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CHAPTER ONE

Process or Product:
An explorative comparative study

Ulla Conner (1979:667) quotes Hairstone (1982) mentioning that the process theory of writing is “diverse flexible and still emerging”. Hence it is quite anticipatory to come up with some new orientations in reference to the true nature of such an approach. There is no doubt that more and more explications and denotations are urgently required to confirm and stipulate the practitioners’ keen comprehensive understanding and there may be still more and more under way. Some writing teachers have flung themselves hanging in suspension, moot in between process or product or process and product due to the fact that no convincing and illuminating guidances to have their composition classes monitored are made available to them and to help them relinquish their impartial undecidedness, to faithfully undertake a single unitary discipline. In fact writing teachers as well as student-writers need to be profoundly informed and institutionalized about the practical realizations and applications of such an approach. It is also evident that such an unstable rocking-swinging pendulum may result in a series of counter
effects of which uncompromised and haphazard eclecticism is inevitably a natural outcome. Such hazardous by-products cannot be reluctantly overlooked; therefore, an emergent need for more speculative illustrations of the process theory of writing is unquestionably and indisputably quite indispensable.

Concurrently, within such a dynamic and revolving paradigm a set of principles has evolved and developed according to which the student-writers are arduously craving for discovering to themselves in a meaningful manner what their synchronic extemporaneous processes of writing as committed learners are. They attentively learn to abide by the process assignments wholeheartedly. And this can facilitate bringing about a beneficial shift, a shift from expository mode of writing to an expressive communicative one; from being a style adherent to a timed quick writer; from mimicking modes to creating meaning, from uncreative duplication to productive generation; from a quality-bound writer to a quantity-affiliated creator; from being an outliner to a brainstormer, or in general from being product oriented to a process-wise writer, at least to mention some.

The "winds of change" (Hairstone 1982) did not blow without being justifiably explanatory in terms of a natural phenomenon. In 80's and still in 90's new teaching methods due to the shortcomings suffered by the already existing ones, were found
unsatisfactory and unstimulating, and because of the motivations injected upon public by the global needs to acquire a second/foreign language in the best way possible, and in the mean time to save time, money and energy, were brought into existence. Those newly introduced methods owing to the modern psychological and linguistic orientations rationally adopted and geared themselves to empirically and scientifically justified characteristics; in consequence, they were proved and distinguished to have far more favourable outcome than the former ones have had. Admittedly, process theory of writing is one of the by-products of those "changing winds and shifting sands" which made up for the demise of Audio lingualism and erupted the emergency of a communicative approach based on realizing the functions of language in their natural-real situational contexts.

To reduce the gap in-between and to minimize the logical divergences resident among the methods of teaching a conceptual feature analysis of those methods has been conducted by some scholars in various styles and fashions (Bosco and Dipietro 1970, Krashen and Seliger 1975). They have provided two sets of universal features in terms of which all methods, are rendered explicitly describable. In allocating universal features to each method, Roman Jacobsons' approach of "markedness" as plus or minus values which have been found very consistent in practically
stipulating the significant phonological distinctive features, has been reasonably exploited. Eleven universal properties: eight of which are of psychological category and three of linguistic nature have been systemically and efficiently worked out and introduced by Bosco and Dipietro (1970). They are accurately manipulated here, primarily to expose in a rather different manner the unique characteristics of the process approach to writing. These features will appropriately put forth a comparative study of the process and product oriented approaches to writing. Thirdly, it will enable one to conclude that the product oriented approach entails its specific priorities or shortcomings whereas the process approach possesses some explicit methodological background at its deep roots. Such a type of analysis will hopefully raise students/teachers' consciousness and will certainly alert their awarenesses about the fundamentals of such academic tendencies. Moreover, the psychological and linguistic background of both approaches: process and product, can be specifically and characteristically isolated from each other and well identified. Needless to say, such an illustrative project can develop an acute determinent power of will and judgment which will provide teachers and students the lucky chance of releasing themselves from the stigmatizing whirling dilemma of process or product with flying colours. Teachers/students by assessing the convincing end results of such a feature analysis can be led to a justifiable act of choice or
integration, one way or another. Teachers/ students can in fact readily recognize as to what paradigm they are empathetic; and more over, this may signal the right path to the stimulation and development of their dormant skills, which have not yet been adequately tapped and harnessed.

The universally applicable features proposed by Bosco and Dipietro (1970) are presented below as found listed and defined by Stern (1983:486-487). To come up with a precise feature analysis of the process oriented and product based approaches to writing, all the features introduced as psychological or linguistic by Bosco and Dipietro (1970) will be critically described and roughly discussed here below:

A) Psychological Features

1) **Functional versus Non-Functional**: Whether the goal is communicative or it is aimed at understanding the linguistic structure.

   The process-oriented approach to writing is as a point-of fact explored to locate and spot the characteristics it manifests so as to have student-writers' capacities developed, enabling them to write communicatively. The student-writers following this mode will discover that the communicative practice requirements are involuntarily and
adequately accomplished. Complying with the true nature of process writing they will find themselves having something meaningful to say, having an audience to reach, cooperating and collaborating in a small group, besides being unpretentiously natural in writing. Thus all the objectives of communicative language teaching are quite met within the inventory of process oriented approach to writing. Moreover, process writing is tuned to target at communication rather than getting engaged, as it is with the product oriented approach to writing, in accurately understanding linguistic structures. Raimes (1991:408-9) asserts that whereas product oriented approach to writing ignores considering communication as one of its sincerest goals, by focusing on form, it provides student-writers with the opportunity to explore some available syntactic options. It can be readily inferred that process oriented writing is [+functional], due to its de-emphasis of communicative factors in developing the writing skill.

2) **Central versus non-central:** whether the method is psychologically directed to ‘central’ cognitive processes or to ‘peripheral’ sensorimotor conditioning.

The process approach to writing depending on the principles advocated by its celebrated proponents is a free
liberal democratic method to which the student-writers react positively and cooperate willingly. The approach provides a non-threatening, unconditional stress-free writing context in which the student-writer can optimistically practice his/her skill of writing to be hopefully evolved. The student writer without being dictated by a demagogue teacher is given the right unquestioned alternative to choose his/her favourite topic at his/her free will. Moreover the student-writer is left unrestricted by time-limitations to write perfunctorily aiming unintentionally at “unfettered communication” (Brown 1987) without being obstructed by the unjustified fear of committing errors which he/she may be unfairly blamed for. On basis of this, it can be referred that process theory of writing is psychologically directed to “central cognitive processes”. Such a claim is well documented by Flower and Hayes (1981:366) when they assert that “writing is best understood as a set of distinctive thinking process which writers organize or orchestrate during the act of writing”. The product oriented approach to writing, on the other hand, propagates the idea of duplicating models or finished products as a main source of developing the writing ability. It supervises the writing assignment with a lot of unexplainable interference and control craving for unrewarding details to be minutely captured in the
reproduced text. White (1988:5-6) boosts our awarenesses with respect to the nature of such regressive dampening theory by stating that in the product- oriented approach to writing the emphasis was on correctness and the adherence to and copying models, both of language and text. The mimicking surface writer caged in those intimidating unacademic demands naturally has no choice but to resist to accept to be directed ruthlessly by the non creative - suppressing peripheral sensorimotor conditioning.

In short, it can be smoothly inferred that the process approach to writing is purely of [+central] category due to its intensive appeals to cognitive processes. It is plainly distinguished to be substantially psychologically directed whereas the product approach is barely identified to be [-central] simply due to the fact that it ignores the humans' emotional side when student-writers are densely involved in paralleling finished written texts.

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

Process theory of writing has been invariably projected as inherently affective, rooted in techniques and procedures by the mercy of which writing as an assignment can be
masterly conducted and supervised. Stressing the affective domain in second language acquisition in terms of Brown (1987:101) means "to be receptive to learners' needs both to those with whom he or she is communicating and to the language itself, responsive to persons and to the context of communication and to place a certain value on the communicative interpersonal exchange".

Teachers who are applying the process approach to writing are diligently informed to have the act of writing professionally supervised with affective care and tendings. In fact the process proponents are invited to open themselves to the realities of the pressure of academic life and their instrumental needs; just as they have opened themselves to the realities of their learners affective and developmental needs. To fulfil the affective requirements teachers' roles have been reduced to minimum interventions and the student writers have been left with their internal experiences to discover the self i.e. to reach self actualization, to be triumphant in the process of self discovery by being involved in "spontaneous exchange in unplanned discourse ..... in communicative language use and not modelled language use" (Marton, 1988:38). The product oriented approach on the other hand, by attending
to predetermined packaged forms and models which have to be honestly reproduced is deliberately ignoring the individuals' cognitive creative strategic potentialities endocentrically embedded in human beings. An approach as such cannot be classified as affectively directed, therefore, affective supervision in producing parallel versions of a finished product can be roughly guessed to be almost non existent. Accordingly process approach to writing is opportuned to be [+affective] whereas the product oriented approach due to its mechanical, non-mentalistic, prescribed procedure is nothing but [-affective].

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

Process theory of writing, as an inductive approach alongwith its technical advocacies and an initiative teaching-learning communicative scheme abides to an implicit perspective in handling and managing the language rules within a liberal curriculum. Martons (1988:57) elucidation on a communicative stance briefly describes that

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

Teachers who are process-oriented in teaching writing, in fact, focus on how writing is produced than on what the finished product as language segments aggregated by means of focused rules look like. In such an approach, writing is considered as process "whereby the writer discovers meaning instead of merely finding appropriate structures in which to package already developed ideas" (Chaudron, 1987:673-674).

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

It may be concluded that the process approach based on the principles advocated above is identified as [-nomothetic] whereas the product centered paradigm emphasizing rules to be explicitly exposed is supposed to be well characterized as [+nomothetic].
5) **Ideographic versus non-ideographic:** whether the method encourages the learners to develop their unique style of personal expression or not.

Actually, the strong commitments of student-writers who are supposed to honestly and ethically abide to performing writing activities based on the principles and techniques strictly and cumulatively developed to meet the process oriented approach goals and objectives mainly practise writing personal expressive texts. Brown (1988) in expounding on Rogers' humanistic psychology when he was contributing to a redefinition of educational process promulgates that “In adapting Rogers' (1951, 1961) ideas to language teaching and learning, we need to see to it that "learners understand themselves and communicate this self to others freely and non-defensively". Rogers believes that the direction of behavior is determined by a tendency toward self actualization - self actualization, as a matter of fact, involves a continuing effort to achieve the maximum development of an individuals' potential. The most important education-related implication of Rogerian theory is that in order to promote full, healthy functioning acting man, schools should be student-centered. Student centered means building the curriculum in the class with and for the
students (Nunan 1988). A major aspect of the whole language view is respect for each student, with all that entails in terms of respect for the students' language, home and culture. So having what has been put forward fully considered, in process oriented classes, by relearning and developing literacy-acquired skill of writing, student-writers are equipped with such a strong impetus to write for significant personal purposes (Raimes, 1991:41). Hamp Lyons (1986) patronizes supporting such a viewpoint as regards writing. Student-writers can write to learn or to display in writing infact can serve them as a tool.

Obviously student writers within the process writing are granted unresrtricted time-outs in a natural setting context to have their writing potentials operationalized uncritically, with no intensive directive surface feed back. Naturally, conducting such a policy entertains the student writers, though the proto-type process is in utter consideration, to work out their unique type of writing process styles which can be readily distinguished to be conforming to or to be a natural extension of the intact original, authentic specimen. Student-writers as referred to what superceding cherish their own private unparalleled ramifications and inferences of the theoretically demonstrated caste of process writing.
Here, it will be academically taken for granted that student-writers will stealthily discover and acquire to discover a unique unpredicted style of personal expression. Research on the writing of the school children (Atwell, 1987, Calkin, 1983, Graves 1983) has convinced many teachers that it is the processes, not the products of writing that deserve their attention. "At present in whole language classes students select their own topics, their own audiences and write for their own purposes and to their own standards" (Rigg, 1991).

On the contrary, the product model dictated sometype of predestined route to exercise writing skills, through honest imitation and faithful duplications of models provided, whether intentionally or unintentionally they will be alienated to their personally acquired or inherent nature of writing; thus forcefully folding themselves to preprepared, ready made frames which will eventually end up with the absorption of a cluster of unidentified symptoms queer enough not to indicate or allude to his/her unexplored, undiscovered self.

Reluctantly, the process approach to writing is privileged by the strategy of facilitating student-writers' writing attempts to evolve their own personal style and
awarenesses; on the contrary, the product model being under the influence of the inflexible mechanism of parroting techniques has no choice but to suppress and deconstruct such growth-oriented tendencies in practicing writing. Process oriented writing, accordingly based on facts mentioned is [+ideographic] whereas the product paradigm is [-ideographic].

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

Evidently, the process approach to writing to meet its communicative ends undertakes coaching an integrated view of the language in use. Zemelman and Daniels (1988:33) supported such an academic stance when they addressed the student-writer saying, "....if you practice the process model of writing in its pure form, you will inevitably be drawn into a more integrated, whole-language approach to teaching, you will be designing and conducting class activities that are not just writing, but that weave writing together with reading, speaking, listening, literature and language study. You will be creating integrated, holistic
language activities that naturally implement many of the principles". To be more in pursuance with fact findings, what has been advocated regarding the process approach in features five and six may be well subordinated and coordinated. Zemelman and Harvey (1988:239) will be once more quoted elucidating that, "integrated activities share a number of essential characteristics". All are inductive experiences that provide a progressive deepening engagement with the material at hand. All involve a rhythmic alternation among various classroom grouping, cognitive processes and purpose and modes of language use.

While the content may be provided by the teacher, student-writers are helped to find personally significant connections and implications in the material. Students' writing may range from expressive to transactional to poetic within a single activity.

On the other hand, we may refer to one characteristic forwarded by Emig (1976) cited in Zemelman and Daniels (1988:18 ) in reference to model based product oriented approach specifying succinctly that in product paradigm "writers must be taught atomistically, mastering small parts and subskills before attempting whole piece of writing" whereas in process approach, the four models speaking,
writing, listening and reading are mutually supportive and are not artificially separated in the classes supervised.

The conclusion worked out goes without saying contributing that the product oriented approach to writing "encourages the acquisition of discrete specific skills" whereas the language skills in the process paradigm are treated in "an undifferentiated manner" (Stern, 1983) abiding to integration in treating language refers to (Krashen & Seliger 1975) feature termed "multiple channel" approach which stresses the combination of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

To sum up, process oriented approach to writing through technical practices proves to be [-molecular]; -molar whereas the product paradigm in giving up to an atomistic approach in treating and handling language is found to be [+molecular]; +molar.

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

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

Tony Silva (1990) from a process perspective stresses
that "writing is a complex, recursive and creative process
or a set of behaviors", it needs to be internally habitualized
to experience from time to time the retarding fro and back
nature of writing. Flower and Hayes (1981) precedently
contributed to the non-linear perspective of acquiring such a
skill by exposing the processes of writing "to be
hierarchically organized with component process embedded
with other components". To define a hierarchical system, it
is one in which a large working system such as composing
can subsume other less inclusive systems, such as
generating ideas which in turn contain still other systems.
Unlike those in a linear organization, the events in a
hierarchical process are not inflexibly and rigidly fixed in a
non-pliable order. Consequently, it is quite common to find
a given process to be recalled upon at any time and to be
embedded within another instance of itself. Naturally and
quite predictably process known to be hierarchical and
admitting recurring embedded subprocesses is powerful
and diverse in its implementations owing to its flexibility and elasticity to display infinite possibilities and variations. It provides the student-writers with countless likely operations and technicalities to be swingingly, rotatively multiplying the process. This empowers the student-writers manifest a great deal of activities with only a few relatively simple processes. Basically, this generative process privileged the process writers try to posses exercise can be worked out through simultaneous oft-occurring triplet (processes of planning, translating and reviewing).

Revision; accordingly, depending on what has been stated so far, cannot be postulated to be a solitary activity packed within a single phase in the act of composing. On the contrary, it is considered to be a thinking process of evaluation and criticism processes that may be rewinded and reverted to any time a student-writer makes up his/her mind to recapitulate his/her own text. Summing it up, this type of writing strategy in which an entire process is embedded within a larger or smaller instance of itself, is technically known as recursion which generates writing in process.

Obviously, the product centered paradigm with its insistent emphasis on fragmentory syntagmatic linearity of
the trilogy of writing activity in fact denies the retrospective generative nature of the writing processes and subprocesses. Such a writing orthodoxicism will, of course, indisputably finalize on ending up with an non-hardened untenderized rough type of a text-product. Needless to say, the writing product manufactured output undergoing a non-retrospective forward (no backward) linearity betrays more ruts and loops due to having missed the rehabilitating, the reconstructive, the recursive cyclical treatments and attending to taxonomical criticism and evaluations. In fact abiding by the true nature of writing, some minor or major writing stages occasionally need to be doubly or triply or more and more times applied in unspecified sessions to have the evolving text matured or perfected. Murray (1989:3) unconsciously describes his own writing behavior highlighting on the inherent significant role of a subprocess as revision admitting that, "I rarely read what I write and when I do I usually feel total despair or a compulsion to revise. I cannot type my own final drafts, or I would change everything".

The last point here in fact is that the process oriented approach to writing can be announced to have won the label of [+cyclic] while the product-based one due to its unparadigmatic linearity is of a [-cyclic] nature.
8) **Divergent versus Non-divergent**: whether the method encourages the acquisition of discrete specific skills or treats the language skills in an undifferentiated manner.

**B) Linguistic Features:**

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

Luckily, as far as process theory of writing is concerned what the researches embarked on or have done to date, has gone so far in pinpointing, framing and promulgating some details concerning the universals of writing. Almost all the properties of process writing constitute mechanisms indicating explicitly those writing universals to be potentially realized existent and virtually present. The idea that the writing cycle is purely recursive is not a property that can be privatized or nomopolized by a particular language. In fact, the skill is inevitably, whether consciously or unconsciously exercised automatically operates in a non-linear shuttle back and forward manner. Such a crucial feature is an inherently non detachable criterion to which writing in all languages of the world
unanimously abides by. This premise can be undoubtedly manifested and settled when universals of writing are realized to be engaged in the unconscious processes (Emig 1971). Moverover, the process approach attends to writing as a skill that can be best supported and developed by following unsystematically the ungraded, multiply jumbled haphazardly unstepped stages of prewriting - drafting - revision, all writers voluntarily or involuntarily in a cyclical spiral manner comply with.

Product oriented approach on the other hand by focusing on the linguistic and rhetorical characteristic patterns of structures of written language undertakes the position of treating languages as something unique specific and particular that must be contrastively observed. Due to the fact that the product oriented approach is also termed as a "parallel writing model" (White 1988), it naturally encourages the analysis of the text to find out the features of form, content, and organization, say English, Urdu or Farsi, so followed to let a model to be genuinely reproduced. The concern in such a model based approach is to capitalize on diverse details of each model deposits within the contrastive details of "a language" not "language" (Lyons, 1988). Hence the body of instruction
extended to teachers are not of a universal category binding all languages human beings interacting with, rather, they explicitly exercise distinction highlighting on the discriminating specificities, particularities and uniquenesses of "a language" (Lyons, 1988). Consequently, from the viewpoint of such an approach to writing, these points can be conclusively inferred: First, writing is nothing but a matter of arrangement. Second, learning to write patronizes the performance of identifying, internalizing and implementing the specifically denominated patterns in the models provided.

Quite expectedly in line with such assertions process approach to writing is proudly privileged to enjoy the prestige of being a universal attendant a pro ["+general"] as well as being recommended for acting versus to particularists' being [non-general] i.e. - general.

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

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

The term "syllabus" refers to a "form in which linguistic content is specified in a course or a method" (Richards and Rodgers, 1985:2). The term is found to be more affiliated with product oriented methods than those which are labelled as process-oriented. The product-modelling approach abides to "a priori" syllabus which is usually determined and prepared in advance. It necessarily follows an organized systematic pre-programming in
selecting, sequencing, grading and presenting the relevant subject matter to be virtually utilized in developing language skills, namely writing. In other words, needless to say, this by adopting a ladder deductive strategy explicitly approaches the skill of writing.

'Syllabus' as a term, on the contrary is rarely used in process-oriented methods in which a secondary role is allocated to language content. In process neither linguistic content nor subject matter are specified in advance.

Learners are left alone free to choose topics not abiding to a sequence of orderliness, but possibly governed by the compulsion of emerging needs to satisfy fulfilling writing for real purposes. To find out what linguistic content had in fact been generated and practised during a course is what really concerns the process approach which is quite geared to a 'posteriori' approach in syllabus design. The syllabus accordingly will be derived from and determined by examining the lesson protocols i.e. "a course is prepared after it has been taught as a record of the language and activities used in the course". (Richards, platt and platt, 1992:21) process approach in congruence with what has been mentioned can be evidently inferred to be abiding to an implicit, inductive, retrospective procedure in displaying
material and assigning tasks within the framework of its educational policy.

Moreover, in terms of theories of language, the product-modelling approach conforms to a structural view of language in monitoring teaching and learning as mastering its grammatical units: clauses, phrases and sentences, or grammatical operations, adding, shifting, joining and transformation, or lexical items. Structure and content words. Process approach on the other hand, is strictly dominated by an interactional view of language according to which language is treated as a medium of interpersonal relations to initiate and enhance the performance of social interactions between student-individuals. In compliance with such an approach, the content of a writing programme is written and organized and it may be left unmentioned or unspecified but to be found restricted and adapted to learners' or interactors' interest or it can be derived from patterns of exchange and interaction.

As it has been formerly referred to process approach to writing is considered a whole language programme satellite, particularly in the case of extending to each student a total kind of respect. Such a humanistic type of intention which eventually involves the student-writers in
determining their own private curriculum by themselves is coupled with the respect for the student with that of teachers (Rigg, 1991:527). This phenomenon has led to interactive performances engaging students and teachers in administering collaborative activities governed by undirected, unprescribed unpredictable content, while simultaneously altered to be adequately responsive to immediate, not looked-forward to real class needs. Besides the full respect for students and teachers as researchers and syllabus designers, the process approach advocates blading awarenesses as regarding students' diversity, the clear understanding of which calls for an individual grasp of students needs, styles and purposes. This view presupposes that not all approaches and procedures might apply to ESL/EFL (Raimes, 1991:421-422) of which student writers are not an exception. Assisted by hard evidences as such, process is identified to be unsystematic violating purposefully orderliness by resisting gradation and allocating language content to its trainees whereas the product-modelling paradigm is contrarily schemetized to conduct its writing classrooms.

11) **Unified versus non-unified**: Whether the method attempts to build up a total structure of language or it deals with each rule in isolation.
Process theory of writing has been developed out of a global understanding of language rather than messing up with local items of interest. One of the major aims advocated by the approach is to liberate the student writers from remaining shackled in dealing with the segments of language motivating them to boldly trespass the borders of commas and points in embracing or separating the syntactic structures and elevating themselves in writing to from a sentence level or a discoursal level of ties with student-writers "adhering to precise rules for writing" which was often more of a hinderance than help in the actual generation of a text (Arndt, 1987:262). Teachers are strictly advised to extend their assistance to student-writers in defining through the written medium their own communicative purposes and to "select appropriate writing tasks and introduce relevant modes for stimulus, guidance and support (Watson, 1982:13). Apparently, Zamels' (1983) least skilled research subject view writing as a static transcription of a "series of parts, words, sentences, paragraphs" rather than the creation of "whole discourse".

(Sommer, 1982:151). Hence process approach to writing allocates evaluation in responding to composition i.e. a "method of evaluating writing in which the
composition is viewed as a whole rather than as distinct parts" (Richards, platt, platt, 1992: 167).

As a conclusion it can be allegedly claimed that the process approach is identified as to be assuming a holistic approach in considering language whereas the product one is atomistic, caring to segregate language into components.

Hence the feature [+unified] can be allotted to the former and the [-unified] to the latter.

Eventually, mainly depending on Dipietro and Bosco's (1970) a markedness-based geared to (+) or (-) value displaying the eleven features: eight psychological and three of linguistic nature. These features can instantly and holistically facilitate the arduous tasks of orienting teachers as well as students with the minor and major details of the qualitative specificities of the two approaches: process and product already discussed.
(TABLE - I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideographic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molar</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides Bosco and Dipitros' (1970) inventory of features exploited to consistently analyse and describe the process approach, Krashen and Sleiger (1975), too, passed on their octagonal inventory of features regarding methods.
of teaching. By introducing a cluster of eight features, they provide a schematic plan according to which the common properties of methods of teaching can be accurately inspected; thus intelligent awareness in this reference can be instantly acquired on demand. Some of the features proposed by Krashen and Seliger (1975) are found to be partially or totally overlapping with Bosco and Dipietro’s (1970). The cluster of eight features found in Krashen and Seliger’s list, on close detection can be classified as psychological and linguistic in category as it has been done with Bosco and Dipietro list of features. Cited in Stern (1983:488-491) the features worked out by Krashen and Sleiger (1975) are marked with (+) or (-) values stated as below:

1) Discrete

2) Deductive

3) Explicit

4) Sequence

6) Exercise

7) Extent of control

8) Feedback

---------±
As it has been mentioned by Stern (1983:488-491) most of the features given on both lists: Bosco and Dipietro (1970), and Krashen and Seliger (1975) are well observed to be redundantly overlapping. The overlappings detected on both lists are attempted to be vividly displayed on the table provided here below:

**TABLE: II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krashen and Seliger's features</th>
<th>Nature of relation</th>
<th>Bosco and Dipietro's features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 + Discrete point</td>
<td>OLW</td>
<td>Divergent vs. Non divergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified vs. Non unified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Molar vs. Non molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + Discrete point</td>
<td>OLW</td>
<td>Nomothetic vs. Non nomothetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 + Explicit</td>
<td>OLW</td>
<td>Nomothetic vs. Non nomothetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 + Sequence</td>
<td>OLW</td>
<td>Systematic vs. Non-systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Performance channel multiple vs. single</td>
<td>OLW</td>
<td>Divergent vs. Non-divergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Exercise type: focus on vs. focus away</td>
<td>OLW</td>
<td>Central vs. Non-central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Extent of control: Error avoidance vs. error tolerance</td>
<td>NCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Feedback: error corrected vs. error ignored</td>
<td>NCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OLW: Stands for "Over lapping with", NCB: Stands for "Not covered by"
Krashan and Seliger's (1995) model for universal feature analysis of methods depending on table (II) displaying overlappings can also be utilized to have both process and product writing approaches contrastively analyzed and described by quite a different set of jargons.

Consequently, process approach to writing can be described as follows:

1. discrete point
2. deductive
3. explicit
4. sequence
5. + multiple performance channel
   - single performance channel
6. + focus away exercise type
   - focus on exercise type
7. + error tolerance extent of control
   - error avoidance extent of control
8. + error ignored feedback
Whereas product approach complies with quite a contradictory set of features as they are found below:

1. + discrete point
2. + explicit
3. + deductive
4. + sequence
5. + single performance channel
   - multiple performance channel
6. + focus on exercise type
   - focus away exercise type
7. + error avoidance extent of control
   - error tolerance extent of control
8. + error corrected feedback
   - error ignored feedback
Accordingly Table (III) is worked out to explicitly bring such a sharp contrastive study into a kind of comprehensive display:

*(TABLE - III)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krashen and Seliger's Product</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discrete point</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deductive</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequence</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance channel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single performance channel</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple performance channel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercise type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus away</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extent of control:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error avoidance</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error tolerance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>errors ignored</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>errors corrected</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of such a kind of contrastive matching accountancy of two sets of features recently tabled and due to their being redundantly overlapping each with its cognate, to achieve full non-fragile consistency, six out of the eight proposed by Krashen and Seliger (1975) will be deleted. Two more significant features, accordingly, will be added to the previous list of eleven, making it up to reach thirteen.

Those features can be practically utilized so as to have process writing consistently defined and described as compared reluctantly with the modelling product writing. Although the feature feedback (i.e. error corrected verus error ignored) is not classified by Krashen and Seliger (1975) as a significant distinguishing factor, but it has been included since it can be worked out as a crucial determinant in explicitly classifying process theory of writing besides dramatically comparing it with the model product one. The couple of features “extent of control” and “feed-back” due to their affective appealings will be accounted for as of psychological category to be added to the previous eight-ones found on Bosco and Dipietros’ (1970) list to work it out, 10. This evidently shows how ESL & EFL teaching and learning and certainly writing as a skill is radically and psychologically oriented activity.
With such an inventory of combined sets of features (Dipietro and Bosco, 1970 - Krashen and Seliger 1975) which can concisely and specifically explain and describe each method and its role in second language teaching, all controversies naturally emerging due to diverse scholastic viewpoints can be unbiasedly neutralized or settled.

Luckily, the combined sets of feature inventories was profoundly examined to have its relevancy tested in passing on to us the unique properties of both process and product approaches to teaching writing, chiefly depending on the empirical procedure of markedness explored by the scholars involved in research enterprises. Undoubtedly, this speculative, explorative style of interpreting the two approaches to writing accommodates, theorists, scholars as well as teachers and students with new choices and alternatives in defining and assessing the real situation of the writing industry. As far as methods of teaching are concerned, the whole project has been initiated to overcome and suppress the separateness and restrictiveness (Stern, 1983:482-491) whereas with the two methods it discovers the essential common features underlying all language pedagogy, it can be found significantly functional in alluding to separateness and
restrictiveness of both model-product and cognitive process paradigms. It can be simply expected that the application of two sets of features collapsed in one though both labelled to be partly unsystematic by Stern (1983:482-491) provides a coherent comprehensive background to evaluate more realistically the trend of language teaching.

But as far as our purpose is concerned, the collapse of those two sets of features disclosed a sharp contrastive gap between a couple of seemingly not adequately explored, contradictory approaches to the complicated skill of writing. Those hostilities hopefully will be worked out as two approaches complementing each other in principles which can lead the specialization of teaching writing skill to abundantly prosper.

The couple of unoverlapping features derived from Krashen and Seliger (1975) list are 'Extent of control' and 'Feedback'. These two features due to their being significant but not redundant are added to hold a discussion unveiling how process and product as two approaches to skillful writing can be analysed and assessed in reference to such feature analysis point of view.
12) Extent of control: Whether the possibility of learners' errors is avoided or not.

Luckily, the studies undertaken in reference to 'error analysis' and 'interlanguage' brought about a positive outlook on the role of significant errors. It has been assumed that without providing the chance of errors, the learner cannot develop his own internalized standards of correctness (Stern, 1983:490). Process theory of writing in adopting a cognitive stance in dealing with language believes offering more freedom to students to experience their creativities and in doing so, the golden chances of learning by errors are correspondingly increased. In free writing, student-writers are strongly advised to practice in classrooms embarking on composition courses so as to provoke ideas and to gather that amount of information required which is mainly employed during the prewriting stage to lower student-writers hard labour to get started. Student-writers while involved in the process of writing are advised to write unconditionally and non-defensively, giving up most of the retarding reservations they undergo while actively busy writing. They are encouraged rather than spoiling the golden opportunities provided to comply with such instructive requirements, to have the sweet dreams of
writing creatively fulfilled in the form of an unpredictable original text. On the other hand, the product-oriented approach by strictly observing correctness standards targets a never-can-be-realized ideal error-free text. In a process-sympathetic course student-writers involved in freewriting are encouragingly advised not to "plan organize, revise or proofread" they write (Man and Man, 1989:5). Clouse (1992:13) reminds the student-writers to "remember the emphasis in freewriting is on free, "so they have not to be side tracked with" grammer, spelling, logic or neatness". In fact by inviting the student-writers to freewrite, they are stimulated to reflect their fluent opinions during the opportunities they will be granted with the possibility of making inevitably occurring errors. In fact most of the thought stimulating techniques such as brainstorming, clustering, cubing, looping besides freewriting let such constructive opportunities occur, resulting in records of advantageous rewarding errors. Attracting the scholar's attention to the significance of Learners' errors in enhancing the development of the writing abilities, process theory of writing fosters a kind of viewpoint which privileges student-writers to exercise their abilities globally aiming mainly at uninhibited meaningful communication. Accordingly errors are not looked upon as
hindering agents which that in the student writers' benefit should be best avoided. A writing programme as such, propagating non blocking non-detering strategies and policies, cannot be affiliated with error avoidance academic advocacy. On the contrary student-writers within the process agenda have been encouraged to exercise all types of freedom in time and topics thus inviting them to be involved in real interactive communicative activities without being preprogrammed to minimize, lower or escape the significant possibility of making errors.

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

The feature in question due to its inconsistency as a discriminatory factor has been denied the privilege of being accounted for as an absolute property, but it has been considered and included in our process approach feature analysis list due the fact that it is capable of functioning as a significant denominator in coming up with a comprehensive appraisal of such an approach. The sub-topic of feedback is a salient factor according to which both approaches: process and product can be illustratively explained and contrastively analysed. Feedback when treated as whether errors corrected or errors 'ignored' can distinctly demarcate the two approaches in terms of exclusive properties.
Zamel (1985) repudiates teachers attending to surface-level features of writing; those that seem to read and react to a text as a series of separate pieces of sentence level or even clause level rather than as whole unit of discourse. In fact they are so distracted by language related problems that they often without realizing that there is a much larger meaning related problem worthy of being curiously considered but that they have failed to address. Some scholars expressed their worries about some other teachers approaching students texts as final products to evaluate and base their evaluations on preconceived and fixed notions about good writing (Sommers 1985). Although it cannot be absolutely asserted that process writing completely ignores whatsoever error emerging. It may be put forward that it is extremely radical in abiding to a biased strategy in overlooking them. Process agenda verifies such an assertion when readers are referred to statements proclaiming that “a premature focus on correctness and usage gives students the impression that language form, rather than how language functions is what is important and may discourage them from making further serious attempts” (Zamel, 1983). When the composing process is identified in every book concerned as non-linear, exploratory and generative process whereby student writers discover and formulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning. Hence “If we prompt the writers' control by ignoring intended
meaning in favor of formal and technical flaws, we also remove the incentive to write and the motivation to improve skills" (Branon and Knoblauch (1982:165) cited in Zamel, 1983). This witty allusion supports process writing in its quite humanistic implication when we are referred to student-writers not blamed for committing linguistic errors; not pathological to meaningful communication. Actually they are empirically appreciated for their systematic privileges they exercise in attending to an evolving approximative language manifested in writers’ $L_2$ interlanguage system.

Brown (1986) tried purposefully to illuminate on the inevitability of an error-oriented agenda which cannot be compromised in anyway. He mentions that

"Human learning is fundamentally a process that involves the making of mistakes..... children learning their first language make countless mistakes..... Many of these mistakes are logical in the limited linguistic system within which children operate their writing abilities, but by carefully processing feedback from others, such children slowly but surely learn to produce what is acceptable speech in their native language. Second language learning is a process that is clearly not unlike first language learning in its trial and error nature. Inevitably learners make mistakes in the process of acquisition, and indeed will even impede that process if they do not commit errors and then benefit in turn from various feedback on those errors". But he adds that "There is a danger in too much attention to learners' errors. While
errors are indeed revealing of a system at work, the classroom foreign language teacher can become so preoccupied with noticing errors that the correct utterances in the second language go unnoticed. In our observation and analysis of errors for all that they do reveal about the learner - we must beware of placing too much attention on errors, and not lose sight of the value of positive reinforcement of clear, free communication while administering of errors is an important criterion for increasing language proficiency, the ultimate goal of second language learning is the attainment of communicative fluency in a language.” (Brown, 1986: 170-171).

Likewise, process school of writing in its guidance inventory openly alludes to ignoring errors so as to secure a higher level of accomplishment; a discoural grasp of language, an objective the negligence of which frustrated for long the experience of language teaching and learning as a result the development of the skill of writing turned out to become a discouraging experience. In a comparative pairing. Raimes (1991:410) asserts that “where linguistic accuracy was formerly emphasized from the start, it is now often downplayed, at least at the beginning of the process, delayed until writers have grappled with ideas and organization”. Process writing can be discussed to be one of the extensions of a more general umbrella school of educational thought as whole language (Zemelman and Daniels, 1988:14-17) of which most of its advocacies have been derived. Such a rewarding cumulative dependency flourished the new emerging process paradigm in
inaugurating a humanistic chapter within the scope of teaching and learning the writing skill. Inspired by the whole language cap, the writing workshop approach postpones the correction of errors to the republication step of editing; this frees both students and teachers to concentrate on matters of content, organization and style (Rigg, 1991:526).

Finally, summing the whole discussion up, implied process oriented approach can be found to be credited the positive humanistic affective points of being biased to ignoring errors, thus letting the curriculum bestow its assistances upon the student-writers by furnishing them with the favourable opportunities of assessing the fit between their plans and the product (Perl 1979, Sommers 1980, Flower and Hayes 1981). The product modelling approach, on the contrary, is exclusively involved to highlighting surface-level errors of local consideration, thus ignoring great expectations with global achievements. Needless to say these tendencies with the product modelling approach forces the student-writers intentionally or unintentionally to rarely “rescan large segments of their work” (Raimes, 1983:230). The detailed story of product-process feature analysis is worked out through Table No.(IV)to wholistically reflect the contrastive enterprise. This time both dipierto and Boscos’ (1970) and Krashen and Seligers’ combined features to provide furthther an overall general orientation of the whole process-product explorative comparative discussion.
TABLE - (IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Product Oriented</th>
<th>Process Oriented</th>
<th>Bosso &amp; Dispietro</th>
<th>Krashen &amp; Seliger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideographic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molar</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Extent of Control: error avoidance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Feedback: error ignored error focussed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having examined the thirteen features utilized to describe process and product approaches to writing, one can readily grasp the primacy of psychological factors in accounting for the distinctive characteristics of both process and product approaches. Apparently, ten out of the thirteen features exploited in the analysis and description of the approaches mentioned in the teaching and learning the skill of writing are identified to be purely
psychological whereas the remaining three can be referred to as to be of linguistic nature or category. The priority of psychology in role and value can be easily felt with process approach to writing whether marked as (-) or (+) indiscriminately as well. Process approach is found to be -molar -divergent systematic -extent of control and -error focused. Those features when interpreted in detail are found to be as positive points process approach is privileged with. For instance, 'process does not develop a programme in which the possibility of error occurrence will be almost reduced to minimum since correct sentence structure is not entertained as an essential factor to develop writing competency. Accordingly, errors in process writing are not avoided and learners writing are not controlled to prevent them from making errors. Process approach to writing in consequence, can be claimed to be granted constructive intentions whether it is marked of (-) or (+) value category. As a conclusion, product-based approach to writing can be described as [-functional -central -affective -nomothetic -ideographic +molar -cyclic +divergent -general +systematic -unified +extent of control +error focused]. On the other hand our approach in question, process writing enjoys the privilege of being accounted for in features as [+functional +central +affective +nomothetic +ideographic -molar +cyclic -divergent +general -systematic +unified +extent of control -error focused].
The features accounted for in describing both approaches cannot be found as sharing characteristics and process and product are not found to be sharing similar identical characteristics. They are in fact absolutely contrastive in properties, a case which makes us believe that the integration of the two paradigms simultaneously is almost impossible. Despite such hasty inference all efforts will be spent to sapiently and coherently let these two trends meet in part (V). Besides, the study done can help teachers to economically and concisely assimilate the whole writing dichotomy, thus enabling themselves even to spot their stances in the domain of writing whether they are of product category or of process origin.

In this way, the clan of writing teachers can willingly and enthusiastically submit themselves to a libration exodus from the demotivating, inhibiting shackles of product to the non-threatening uncritical non-defensive atmosphere of the unpredictable process where student-writers can focus on creating writing that has form and structure, the composing processes of good writers i.e. means rather than ends.

In process theory student-writers who develop explicit awareness in process particulars by being exposed to such accurate objective, complete contrastive canons can facilitate a shift to process focused classrooms; in fact, a shift from language
focused activities to learner-centered tasks in which students can assume greater control over what they write, how they write it, and the evaluation of their own writing.

Accordingly, by supportive authentic inference we conclude that process approach is strongly identified as a purly affective psychological approach strictly a biding to the obligations of human nature and the requirements of the age.
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