

Theoretical and Practical Linguistic Shifting from Product/Guided Writing to Process Writing and Recently to the Innovated Writing Process Approach in Teaching Writing for Second/Foreign Language Learners

Dr. Anwar Mourssi

Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

E-mails: anwarmohd1967@yahoo.com anwar.mourssi@hct.edu.om

Anwar2.Abdoumourssi@live.uwe.ac.uk

Abstract

Writing is a complex cognitive activity in which foreign language learners are required to pay attention simultaneously to content, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling and letter formation. Therefore, there can be no guarantee that an effective teaching method in one context would result in effective student learning in another. It is proved that Product/Guided Writing resulting in poor writers, and Process Writing does not provide much care for metalinguistic feedback or enough time for negotiation as well. Following the stages of Innovated Writing Process (IWP), the instructor may be able to teach students many skills that may improve the quality of their writing as well as speaking. This paper presents the theoretical and practical linguistic shifting from Product/Guided Writing to Process Writing and recently to the Innovated Writing Process Approach in teaching writing for Second/Foreign Language Learners. It is indicated that metalinguistic feedback, error/contrastive analysis and the communicative interaction negotiating of meaning and form provided by the teacher lead to remarkable improve in second/foreign language learners' written accuracy and fluency as well.

Key words: *Product/guided writing, Process writing, Innovated writing process, Metalinguistic feedback, Interaction, and Negotiation.*

1. Introduction

Writing skill has been considered as the most difficult skill to be taught and acquired as well. The common concept between linguists and pedagogical specialists is that it is easier for second/foreign language learners to speak, listen and read L2 than writing it, since writing requires much more effort from language learners to be acquired. Writing teaching methods were developed matching with the development occurred in English teaching methods and approaches.

In the current article, three types of teaching methods are presented chronologically. The first type is the Traditional Product Writing (TPW), followed by the Process Writing (PW), and the

third type is the Innovated Writing Process (IWP). The aim is to show and identify theoretical and practical linguistic shifting from Product/Guided Writing to Process Writing and recently to the Innovated Writing Process Approach in teaching writing for Second/Foreign Language Learners. This paper consists of five sections; the first section is the introduction, the second section is describing the Traditional Product Writing, section three presents the Process Writing approach, while section four presents the Innovated Writing process, and finally, conclusion is presented in section five. In the following, describing the Traditional Product Writing is presented.

2. Describing the Traditional Product Writing (TPW)

The TPW is a method of teaching writing, which emphasizes the students' finished written product. It is termed a product-oriented approach which focuses on what to write and the rules for writing; the teacher is the only one who evaluates the final product. Mourssi (2006) indicated that product writing is a teacher-centered method, in which there is no role/space for the students to interact, discuss, negotiate, or get concrete feedback. Although some students can imitate certain styles of writing, the majority of the students produce weak written pieces which are full of non-target-like forms. The teacher's evaluation is provided by putting a tick or writing "good, very good, well done or bad" and there is no space for interaction or enough feedback.

The product approach has been evaluated by a number of linguists who have shown the weaknesses of the product approach in language acquisition: Pincas (1962) commented that in the product approach, the use of language is the manipulation of fixed patterns, these patterns are learnt by imitation; Eschholz (1980) mentioned that the product approach merely results in mindless copies of particular organizational plan or style; Prodromou (1995) criticized that the product approach for devaluing "the learners' potential" both linguistic and personal; Jordan (1997) commented that the product approach has no practical applications; Nunan (1999) similarly mentioned that the product approach focuses on writing tasks in which the learner imitates, copies and transforms models supplied by the teacher. I think that the product approach does not teach how to write independently or teach learners how to think, and most of the students feel bored during the writing task.

Traditional methods of teaching writing have focused upon the final written product and it is the role of a teacher to assess and rate the finished product, an approach otherwise known as the product-oriented approach. Cross (1991) suggested that ESL writing classes with particularly lower levels of proficiency may successfully use controlled, guided and independent writing techniques to facilitate vocabulary, sentence structure knowledge and self-confidence. According to Zamel (1987, p. 67):

The teacher's role in the product-oriented approach is often criticized for being too teacher-centred resulting either in an over-controlled or judgmental environment. The process approach on the other hand could be a more effective way of teaching writing since it provides the avenue for students to build up their confidence and thus increase their motivation.

Similar to my evaluation of the product writing approach, Ting (2010, p. 623) compared the product approach and the process approach. He mentions that the product approach is based on behaviourism theory, while the process approach is based on the communicating theory which changes the centre of the class from the teacher to the learners. He adds that the product approach developed from Russian scientist Ivan Pavlov's "conditioned reflex". Pavlov thought that the learning process consists of the formation of associations between stimuli and reflexive responses. In the following, describing the Process Writing Approach is presented.

3. Process Writing Approach

This section consists of seven sub-sections. The first sub-section 3.1 provides a review of previous research works on the process writing approach covering a decade from 1980 to 1990. The second sub-section 3.2 explains the stages of process writing. Sub-section 3.3 deals with recent research on writing processes and developments in the implementation of writing sub-processes, namely: revising and (re)drafting in the second millennium (21st century). This is followed by sub-section 3.4 which is a review on group work and motivating learners to write. Techniques of revising and using modern technology tools in revising will be presented in sub-section 3.5, while research on drafting/redrafting and think-aloud protocols will be presented in sub-section 3.6. First, I will talk about the research on process writing between 1980s and 1990s.

3.1 The Birth of Process Writing (1980s-1990s)

There is an assumption suggesting that, when teachers teach students how to write target-like forms, the process helps the latter to learn the underlying structures of the language as well. Raimes (1983, p. 3) posited that the use of writing as a medium for communication reinforces grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary. Thus, teaching writing provides a unique way to reinforce learning.

Another important consideration is the tendency for students to venture with the language, as they write beyond their speech abilities. When writing, Foreign Language Learners (FLLs) are better motivated and more confident as they are not confined to their own limitations but instead freed from inhibitions. As this facilitates confidence in thinking and execution, there is a corresponding probability that the better students think the better they write (Hedge, 1997). Thus, there could be a relationship between writing and thinking that makes writing a valuable part in any language course.

According to Reid (1993, p. 21), in the 1970s, many ESL composition teachers in intensive language programs used writing mainly as a support skill in language learning. Some of the activities in writing included: doing grammar exercises, answering reading comprehension questions, and writing dictation. Furthermore, writing was viewed as one technique used to add interest to a lesson or even perhaps, as a testing device to diagnose grammar or comprehension errors.

In the 1980s, linguists and teachers of EFL/ESL observed that traditional writing exercises were “product” orientated, meaning that they were more concerned with the final result than with the process of learning which can occur through the writing activity.

Richards et al. (1999, p. 290) defined process writing as an approach that puts emphasis on the composing process, wherein the writer makes use of tools such as planning, drafting and revising. These tools are used to help students improve their writing skills and possibly achieve target-like procedures in composing. Sometimes, process writing is comparable with the product approach or the prose model approach that focuses on producing different kinds of written products by imitating model paragraphs or essays. Atwell (1984, cited in Schroder and Lovett, 1993, p. 3) introduced a five-step writing process system that involves: *prewriting, drafting, revising, editing and publishing*. This was successfully implemented in a middle school classroom in Hong Kong. Similarly, Stewart and Cheung (1989, p. 42-4) have shown that process writing can be implemented in secondary schools effectively if it is introduced gradually and certain modifications/adaptations are implemented. One important aspect that needs to be addressed strongly pertains to the constraints of the writing processes in relation to the educational environment of L2 learners or FLLs. In other words, time constraints make process writing more difficult.

Pennington et al. (1996) conducted a study on the introduction of process writing among secondary school students in Hong Kong. The outcome of the survey suggests the presence of a complex pattern of cause and effect relationships between students' attitudes and teachers' behaviours. Results also revealed that the student group that had positive experiences with process writing are those who demonstrated positive attitudes at the beginning of the project. This group was supervised by a teacher who integrated elements of process writing into his/her teaching routine. On the other hand, the group that evaluated the experience negatively was taught by a teacher who focused on traditional language exercises and grammatical accuracy, and did so with very little integration of elements of process writing. These findings underline the importance of the role of the teacher in teaching writing processes inside the classroom.

Fulcher (1997, p. 17) maintained that the process approach often emphasizes the development of thinking skills along with the writing process. Raimes (1983, p. 3) also underscored the strong relationship between writing and thinking that makes writing a valuable part of any language course. Therefore, it can be surmised that writing holds an important role in the development of language skills.

Walvoord and Fassler (1985, p. 1) conceded that writing is the vital foundation-block on which education and culture depends. Thus, writing becomes an essential tool for discovery and thinking. Such a standpoint underscores the importance of teaching students how to write in a target-like way by motivating them to know, to read, to listen and to write. They could be encouraged to apply different but useful learning strategies to produce good writing such as mastering the language as well as they can (Mourssi, 2006). With regard to some difficulties encountered in the teaching of writing, Tribble (1997, p. 3) conceded that the ability to write appropriately and effectively evades many of us, either in our mother tongue or in any other

language one is wishing to learn. This phenomenon is relatively evident, despite the many years one may devote to developing such a skill.

According to Walvoord and Fassler (1985, p. 1), there are two important paths to effective writing: (1) knowing what effective writing looks like and (2) knowing how to plan and carry out a writing task. Hedge (1997, p. 9) asserted that students need opportunities to practise various forms and functions in writing, for these might subsequently lead to the development of other skills needed in producing written texts. Part of these opportunities can be acquired by spending classroom time on writing, as this will allow students to work together on writing in different ways. As Raimes (1983, p. 18-19) pointed out, group work in the classroom proves to be a valuable exercise for native speakers who are learning to write. For L2 learners – who would need ample time and opportunity, group work is particularly beneficial as they can practise speaking a foreign language with their peers. Now, I will present the stages of process writing.

3.2 Stages of Process Writing

A number of recent works support the use of process approaches in teaching writing and these are reviewed below:

White and Arndt (1991, p. 7) provided a list of the possible stages of producing a piece of full-scale writing as part of a process writing course. The stages are as follows:

- discussion (class, small, group, pair);
- brainstorming / making notes / asking questions;
- fast writing / selecting ideas / establishing a view point;
- rough draft;
- preliminary self-evaluation;
- arranging information / structuring the text;
- first draft;
- group / peer evaluation and responding;
- conference;
- second draft;
- self-evaluation / editing / proof-reading;
- finished draft;
- response to final draft.

(White and Arndt, 1991, p. 7)

In addition, Hedge (1997, p. 21) explained that the process of writing contains a number of stages as represented in the following table.

Table 1.1: Stages of Process Writing

being motivated ► to write	getting ideas ► Together	Planning and ► Outlining	making notes ►	Making a first ► Draft	revising ► Re-planning ► redrafting	editing and getting ready ► for publication
-------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	---	--

To emphasize clearly the importance of the teacher’s role during the writing class, Nunan (1989, p. 13) asserted that English as Second Language (ESL) courses must be carefully planned for each class is a single piece of a complex design. Likewise, teachers should determine the materials in order to arrive at a specific performance level by setting some goals that a teacher aspires to achieve.

Reid (1993, p. 73) argued if the ESL writing class is one of the areas in a writing program, it is necessary to know not only the performance objectives of a single course but also the overall goals of a writing program involving other classes. Teachers may also experience difficulties in teaching speaking, listening and reading. But more often, it is more difficult to teach writing because it requires greater effort and a larger amount of time from both teachers and students (Hedge, 2005).

Pressley and Yokoi (1997) examined certain instructional practices and procedures in teaching writing developed by fifth-grade teachers, nominated as outstanding teachers in the U.S. An analysis of the survey returns shows that these teachers have prioritized the development of word-level comprehension, and critical thinking skills. As they believed that the development of background knowledge is essential to the process, students were consistently reminded about the importance of planning, drafting, and revising.

On the aspect of interaction between students and teachers, Hamp-Lyons and Liz (1994) proposed the inclusion of writing assessments available for instructional methods in college level ESL writing classes. The authors defined the term “writing assessment” as a process which is inherent in nearly every interaction teachers would have with their students in a writing class. Their proposal was based on empirical findings suggesting that most models of writing process regard evaluation as the final stage in the instructional cycle, hence excluding other stages such as prewriting, drafting and revising in the final assessment.

In an attempt to implement previously known categories of process writing, Schroder and Lovett (1993) put Atwell’s (1984) theories into practice in a third grade classroom. The authors noticed that there were concerns expressed during the early stages of the writing sub-processes. Although the lack of student interest in writing has shown to decrease when students were allowed to choose their own topics, this did not eliminate the problem; it was learnt that the teachers were having more serious difficulties in managing the process. The above case was one illustration stressing the importance of the relationship between teachers and students in the implementation of writing processes. In the following, I will talk about research on writing processes in the 21st century.

3.3 Developing Writing Processes in the 21st Century and the Birth of the IWP

Due to the dramatic changes in the process of teaching writing in the 1990s, there has been an increasing awareness amongst L2 writing researchers and teachers that classroom-based instruction plays a significant role in helping L2 learners improve the accuracy of their written texts (Bitchener, 2005; Ferris, 2002, 2004). To ensure improvements in writing skills, additional exercises now include discussions and exercises in marking strategies encompassing further activities such as revision in the planning and drafting stages (Hedge, 2005, p. 5). These exercises are expected to increase teachers' interest to find intervening measures using feedback in a variety of ways.

Concerning difficulties and challenges in the teaching process of writing, Hedge (2005:7) argued that compared to speech, effective writing requires a number of things, such as: (1) a high degree of organization in the development of information; (2) ideas or arguments; (3) a high degree of accuracy; (4) the use of complex grammatical devices for focus and emphasis; and (5) a careful choice of vocabulary, grammatical patterns and sentence structures. These five items may explain why writing can be a difficult task for most ESL/L2 students. From this point of view, Mourssi, (2013) tried to activate the writing sub-processes which are drafting, revising and redrafting and increasing the role of the teacher inside the classroom in teaching writing skills. The IWP approach integrates noticing, active interaction, feedback and error analysis aiming at improving foreign learners' writing as well as speaking. The framework of the IWP is presented in Appendix A.

Hedge (2005, p. 10-15) developed several assumptions which could motivate students and teachers. Four of these assumptions are as follows: (1) students need opportunities to practise various forms and functions of writing, and from within these develop different skills; (2) the need to encourage students to go through the processes of planning, organizing, composing, and revising; (3) the process of marking needs constant review and modification, and (4) giving students more time in the classroom to generate discussions and activities that encourage effective writing processes.

Based on these assumptions provided by Hedge, Mourssi (2013) investigated the role of revising and (re)drafting in improving foreign language learners' writing as well as speaking in which error analysis and error correction in addition to contrastive analysis will be involved to motivate students to participate with their teacher. I think that the integration of different teaching methods and approaches –the grammar translation method combined with a communicative approach within the general framework of the task-based approach revised and designed by Nunan (2009), might lead to a practical means to improve foreign language learners' writing as well as speaking.

Shin (2008, p. 3) made a critical review of the usefulness of grammar correction in second language writing. The author concluded with a discussion on the necessity and importance of proper grammar correction for L2 writers. Similarly, Rahimi (2009) investigated the impact of

feedback which includes reference to the students' L1. Both indirect feedback and no feedback approaches were studied. He concluded that feedback is effective.

A number of linguists have divided the composing processes of a writer into three components: "the composing processor, the task environment and writer's long term memory" (Flower and Hayes 1980 cited in Grabe and Kaplan 1996, p. 92). The writing process model that was elaborated by Flower and Hayes (1980) views writing as a recursive process which requires a number of processes such as: planning, organizing, editing, evaluating and so on. Bowen (2004) supports the suggestions given by Flower and Hayes (1980) and asserted that focusing on the process of writing by introducing skills such as generating ideas, structuring information, drafting and redrafting, reformulating and reviewing can make teaching writing skills a communicative and not a silent or a solitary activity that can be often viewed as a waste of valuable classroom time. In fact, the methods of teaching writing in the Arab world in general neglect such classroom activities in learning writing.

O'Brien (2000, p. 40) set out four principles which presumably govern the teaching of writing. These are: (a) teachers should be aware of the difficulties involved in writing and should take into account the assessment methods they use; (b) teachers should expose students to a variety of models of effective writing; (c) teachers should be careful in selecting topics; and (d) teachers should bear in mind that the production of the whole text must be encouraged otherwise the teacher will lose the opportunity to proceed with the teaching of the sub-processes. Students in most of the Arab countries in many cases are asked to write a final draft of their work from the beginning not only in secondary schools, but in the foundation course provided to Higher Education Students in many different universities. Qatar University EFL Students are typical of university students from the Gulf countries which are considered as the richest countries in the Arab world. These students need to use modern technology and methods in teaching as well as in the business and banking fields. In order to examine the effects of this practice, Al-Buainain, (2006) conducted survey of language instructors at the Department of Foreign Languages in the University of Qatar. The majority were in agreement that most EFL students were weak in three writing courses namely: writing 1, writing 2 and advanced writing. With this finding, Al-Buainain (2006) recommended further research that will investigate this problem and develop remedial procedures that will help students overcome their weakness and therefore lessen the number of them failing every semester.

Al-Buainain (2006) gathered forty exam scripts in the first writing course and used them as data. The subjects in the first writing course were 18-20 year-old females. A ten-point scale was developed to rate each item as the method for scoring. The analysis of the data involved the separation and classification of errors to identify their types. This study discovered that sentence-level grammatical errors committed by the learners involve syntactic features and the samples present the commonest Arabic (Qatari) errors in English. Al-Buainain (2006) explains that most of these errors are common to all non-native users of English and concluded that there could be no definite answer to the question of how to teach writing in ESL/EFL classes since these are many different approaches for teaching writing.

Hedge (2005) argued that, although developing writing skills is essential for all students, it is still considered to be less significant than reading and speaking skills. Hinkel (2004) criticized the over-emphasis given to teaching the process of writing in ESL courses instead of teaching practical skills that students would really need.

Al-Buainian (2006) enquired whether it was possible to acquire syntax through writing. In a similar vein, Weissberg (1998) tested the hypothesis that SL learners may acquire syntax in part by writing in class and the result indicates that classroom writing has a positive effect in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). On the other hand, Liu (2000, p. 33) argued that “insufficient use of lexical cohesive ties by ESL students contributes to the lack of cohesion in their writing”. In Iran, Kiany and Khazrinshed (2001) carried out a study to explore the relationship between English proficiency, writing ability and the use of conjunctions. Part of the conclusion the authors were able to draw suggests the creation of innovative materials since these can insert particular types of conjunctions for every level.

Due to the need to improve high schools students’ writing, De la Paz, et al. (2002) made a study on the writing instruction used in middle school classrooms and developed an experiment requiring the development of a variety of cognitive resources. De la Paz et al. (2002) concluded that the students in the experimental group wrote longer essays containing more mature vocabulary and were qualitatively better than those in the non-target groups. In the following, I will present how group work motivates L2 learners to write.

3.4 Group Work and Motivating Learners to Write: a step towards the IWP

On the importance of group work activities related to revising and drafting, Kowszyk and Vazquez (2004) examined the effectiveness of group learning along with the pedagogical rationale for implementing a group learning approach in written language instruction. Analyses were made of experimental data and on the learning theories proposed. Results show that peer interaction in groups and between the teacher and students is a very productive strategy in writing and revising written material.

Mason and Christine (2006) also used group-work and examined what undergraduate students have learned from a process approach to writing and the aspects they have actually internalized at the completion of First Year Composition (FYC). As a result, recommended encouraging teachers to give students ample space to reflect on, write about, and discuss their own composing processes. That way, students will be empowered to harness their skills and develop their abilities to adapt to different writing tasks and conditions.

With regard to motivating students to perform classroom tasks, Scheidecker and Freeman (1999, p. 116) are convinced that motivation without a doubt is the most complex and challenging issue that teachers face today. According to Dörnyei (2001, p. 1), motivation is a key issue in language learning posited upon the ability of a teacher to motivate a student. And language learning can become even more fragile if teachers are not skilled in motivating

learners. In what follows the author will cast light on techniques of revising and using modern technology tools in revising which have been implemented recently.

3.5 Techniques of Revising and the Absence of Using Modern Technology Tools in the ALEs' Context

Butcher and Kintsch (2001) examined the effects of content and rhetorical prompts in writing process activities and the quality of the output in the form of written products. They also examined the usefulness of Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) developed by Landauer and Dumais (1997) which is a computational technique for representing the content of documents as a tool for assessing texts. In evaluating the computer-grading system, Butcher and Kintsch (2001) measured the time spent in three writing activities (planning, drafting, and revising) and reached the conclusion that the LSA had generated consistent judgments of writing quality resembling a human grading system with the help of professional writing instructors.

Lee et al. (2009) made both quantitative and qualitative evaluations critiquing the Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) designed by Landauer and Dumais (1997), which was subsequently used by Butcher and Kintsch (2001) with the intention of providing students with immediate content and organizational feedback online. The authors claim that there were no statistical and significant differences found between LSA users and the traditional feedback users.

With the objective to know how Text-To- Speech technology (TTS) could support English Language Learners (ELLs) in process writing with the use of computers, Kirstein (2006) developed a six-case study of ELLs applying Text-to-Speech (TTS) technology to the process of drafting and revising essays. Kirstein (2006) collected data using questionnaires, literature interviews and observations. The study respondents comprised students developing writing processes with and without the aid of the TTS. The author concluded that, with the use of the TTS, learners tend to write more drafts, spent more time on each draft, and detected more errors, giving them increased capability to revise meaning-level features.

Using a self-designed Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) software to provide instant computer-generated scores for a submitted essay along with diagnostic feedback, Chen and Cheng (2008) examined the practices and perceived learning effectiveness in writing classes in Taiwan. Setting a naturalistic classroom-based task to investigate the interaction between the AWE program and EFL College students, they discovered that the implementation of the AWE was generally not perceived positively by the Taiwanese students. However, the perception shifted to a more favourable rating when the program was used to facilitate students' early drafting and revising process, although it was noted there was human intervention and feedback from both the teacher and peers during this supposed "man and machine" interaction. Results also suggest that the rate of success with the use of the AWE would depend on attitudes by both teachers and the students towards the technology.

Although the use of computer technology is no longer a novelty, tapping E-technology resources as a means of instruction is still in its infancy in many developing countries (Shana,

2009). Therefore, insofar as pre-university education is concerned, the modes for teaching and learning are still reliant on rote learning and memorization-based assessment methods. Such a system, however, can easily result in lesser creativity and individuality amongst students, particularly in teacher-centered environments or with the traditional behaviourist stimulus-response learning model.

The study by Shana (2009) is based on a sample of students in the Information Technology Department in Ajman University of Science and Technology, (AUST), Fujairah, United Arab Emirates. The main ideology behind that research was to experiment with a shift from the traditional learning/teaching model to the constructivist information processing model and learn from the outcomes. She concluded that students should have a course on computer skills before joining the foundation course.

In an attempt to evaluate techno-constructivism and other creative devices in foreign language classrooms, Spodark (2008) suggested that the blending of pedagogical practices advocated by social constructivism with educational technologies may only result in further and in-depth research on drafting/redrafting and on other think-aloud protocols.

Personally, the author agrees with these findings but wonders how it can be implemented in an educational environment that still teaches English Language based on classroom-oriented, and student-teacher oriented approaches. In other words, learners do not access computers inside the classroom while learning writing. This guided me to design the IWP. In the following, I will present research on drafting/redrafting and think-aloud protocols as a step towards shifting from Process Writing to Innovated Writing Process Approach.

3.6 Research on Drafting/Redrafting and Thinking-Aloud Protocols: shifting from Process Writing to Innovated Writing Process Approach

The writing process, if it is implemented with Arab learners of English, is usually achieved by students individually outside the classroom. Previous research work has generally focused on classroom activities. There is a tendency for data to overlap between writing sub-processes acquired inside and outside of the classroom (Lopez, 2005). Therefore, any success rate predictions could become very unreliable if such a critical aspect is overlooked. Hedge (2005, p. 13) mentions that it is not surprising that writing often tends to be an out-of-class activity, because many teachers feel the class time is best devoted to oral/aural work and homework to writing, which can then be done at the student's own pace.

Mourssi (2013a, 2013b) indicated that if the low level students experience some measure of success in the supportive learning environment of the classroom, they will develop their confidence and this will result in writing more in the classroom after getting the opportunity and enough space to interact, negotiate, and receive the teacher's metalinguistic feedback. Hedge (2005, p. 13) mentioned that many students benefit greatly from classroom practice in writing because the teacher can then prepare more with carefully planned stages covering Planning, Drafting, and Revising.

With regard to practice speaking when drafting, Lopez (2005) reiterated that the classroom equivalent of the think-aloud research technique is collaborative talk focused on various stages of the writing process, particularly on feedback by either the teacher or peers. Flower (1994) argued however, that such an activity might only be explicitly expressed in non-threatening environments between the teacher and the learners, whereby engaging in dialogues with substantial and rhetorical concerns could further take place (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987).

A study by Baroudy (2008) that focused on identifying both successful and unsuccessful learning/teaching strategies suggests that student-writers improve when asked to attend to the following five components: (1) rehearsing, (2) drafting, (3) revising, (4) student-writers' role and, (5) instructional materials. With respect to giving learners freedom in selecting a writing topic, Bonzo (2008) observed the presence of both fluency and complexity in intermediate foreign language writing in Germany. Study results indicate that topic control had an influence in promoting written fluency whereas overall fluency increases when participants are allowed to choose their topics.

Gutierrez (2008, p. 86) asked what meta-linguistic activity in learners' interaction during a collaborative L2 writing task looks like. The author found that:

The meta-linguistic activity that arose comprised three types of oral production: comment, speech actions, and text reformulations. Text reformulations and comments were the most common types.

In the following section, it is noticed how the IWP encourages peer-interaction and argues for the role of metalinguistic feedback in improving learners' internalized grammatical system (Mourssi, 2012d).

The author thinks that when these activities are conducted in the classroom, this may allow linguistic knowledge, which might not be available to the foreign language learners outside the classroom in general and in the context of ALEs in particular, to be attained. Hence, the author in designing the IWP aims at evaluating the role of teacher correction and his/her feedback.

The literature on process writing has guided the researcher to design the IWP concentrating on group work, noticing, interaction, feedback, error analysis and motivating teachers as well as learners to be involved in writing processes and consider writing as a starting point to improve their other language skills (Mourssi, 2012d, 2013b). In other words, there are a number of potentially conflicting issues; students need grammar rules in order to be accurate, but traditional grammar teaching has proved to be demotivating for them. Mourssi (2012d) investigated that if students are given a motivating topic to write about (rather than just being given grammar exercises to do), they will engage with it, and investigated that in the process of revising and redrafting, their grammatical accuracy can be improved. The result might be that this can lead to long-term gains which are reflected in the spoken language as well as in the written language (Mourssi, 2013). The impact of improving writing on improving speaking will

be discussed in section four. In the following, describing the Innovated Writing Process is presented.

4. The Innovated Writing Process (IWP)

Mourssi (2012d) indicated that the IWP and the Communicative Grammar Language Teaching Approach (CGLTA) were designed to be a bridge to apply recent SLA and applied linguistic theories in pedagogical settings; the aim was for the IWP to create a relationship between Sociocultural Theory (SCT) and pedagogical settings in the classroom, while the CGLTA aimed to draw on error/contrastive analyses with metalinguistic feedback within a communicative framework.

4.1 Rationale for the design of the IWP

Mourssi (2012a, 2012c) analyzed interlanguage writing and interlanguage grammar in L2 as well and contrasted the errors which appear to originate in L1 and L2 linguistic items, he discovered that this contrastive analysis sheds considerable light on errors related to forming target-like sentences in L2. He thought that there should be a method which could be implemented to narrow the gap between the L1 and the L2 learners' internalized grammar system and which takes into consideration the big differences between the Arabic and English language. The researcher thought that this might be achieved by increasing the role of the teacher's interactions and instructions while concentrating on analyzing L2 learners' interlanguage grammar. The explanation and analysis of the learners' non-target-like forms should be performed using Ex-implicit grammar learning (Mourssi, 2013a) following *Meaning* negotiation and *Form* negotiation when it is needed and using corrective feedback. Implementing these stages might motivate L2 learners and give them the opportunity to revise and redraft their writing - most of them feel that writing activity is a boring task and they do not have desire to revise and redraft as well - to develop their internalized grammar which will be reflected in their writing. After implementing the IWP for a period of about four months, the researcher concluded that Ex-implicit grammar learning with teacher's instructions and interactions alongside metalinguistic feedback and L2 learners' communication with each other and with the teacher might be more effective and more useful for acquiring the target-like forms in English, which would result in improving the second language learners' internalized grammatical system.

The design of the IWP method is primarily based on the definition of method as it is essentially the level at which theory is put into practice and at which choices are made about particular skills, content and the order in which the content is presented. Therefore the IWP method is defined as a suggested method of teaching writing which involves both speaking and writing processes based on the learners' level. It aims at improving learners' accuracy as well as fluency. One of the assumptions was that the implementation of the IWP method with ALEs would help learners improve their writing and speaking skills. What distinguish the IWP method from others are the procedures and tasks involved while teaching writing. These procedures include: the processes of contrastive analysis and error analysis (metalinguistic feedback) based on the learners' mistakes; explicit grammar teaching; negotiation of meaning and form based

on the learners' level of interlanguage grammar; interaction between teacher-students and students-students in a form of communicative grammar language teaching approach; and finally, feedback which is either direct or indirect (Mourssi, 2012b).

4.2 The differences between the TPW and the IWP

The contents and procedures implemented in each method may give us a picture of how the teachers dealt with the learners' errors/mistakes. As a tutor following the IWP, I encouraged the learners to get involved and participate in the task, discuss, interact, and negotiate, which in turn helped learners develop their internalized grammatical system and acquire the target-like forms more rapidly compared with what happened in implementing the TPW with Second/Foreign Language learners as it is mentioned previously in section 2.

4.3 The importance of moving from speech to writing in the IWP

As can be seen from the model –presented in Appendix A- the IWP not only aims to improve Second/Foreign Language learners' writing skills, but also to improve their speaking skills. It is worth mentioning that improvements in their speaking skills occur before some improvements in writing can be observed. Allowing students to self-correct while speaking - by giving a space for the learners to reformulate what they want to say - generally led to an improvement in learners' speaking level, at the same time as it helped them improve their writing skills. When learners started to narrate (a picture-story), they used a variety of non-target-like forms. From that point, Error Analysis and Contrastive Analysis can be introduced by the teacher in the form of metalinguistic feedback and by interacting with the learners. Learners' mistakes/errors can be classified into three categories: (1) interlingual errors which originate in L1; (2) intralingual errors which originate in L2; and (3) in-between errors which originate in both L1 and in L2, Mourssi (2013d)

Narrating a picture-story orally is considered as a primary stage in the implementation of the IWP. It has its own advantages in shifting learners' declarative/implicit knowledge into procedural/explicit knowledge - they start to use their implicit knowledge to form sentences about each picture using the simple past tense forms - as well as shifting their competence of how to form target-like sentences in L2 into performance of L2 when trying to produce the target language even though this may be with some or many non-target-like forms.

When the ALEs produced sentences using L2 during speaking, they produced a variety of non-target-like forms. Therefore, the following question arose: will Ex-implicit grammar teaching here be the proper method of dealing with these mistakes? An analysis of the learners' level in the second writing suggested that the answer was positive, (Mourssi, 2013a). The author noticed that the process of Ex-implicit Grammar Teaching and provided metalinguistic feedback in dealing with learners' mistakes/errors, while it was noticed that the teacher following the TWP/ Process Writing only marked and corrected the students' mistakes/errors without explaining them. However, we cannot say for certain whether it is the spoken interaction only in the classroom or focus on form which may lead to greater improvement.

4.4 How language is learnt in interaction implementing the IWP

The question arising here is whether the first output can be reused in a more comprehensive way and improves language learners' level of proficiency? Mourssi (2013) concluded that based on the results of his empirical study, it can be reused and becomes "intake". During implementing the first stages in the IWP, the learners are not allowed to write down any sentences related to the writing task; they are given the opportunity to write down only the new forms which they do not know, following which they are given the opportunity to write down the forms that they have doubts about in terms of their ability to perform correctly. That is because the first stages in the suggested method of teaching are devoted to improving learners' speaking skills which are based on a writing task.

Another question to be raised is whether Long's (1983) Interaction Hypothesis has any bearing on the way that foreign language learners write their first draft? Long (1983) suggested that, if conversational adjustments in interaction help make input more comprehensible (and this is facilitative of L2 learning), then the linguistic and conversational adjustments that occur during interaction may promote language learning.

The question that researchers have been investigating is how interaction creates opportunities for learning. Mackey (1995, 1999) investigated the link between interaction and L2 learning, and studied the development of question formation in English. Pienemann and Johnston (1986) analyzed learners' production of question forms in pre-and post-tests. They put forward the idea that most of the developmentally –ready learners who had engaged in active interactions progressed more quickly than the other group which did not engage in active interaction.

In an attempt to answer the question of how interaction creates opportunities for learning, evidence from an empirical study was carried out (Mourssi,2013) suggested that an approach designed for foreign language learners termed the Communicative Grammar Language Teaching Approach (CGLTA) can help students develop their internal grammatical systems and improve accuracy in both spoken and written work. The CGLTA emphasizes the connection between the internalized grammar system, and the output – these connections occur during interactions which take place in four forms: student-student, students-teacher, teacher-students and student-teacher, (Mourssi, 2012d).

Based on the language learners' level and individual differences, the important role of interaction in acquiring second language grammatical rules was highlighted along with the impact of metalinguistic feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. The Communicative Grammar Language Teaching Approach integrated in the IWP method for teaching writing seemed to help second language learners acquire both the simple and complex rules related to forming the target-like sentences in English, see appendix A.

Ellis (N) (2002) prefers instruction to be in the form of explicit knowledge but the main aim is to build implicit knowledge. This means that explicit acquired knowledge is proceduralized to be

implicit knowledge. He mentions in his study that this could be done through engaging students in communication activities. This view was supported by Lantolf's (2008:44) claims in order to enhance the acquisition of implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge should be associated with engaging students with communicative activities and that explicit grammar teaching and metalinguistic feedback are appropriate because learners will be motivated to analyze rules for themselves. These activities were taken into consideration in designing the IWP. In the following, the conclusion is presented.

5. Conclusion

The researcher believes that reflection and feedback are important stages in the writing processes that each learner will be involved in and a key component of a learner's development. Furthermore, a teacher's feedback on grammatical errors serves as a means of encouraging students to critically study their own written performance. In addition, engaging students in problem solving could further lead to greater cognitive and reflective engagement with linguistic forms that in turn promote effective language acquisition.

This article shows how the IWP addresses the gaps learners face while writing and the goal is to help Second/Foreign Language learners improve not only their writing and speaking skills, but the other language skills as well. In addition, the IWP attempts to take writing activity as a starting point to teach the other language skills by implementing the writing sub-processes inside the classroom properly and effectively. This should include focus on error patterns and pair and group interaction and students-teacher interaction. This is the result of the shifting from Product/Guided Writing to Process Writing and recently to the Innovated Writing Process Approach in Teaching Writing for Second/Foreign Language Learners. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the teacher plays a crucial role in the methods and approaches of teaching in general and in developing writing skills in particular.

6. References

- Al-Buainain, H. A.** (2006). Students' Writing in EFL: Towards a Teaching Methodology. *Bulletin of the faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Qatar*.
- Baroudy, I.** (2008). Process writing: Successful and Unsuccessful Writers; Discovering Writing Behaviours. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8/2:43–63.
- Bereiter, C. and M. Scardamalia,** (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bitchener, J.** (2005). The extent to which classroom teaching options and independent learning activities can help L2 writers improve the accuracy of their writing, in: Anderson, H. et al. (eds). *Proceedings of the 2nd Independent Learning Association Oceania Conference*. Auckland: Manukau Institute of Technology, 1-7.
- Bonzo, J. D.** (2008). To design a topic or not: Observing fluency and complexity in intermediate foreign language writing. *Foreign Language Annals* 41: 722-735.
- Butcher, K. R. and W. Kintsch,** (2001). Support of Content and Rhetorical Processes of Writing: Effects on the writing Product. *Cognition and Instruction* 19/3:277-322.

- Chen, CE.** and **W. Cheng,** (2008). Practices and Perceived Learning Effectiveness in EFL Writing Classes. *Language Learning & Technology* 2: 94-112.
- Cross, D.** (1991). *A Practical Handbook of Language Teaching*. London: Cassell.
- De La Paz, Susan,** and **G. Steve,** (2002). Explicitly Teaching Strategies, Skills, and knowledge: Writing Instruction in Middle School Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94/4: 687-698.
- Dörnyei, Z.** (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, N. C.** (2002). Frequency effects in language acquisition: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24: 143–88.
- Eschholz, P. A.** (1980). The prose models approach: Using products in the process. in: T. R. Donovan, and B. W. McClelland, (eds.) *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*. Urban IL: Council of Teachers of English.
- Ferris, D. R.** (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R.** (2004). The "Grammar Correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime....?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*,13: 49-62.
- Flower, L.** (1994). *The construction of negotiated meaning: A social cognitive theory of writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
- Flower, L.** and **J. Hayes,** (1980). The dynamic of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints, in: L. W. Gregg et. and E. R. Steinberg (eds.) *Cognitive process in writing*, Hillsdale (NJ), Erlbaum, 31-50.
- Fulcher, G.** (1997). *English Language Teaching Review: Writing in the English Language Classroom*. Prentice Hall Europe ELT in association with The British Council.
- Grabe, W.** and **R. Kaplan,** (1996). *Theory and Practice of Writing*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Gutierrez, X.** (2008). What does metalinguistic activity in learners' interaction during a collaborative L2 writing task look like? *The Modern Language Journal* 92: 519- 537.
- Hamp-Lyons, L.** (1994). Interweaving Assessment and Instruction in College ESL Writing Classes. *College ESL* 4/1: 43-55.
- Hedge, T.** (1997). *Writing*. (9th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hedge, T.** (2005). *Writing*. (12th edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hinkel, E.** (2004). *Teaching Academic ESL writing. Practical Techniques in Vocabulary and Grammar*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Jordan, R. R.** (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarvis, S.** and **A. Pavlenko,** (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge
- Kiany, G.R.** and **M. Kherzrineshad,** (2001). On the relationship between English proficiency, writing ability and the use of conjunctions in Iranian EFL learners compositions. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 229:241.

- Kirstein, M.** (2006). Universalizing universal design: Applying test-to-speech technology to English Language learners' process writing. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, 06*, Dec: 21-24.
- Kowszyk, D.** and **A. Vazquez**, (2004). The Interaction between Peers in Writing Tasks. *Lecturay Vida, 4*: 36-46.
- Landauer, T. K.** and **S. Dumais**, (1997). A solution to Plato's problem: The latent semantic analysis theory of the acquisition, induction, an representation of knowledge. *Psychological Review 104*: 211-240.
- Lantolf, J.** (2008) Integrating Sociocultural Theory and Cognitive Linguistics in the Second Language Classroom. In Hinkel Eli (2011) Handbook of Reseach in Second Language Teaching and Learning. 11: 303-318.
- Lee, C., K. C. Wong, W. K. W. Cheung, and F. S. L. Lee**, (2009). Web-based essay critiquing system and EFL students' writing: A quantitative and qualitative investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning 22*: 57-2.
- Liu, D.** (2000). Writing Cohesion: using content lexical ties in ESOL. *English Teaching Forum .* January 2000: 28-33.
- Long, M.** (1983) Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly 17/3*:359-382.
- Lopez. E.** (2005). Current State of the Teaching of Process Writing in EFL Classes: Profile n.6 Bogota' jan./ dez 2005. ISSN 1657-0790 *versao impressa*.
- Mackey, A.** (1995). *Stepping up the Pace: Input, Interaction and Interlanguage Development. An Empirical Study of Questions in ESL*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sydney.
- Mackey, A.** (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: an empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 21/4*: 557-87.
- Mason, S.** and **A. Christine**, (2006). Students' Understanding and internalization of a process approach to writing. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences 67/6*: 20-35.
- Mourssi, A.** (2013). The Role of Revising and Redrafting in Improving Second Language Learners' Writing: the Acquisition of the Simple Past. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK
- Mourssi, A.** (2013a). The Efficacy of Ex-implicit in between Implicit and Explicit Grammar Teaching Approach on Second/Foreign Language Learners' Writing. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, Volume 2 (2)*, 43-53.
- Mourssi, A.** (2013b). The Effectiveness of the Innovated Writing Process. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, Volume 2 (3)*, 66-84.
- Mourssi, A.** (2013c). Crosslinguistic influence of L1 (Arabic) in acquiring linguistic items of L2 (English): an empirical study in the context of Arab Learners of English as undergraduate learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Volume 3 (3)*, 397- 403. Doi: 10.4304/tpls.3.3.397-403.
- Mourssi, A.** (2013d). The Efficacy of Error Analysis on Second Language Learners' Written Accuracy: An Empirical Study in the Context of Arab Learners of English. *International Research Journal, Educational Research (ER), Volume 4 (3)*, 249-256
- Mourssi, A.** (2012a). Analyzing Interlanguage Stages ALEs Pass Through in the Acquisition of the Simple Past Tense, *English Language Teaching; Volume. 5 (1)*, 148-163.

- Mourssi, A.** (2012b). The impact of Reflection and Metalinguistic Feedback in SLA: A Qualitative Research in the Context of Post Graduates. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, Volume 1 (1), 122-139.
- Mourssi, A.** (2012c). The Acquisition of the Simple Past Tense in the Context of Arab Learners of English, *Arab World English Journal*, Volume. 3 (3), 204-222
- Mourssi, A.** (2012d). The Innovated Writing Process (IWP) Approach: a Practical Bridge between Recent SLA and Applied Linguistics Theories, *English Linguistics Research*, Volume 1 (2), 102-118.
- Mourssi, A.** (2006). The role of motivation and learning strategies in improving second language learners' writing. A dissertation submitted to the University of Birmingham.
- Nunan, D.** (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom (12th ed)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D.** (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Nunan, D.** (2009). *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O' Brien, T.** (2000). *The Teaching of Writing Skills in Second/ Foreign Language*. Patras: HOU.
- Pennington, MC, MN. Brock, and F.Yue,** (1996). Explaining How Kong Students' response to process writing: An exploration of causes and outcomes. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 5: 227-252.
- Pienemann, M. and M. Johnston,** (1986). An acquisition-based procedure for second language assessment. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 9: 92-122.
- Pincas, A.** (1962). Structural linguistics and systematic composition teaching to students of English as a foreign language. *Language Learning* 12/3: 185-194.
- Pressley, M., L. Yokoi, P. Meter, S. Etten, and G. Freebern,** (1997). Some of the reasons preparing for exams is so hard: what can be done to make it easier? *Educational Psychology Review* 9/1: 1-38.
- Prodromou, L.** (1995). The Backwash Effect: from Testing to Teaching. *Language Testing* 49/1: 13-25.
- Rahimi, M.** (2009). The role of teacher's corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy over time. Is learner's mother tongue relevant? *Reading and Writing*, 22: 219-243.
- Raimes, A.** (1983). *Techniques In Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, J.** (1993). *Teaching ESL Writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Regents Prentice Hall.
- Richards, J., J. Platt, and H. Weber,** (1999). *Longman Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics (18th ed.)*. Harlow: Longman Group UK.
- Scheidecker, D. and W. Freeman.** (1999). *Bringing out the Best in Students: How Legendary Teachers Motivate Kids*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Schroder, V. and K. Lovett,** (1993). Modeling the process Approach Elementary Grades. in: Cullinan, Berrice E. (ed) *Pen in hand: children become writers*, Newark, DE: International Reading Assoc., 36-49.
- Shana, Z.** (2009). Learning with Technology: Using Discussion Forums to Augment a Traditional-style Class. *Educational Technology & Society* 21/3: 214-228.
- Shin, S. K.** (2008). Fire your proof-reader! Grammar correction in the writing classroom *ELT Journal* 62: 358-365.

Spodark, E. (2008). Technoconstructivism and millennial: Creative writing in the foreign language classroom. *Dimension 1*: 27-38.

Stewart, M. and M. Cheung, (1989). Introducing a process approach in the teaching of writing in Hong Kong. *Institute of Language in Education Journal 6*: 41-8.

Ting, W. (2010) Study of “the Product Approach” and “the Process Approach” in Writing Class for University Students. College of Arts and Law, Taiyuan University of Technology, Taiyuan, Shanxi, China.

Tribble, C. (1997). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walvoord, B. and E. Fassler, (1985). *Writing, Strategies for all disciplines*. London: Prentice Hall International, Inc.

White, R. and V. Arndt, (1991). *Process writing*. Harlow: Longman.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly 21/4*: 697-715.

7. Appendix A Framework of the Innovated Writing Process

