing is to be comprehensively described, analyzed and compared at the levels of approach, design and procedure.

Unfortunately, writing classrooms whether of L1 or L2 scheme have not yet been pedagogically exposed to a revolution brought about by the writing tenets of such an innovative movement. This is due to the fact that process writing has not been introduced to its true is still not explicit to audiences at the level of approach, design and procedure. Particularly, innovative schemes need to be treated analytically at the level of design, a level at which an approach can lead to a method and the use of certain teaching activities; as a consequence, theoretical assumptions about language and learning, are advocated. It is, in fact, at this level that learner's role, teacher's role and the role of instructional activities are specifically pinpointed and attended to (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 29)

The researcher in this study, accordingly, aims at elaborating on writing teachers' role nucleated in the design of the process approach to writing. Writing teachers, on having their awareness about their labeled process roles adequately promoted, will functionally enable their student-writers to have their ideas realized, their analysis accomplished and their self actualized in the act of writing. Obviously, the findings of an explorative effort as such, will admittedly encourage writing teachers to decisively and non-skeptically embark on a pedagogical exodus despite the vagaries of writing, shifting them smoothly away from product writing to the process paradigm presently seen in vogue.

The present study, accordingly, aims at elaborating on writing teachers' role embedded in the design of the process approach to writing. Writing teachers as well as student-writers, on having them openly oriented and accessed with labeled process roles, will eventually experience the skill of writing and thus have their own ideas practically realized, their analysis accomplished and their self actualized in the act of writing. Obviously, an explorative effort as such will indispensably enable the writing teachers to introduce their student-writers to the roles specifically allocated to be adopted in process writing. This is justifiably expected to intrinsically motivate them to knowingly submit themselves to an inevitable exodus, despite the vagaries of writing, successfully shifting them from the impediments of product writing to the open-endedness of process writing pedagogy currently in vogue.

2. Process writing: Writing-teacher roles

Teachers of ESL, and EFL, writing are often heard claiming formally introducing themselves as language teachers rather than writing teachers" (Zamel, 1985, p. 86), but the reverse might also be possible. The emphasis in fact in most writing research literature has been on "psychological and social

strategies or processes in extended writing, with some consideration of discourse, rhetoric and genre models, but with virtually no consideration of language input and input processing” (Bruton, 2005, p. 15).

But a set of specifications, on having them justifiably extracted from a particular theory of the nature of second language learning, can be inquisitively traced in almost all methods and approaches. This elaborates on how process writing procedural techniques can be readily transferred to be stealthily and effortlessly acquired by student-writers. Unsurprisingly, differences in the instructional specifications reflect implying differences in the theories underlying the methods or approaches of second language teaching and learning. Multiple possibilities can be arranged to have teachers’ role within the process framework explicitly projected for functional absorption. Of course, the specifications of such roles can comprehensively acquaint the student-writers with a set of instructions to which they need to cooperatively respond. Student-writers as ‘unbenched learners’ (Richards and Rodgers, 1988, pp. 100-1) can hone their roles indirectly deriving them from the teachers’ systematic classroom instructional behaviours.

The roles specifically allocated for teachers to comply with in directing their second language classrooms can be attentively inspected to infer extrapolating plausible roles which may be analogically assigned to be undertaken by process writing teachers. Communicative Language Teaching, The Silent Way, Community Language Learning and The Natural Approach are seen to transparently mirror reflecting within their designs process writing teachers’ role commitments.

All these methods can be gloriously decorated with humanistic label indiscriminately. They view the person at the center of things. They primarily consider the learner and secondarily try to fully observe what is supposed to be learnt. In these person-centered methods and approaches learners are treated as intelligent, sensitive, knowledgeable and experienced beings who are functionally accompanied with a resourceful bio-data which can be found overwhelmingly useful as undergoing the learning process. Teachers who are biased towards the pedagogical implications of such a tendency abide, in consensus, by a set of humanistic principles, documented to have been specifically proposed by Brookes and Grundy (1990, p. 10). These instructional proposals can be worked out to stipulate some of the roles, which can be authentically allotted to process-writing teachers. In process classrooms, the teachers in compliance with their ultimate goal of enabling the student-writers to perform their task diligently try to:

- promote freedom to express self.

- recognize the learner as a resource.
- assure learner freedom from authority.
- value self-expression as intelligent.
- recognize centrality of personal discovery.
- respect individual learning styles.

2.1. Communicative Language Teaching

These roles confidently reflect and illustrate how process student-writers involved in the making of meaning behave within the dimensions of a communicative scheme prospectus. Process writing teachers' roles are well defined and represented in diverse varieties of Communicative Language Teaching Programs. Teachers socializing student-writers into process writing behaviours are accordingly described as facilitators capacitating their student-writers to communicatively express themselves in writing, and to do so, they cooperatively behave with other participants in the classrooms. For instance, when teachers allow student-writers to select their own topics, and since "the process approach extols individual creativity, individual growth and self-realization, thus the teacher's role is that of a 'facilitator' rather than a 'director'" (Bamforth, 1993, p. 94). In the similar vein, Tobin (2001) stresses the point that process-oriented teachers argue for student choice of topics and forms: the necessity of authentic voice; writing as a messy, organic, recursive form of discovery, growth, and personal expression.

The concept of teacher as mere instructor is rendered inadequate to depict a process writing teacher's overall descriptive functions. In a broad sense, he/she is a facilitator of learning to write and may need to perform in a variety of ways, individually or collectively. Writing teachers are also expected to appear as independent participants in the midst of their writing community circle. These two roles, as a facilitator of learning and as an autonomous participant, cause the process writing teacher to be intimately oriented with more constructive functional roles. Having been typically paralleled with teachers advocating the Communicative Approach, process writing teachers are known to act as facilitators of their own student-writers' functional-notional skill acquisition. They act as advisors globally responding to student-writers' curious questions, act as co-communicators and engage themselves in the communicative activity along with the students (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 131).

2.2. The Silent Way

The Silent Way hides nucleated within itself learning principles consistently matching up with what process writing strongly advocates. Bruner (1966) introduces two traditions of teaching. The first is the 'expository mode' under

which pace and styles are determined by teachers as expositors. The second tradition is known as the 'hypothetical mode' based on which teachers and students cooperatively and collaboratively attend to learning requirements. Needless to say, process-writing teachers are seen to abide by the hypothetical mode which inherently treats writing as a creative and problem - solving activity. Process writing teachers supervise student-writers who are not 'bench-bound' (Richards and Rodgers, 1986) attendants, but salient actors involved in discovery learning, aiming at increasing their intellectual potency, adopting an intrinsic attitude to experience their heuristic trials, and efficiently promoting their memory load as well as smooth systematic retrieval (Bruner, 1966, p. 83).

Process writing teachers are not required to submit themselves to their classical commitments: to model, remodel, assist and direct desired student-writer responses to learning, but this outlook does not deny teachers' crucial role in critically attending to student-writers' process of learning. In fact process writing teachers are required to re-examine and reassess their attitudes and values about the roles they embark on in training student-writers to develop relevant process writing behaviours. Writing teachers in complying with process principles behave as instructors, as observers and as non-detering or intervening attendants. They give their job description a unique, unrehearsed tone and turn. As process writing teachers, they immerse their student-writers in cooperative-collaborative, group sponsored, peer centered, community oriented activities whereby they try to intentionally keep out of the way letting the creeping-crawling skill mature and develop uncritically and non-defensively in a non-threatening but an encouraging environment. In many cases, there is a further assumption that collaborative peer interaction and student independence should be phased in to replace more teacher-fronted interaction and caretaker dependence (Bruton, 2002). As observers, they non-verbally elicit and shape student-writers text production. Most of the time, they take up a neutral, unbiased mode neither privileged by non-erroneous performance or dispirited by mal-performance. Teachers as non-existent or back-stage participant invisibly monitor student-writers interactions with each other in absentia. They happen to quit their classrooms leaving their student-writers behind free -willed to plausibly struggle with themselves managing their own experimental personal endeavors, to create their own knowledge, to make their own meaning in the real, world.

Process writing teachers perform their roles in the absence of a well-defined, preconceived and strictly prescribed teachers' manual. They themselves are to devise their own self made syllabus collocated with process assignments, accompanied with description, ordered in sequential hierarchy and rationed

covering phases or units to be individually or collectively served and manifested within the structural foundation of a writing workshop. The predicament in the process writing curriculum resides with teachers being held responsible for formulating and constructing aid-saturated atmosphere. Student-writers, in such circumstances, are encouragingly spurred to take risks, to adopt adventurous academic personality, to vicariously roam outdoors beyond to the level of competence. Besides, they are expected to fearlessly embark on extemporaneous writing assignments, to streamline their learning styles and strategies, and to adapt themselves to the uncertainties of unexpected products inherently penetrating the true nature of writing.

2.3. Community Language Learning

Process-writing teacher' roles can be explicitly found dissolved not only in the major characteristics but also in the finer minor details of a humanistic oriented approach to language teaching popularized as Community Language Learning. In view of this, process writing teachers role is then seen to fulfill the commitments of a counselor who skillfully understand and supports their student-writers in their cognitive struggle to master the dynamics of process-writing behaviours. This does not imply that these may occur in the absence of teaching. On the contrary, on having recognized how the new process writing experimental involvement can be hazardous to vulnerable novice practitioners, process-writing trainers' meaningfully punctuated task interventions affectively deactivate the unwelcome adverse outcomes. Process-writing teachers are presumably expected to create that kind of writing environment in which student-writers by undergoing gradual inter-hierarchical stages shift from dependency to independency; from total dependence and helplessness to reasonable independence and self assurance, from struggle and confusion to stability and self-reliance.

Community Language Learning model of language education can be extended over to adequately blanket the process-writing enterprise. What this model, if inquisitively detected, emphasizes, is nothing but the facilitation of writing by process to be efficiently realized by some members interacting by the privilege of an interpersonal relationship. Based on such a type of contact, student-writers and instructors come close together collaboratively to facilitate the realization of writing by process. Accordingly, writing by process demonstratively takes place in convenient and coherent contexts whereby student-writers can be analytically and synchronically assessed and rewarded. A supportive community, in fact, sharply lowers the skepticism and anxiety usually caused by those untrod, unrehearsed educational contexts. Moreover, process writing teachers' presence do not impart threatening implication or exercise an inhibiting restriction, but they are

there to roam with their illuminating guidance among the awaiting responsive student-writers rendering their doubts, worries and uncertainties void and non-functional. Student-writers' needs and shortcomings are urgently and decisively met with the empathetic relationship they have unconditionally initiated and started.

The affective policy is extensively imparted and implemented by process writing teachers abiding by the Rogerian school of whole person education in this sense, students are freed from the shackles of attending to local considerations so as to cherish unfettered, global, meaning-driven communication. Process writing is considered an alternative approach in which teachers lay their most emphasis on affection and cognition. Student-writers get rid of their stumbling defenses to attend wisely to the writing situations emerging with teachers creating non-threatening free classroom contexts. In these contexts, by the way, teachers capitalize on writing activities directed towards meaning-making assignments and meaningful interactions.

Process writing is in fact an inner directed, meaning oriented and student centered program. It is strongly biased towards letting a learner-centered mentality dominate and govern the learning/teaching sphere. The superiority of an all-knowing teacher of student-writers appearing foolish in front of the classmates due to uncertainties of raw trials of student-writers competing against those not cooperating with peers, of possibilities to corner and eradicate or alienate student-writers are almost constructively suppressed. The process-writing teacher allows the student-writers to choose the type of topic they find in their interest to write about and to experience language production inductively. During later stages of experiencing with writing as communication, teachers role all of a sudden switch. The student-writer "no longer needs the teachers' encouragement and absolute sense of security to recapitulate the new emerging situation. It is the teacher who needs the understanding and acceptance if he is to continue to give further information" (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 199). The process writing teachers by "physically removing themselves, shift their responsibilities to their student-writers, thus providing a safe environment which in its atmosphere they can freely interact with each other". When student-writers grasp the sense of security in the atmosphere provided, their affective-cognitive energies will be selectively directed and wisely spent on tasks of communication. Consequently "teacher's position becomes somewhat dependent upon the learner. The knower derives a sense of self-worth through request for the knowers' assistance" (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 122). Carey (1986, p. 64) reports that the of teachers in later stages develops to find themselves involved in similar "assignments to demonstrate

and test the viability of the topics in front of the students sharing the composing problems and the successes each student was expecting". And, since student-writers are found to be helpful in revising the teachers' drafts, process writing teachers' role come close to fellow writers and move away from being judges and critics. Novice writers inductively find the experts themselves have failure and problems to overcome although their writings by the privilege of knowledge and experience are more developed and polished.

2.4. The Natural Approach

The Natural Approach is not rendered a deviating exception. Similarly, as it is a burning star in the humanistic education cluster, some of the roles adopted by second language teachers observing Nature Approach can be ascribed to, to find them serving in favor of interpreting process writing teachers' role. Process writing teachers in their compliance with teachers' role specified in the Natural Approach direct their educational policies and initiatives toward assisting student-writers to mainly center on meaning, not on form or structure. Process writing teachers as knowers, consciously aware of writing as an experience marked with rewarding errors, do not engage themselves in correcting errors unless they are confronted with meaning blocking agents. Teachers are usually encouraged to be elective with corrections on communicative writing (Ferris, 1999). They are also expected to deal with common points for editing (Muncie 2002). Process writing teachers' doctrine grants momentum to acquisitional activities rather than to learning efforts which in turn encourage student-writers, so as to maintain higher goals attending primarily to meaning.

The momentum process writing teachers' role gains is best realized and manifested in their hard attempts to alleviate the student-writers' affective filter. Of course, this can be realistically fulfilled when they are iron-willed to take risk of experiencing writing in real language that they have in access to be practically exposed in real contexts and to real audiences as teachers or classmates (Chastain, 1988, p. 99). Teachers in process writing, "create interesting, friendly and relaxed classroom atmosphere" (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 138) in which student-writers enjoy the true benefit of low personal anxiety and low classroom tension. This helps them receive more concluding guidance to write with more confidence and to be more reactive to indicative clues of topics readily found in the accessible surroundings. In sum, Richards and Rodgers (1986, p. 138) aligned with Natural Approach enable readers to specify process writing teachers role as of choosing and orchestrating

. . . a rich mix of classroom activities involving a variety of group size, content and contexts. The teacher is seen as responsible for collecting materials and designing their use. These materials . . . are based not only on teacher perception but on elicited student needs and interests.

3. Process writing teacher

By and large, the role of the teacher within a process focused classroom in response to the paradigm shift i.e. product to process has been redefined and re-negotiated. Process writing teachers instead of causing and building constraints to student-writers activities to supposedly ensure correct writing, adopted facilitative tendencies and liberal inclinations, and proposed less teacher centered classroom. Moreover, it reflected full responsibility to organize writing experience, exercised strong commitment with facilitating the simulation of successful writing behaviours and showed deep interest in cyclical writing.

Teachers involved in process writing, to introduce their genre identity, monitor their classroom as a setting for real communication and communicative activities in which student-writers are to be enabled to develop cognitive composing strategies. Process writing teachers, in maintaining their roles as investigators, endeavor to concentrate on honestly and genuinely penetrating deep in the particulars of writing processes that are implemented and undergone by student-writers while observing and discussing to identify and marginalize successful styles; and strategies styles employed by hardened student-writers while diligently attending to different aspects of the process writing. In fact, based on Laviosa's (1994:488), "Helping students with planning and drafting is only half of the teacher's task, the other half concerns the teacher's response to a piece of writing".

To conclude, a comprehensive collection of roles privatized and prioritized as to be allotted to teachers in the process writing enterprise can be selectively specified, identified and ordered. Process writing teachers, when witnessed carrying out labeled classroom procedures and activities as concrete role performances, were found that:

1. they control and manage what takes place in the classroom to bring about successful writing behaviours.
2. they promote the development and the use of writing strategies.
3. they commit themselves to instructional procedures observed in the silent way. The Natural Approach, Communicative Language Teaching and Community Language Learning.
4. they adopt and maintain a non-authoritarian presence in the classroom.

5. they move beyond methods and focus on exploring the nature of effective classroom writing.
6. they create the favorable conditions under which learning/ acquisition of the skill of writing can effectively take place.
7. they impart knowledge to their student-writers by a variety of multiple means.
8. they abide by the task-oriented side of teaching writing.
9. they motivate the student writers who are unmotivated and nurture those who are already well motivated via the task of writing by process in a foreign language.
10. they give student writers meaningful, relevant and interesting task to comply with in writing.
11. they maintain discipline to the extent that a flourishing working atmosphere is established.
12. they steadily involve the student-writers in activities that demand intra-student communication and cooperative efforts on their part.
13. they introduce student writers to the concept of self appraisal and self evaluation through reports and discussions.
14. they encourage pride in achievement by allowing student-writers to display their work on classroom walls and noticeboards.
15. they guide the “subject” under consideration and the way in which it is learnt in the classroom.
16. they evaluate and judge whether student writers’ efforts and contributions to the writing process are valid, relevant and correct.
17. they behave as a resource of knowledge about the writing process and how to acquire it.
18. they organize classroom activities, set up learning tasks and assist student-writers in performing these activities.
19. they probe the student writers through close questioning in order to recall previously acquired knowledge back to access.
20. they cope with a new set of social relationships in the class.
21. they instruct less than usual.
22. they keep the writing task clear, simple and straightforward.
23. they teach the convoluted, the cyclical, and the spiral writing process.
24. they analyze and diagnose the writing product.
25. they establish short term and long term goals for each student.

26. they balance classroom activities, some for individuals and some for groups.
27. they develop and assign meaningful assignments.
28. they provide a real audience; an audience other than the teacher.
29. they make student-writers papers available to other student-writers.
30. they help student writers see their own body of work to gradually develop.
31. they provide writing activities which reinforce, listening and speaking skills.
32. they provide heuristics for invention, purpose and audience.
33. they outline the goals clearly for each writing assignment.
34. they distinguish between students who want to be corrected and those who do not.
35. they seek to develop classroom activities in which students can simultaneously communicate through writing while they are engaged in learning language forms.
36. they include in-class writing activities besides writing for homework.
37. they seek to elevate the quality of student writers' written communication by letting students experiment with writing as a means of self expression.
38. they realize that writing involves a sequential and interrelated process of creating and criticizing.
39. they specify a communicative purpose for each piece of writing.
40. they select topics that fit in the student-writers' schemata.
41. they avoid appearing as authoritative director or arbiter.
42. they respond to students' writing.
43. they guide helping student-writers get engaged in thinking process of composing.
44. they incorporate practices of "successful" writers in their syllabus.
45. they balance process and product in their classroom contexts.

4. Student-writer roles/Writing-teacher roles

Unsurprisingly, as it has been previously stressed, learning theories can be tossed upside down to their heads to let counterpart theories crop-up on behalf of teaching. By the same token, learners' roles can be stood bottom up to leak out functional teachers' role to have them readily realized and dramatized in real classroom contexts. Quite expectedly, the teaching-learning communicative dependency can be transparently crystallized when

standardized process writers' roles listed as canons are turned round to yield cognate versions to provide a systematic description of process writing teachers' role.

Accordingly, a set of selective statements selectively embodying process student-writers' roles are converted to serve as process writing teachers' roles which can be worked out to pragmatically denote that it is quite essential for process writing teachers:

1. to bring up student writers primarily depending on themselves as initiators.
2. to introduce themselves as facilitators to help student-writers learn to write by process.
3. to coach student writers struggling with challenging ideas in unrehearsed contexts.
4. to habitualize the student writers to take risks with language and to deactivate the adversities by referring to judicial justifications.
5. to inject confidence in what their student-writers evolve as a quality product.
6. to tag their student-writers with the title of teacher knowers who can be matched in pairs assembled in small group collaboration.
7. to advise their student writers not to restrict themselves merely to teacher generated rules and modification of lexis.
8. not to expect their student-writers to write finished products merely to be examined by them.
9. to acculturate their student writers to writing for some actual, experimental reader (e.g. classmates, friends, etc . . .)
10. not to impose writing in response to tests or homework assignment that are to be evaluated by them.
11. to mention the resources where relevant information can be found.
12. to stimulate student-writers to refer to their background knowledge when they undergo the experimentation of creating a text.
13. not to hinder student writers flow of writing by imposing unjustifiable time limitations.
14. to foster writing as a daily activity in student-writers.
15. to encourage student-writers to resort to aids such as dictionary, grammar and the like.
16. to expect student writers experience writing in compliance with a specified discourse community.

17. to orient student writers with “process” “making meaning” “invention” “heuristics” and “successive drafts” as essential requirements if process writing is required to be accomplished.
18. to treat the four skills of listening, reading, speaking and writing integratively, as interrelated communicating vessels.
19. to familiarize their student writers with the rhetorical structure of the second language.
20. to motivate student-writers to respond positively to writing assignments.
21. to attract student-writers to reflect on what they produce as a text.
22. to allow student-writers to write as often as possible.
23. to trigger student-writers will to deliberately involve themselves in writing activities.
24. to instigate student writers to master the syntax and lexicon of second language in order to gain control of the language.
25. to enable student-writers to develop insight into their own writing styles.
26. to stress inductive reasoning.
27. to encourage student writers to take their chances, appearing foolish to communicate by using the means at their disposal to convey meaning.
28. to reflect on student-writers’ learning to write strategies and preferences which might assist them in becoming more effective writers.
29. to promulgate the links existing between the task and its rationale.
30. to supervise student-writers find their own way.
31. to leave student-writers with learning how to learn writing dimension.
32. to show student writers how knowledge about language can be organized.
33. to introduce student writers to the subject that they will develop and to prepare the necessary background by the time they undertake their writing task.
34. to raise student writers’ awareness so as to help them discover to themselves their own strength and weakness.
35. to enhance student writers endeavors at exploring and developing a personal approach to writing.

36. to familiarize student-writers with how to develop self directed learning as a writing habit.
37. to socialize student writers with procedures to be followed so as to come up with generalizations, and to work out decisive conclusions.
38. to inform student-writers to involve themselves in joint accomplishment.
39. to play multiple varying roles.
40. to develop characteristic interaction patterns with the student-writers as partners to convey meaning.
41. to remind student writers how errors can be made to work positive didactic functions.
42. to make student writers depend on their linguistic knowledge and knowledge of their first language.
43. to provoke student writers to stress learning chunks of language as wholes and formalized routines to help themselves perform writing beyond their average competence.
44. to vary their teaching style conforming themselves to the formality of the situation they are involved in.
45. to conceptualize how student writers manage information by strategies, such as attending selectively to associating, categorizing, pattern learning and inferencing.

5. Conclusion

The paradigm shift from product to process on abiding by the requirements of a trendy design may provide the possibility to be concretely actualized in the second/foreign language settings. In fact, on specifying the labeled roles of instructional activities, the roles of process student-writers as well as the roles of process writing-teachers, such as the historic exodus to process writing may be authentically and genuinely observed in the development of successful writing behaviors. Now that labeled process writing-teachers are explicitly specified, the writing-teachers can implement them helping student-writers readily assimilate the change and enter for accomplishing its immediate requirements. They can discover by writing what they do know and eventually accept the idea of dynamically practicing the writing skill as a meaning-making event. In sum, process writing cannot be successfully harnessed and enhanced unless the components of a proper design in which the writing-teachers' exclusive roles are well pinpointed and clearly disclosed for real implementation.

Acknowledgements

I would like to grant my appreciation to Mr. Mohammad Mohseni Far, M.A., for his meticulous revision of the paper. My special thanks also go to him for his sharp comments and invaluable suggestions on the manuscript.

The Author

Ismail Baroudy (Ibaroudy2006@yahoo.com) is an assistant professor of the Department of English at Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, Iran. He did his M.A. in English literature (Tehran University) and Ph.D. in TEFL/Applied Linguistics (A.M.U., India). His main areas of interest take in comparative literature, European and American literature, developing language skills, language testing (designing multiple-choice tests), ESP, teaching methodology, syllabus design, discourse analysis and theories of second language acquisition. He is fluent in English, Arabic and Persian Languages (Speaking & Writing), French (Reading). He has published seven books and several articles in refereed journals. He is currently engaged in supervising an explorative research project embracing *Teacherless, Distance and Attendance Free Learning in Linguistics and Methodology*.

References

- Bamforth, R. (1993). Process versus genre: Anatomy of a false dichotomy. *Prospect*, 8 (2), 89-99.
- Brookes, A., & Grundy, P. (1990). *Writing for study purposes: A teachers' guide to developing individual writing skills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1966). *On knowing: Essays for the left hand*. New York: Atheneum.
- Bruton, A. (2002). From tasking purposes to purposing tasks. *ELT Journal*, 56, 280-288.
- Bruton, A. (2005). Process writing and communicative-task-based instruction: Many common features, but more common limitations? *TESL-EJ*, 9, 1-38.
- Cary, J. (1986). Not-teaching writing: Discovering the writing process. *Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies*, 111, 47-76.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 1-11.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Laviosa, F. (1994). The writing process of Italian as a second language: Theory and practice. *Italica, 71*, 484-504.
- Muncie, J. (2002). Finding a place for grammar instruction in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal, 56*, 180-186.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tobin, L. (2001). Process pedagogy. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper, & K. Schick (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 1-18). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 79-101.