4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives an account of the various approaches to the teaching of writing commonly adopted by teachers of English in the classroom. It discusses in detail the process approach to writing, establishing its advantages over the others in imparting writing skills to the learners.

In colleges, the teaching of writing has always been oriented towards preparing the students for the examinations. Since grammar exercises based on the transformation of sentences (Direct-Indirect, Active-Passive, etc.), correction of sentences, precis writing, expansion of an outline into a story, and writing a general essay form an important part of the examination pattern, the classroom writing exercises have also been based on them. Sentence-level grammar exercises have been a part of the approach to writing, since apart from fulfilling the examination requirement, they are believed to lead to the development of writing skills. To make the task easier, composition work-books have been used by the teachers.
These books are either prepared by the members of the Department of English in a particular college or brought out by the local publishers. They have all the exercises listed above.

In this examination-oriented approach to writing, students are required to write exercise after exercise in the class and the teacher’s job is only to dot the pages with red marks for errors. For precis writing, there would be a model with instructions on how to write one, and for writing essays, there would be guidelines for the students to follow while attempting to write essays on their own. The teacher’s performance is also evaluated on the basis of the number of note-books and exercises he has corrected. Thus the examination system dictates the classroom approach to the teaching of writing.

4.1 CONTROLLED - TO - FREE APPROACH

The Audio-Lingual Method of teaching a second language laid primary stress on speech, and writing was used to reinforce speech in that it ensured mastery of grammatical and syntactic forms. In this approach, students are first given sentence-level exercises, then paragraphs to copy or manipulate grammatically. They work on the materials given and perform rigidly prescribed operations until they achieve a mastery over the appropriate language. They are then allowed to attempt some free compositions. The teacher
thus ensures that the students write a great deal and yet do not make errors. Since the students are led from a controlled to a free stage of writing, the approach is called the Controlled-to-Free Approach and it stresses three features of writing, namely, grammar, syntax, and mechanics. It emphasises accuracy rather than fluency or originality (Raimes 1983:7). The teacher also finds it easier and quicker to mark the compositions because the students have very little scope for making mistakes.

4.2 FREE-WRITING APPROACH

The Free-Writing Approach encourages the students to write, giving free rein to their flow of thoughts. The teacher assigns a vast amount of free writing on given topics with only minimal correction of errors. Once the topic is given, the students put on paper whatever comes to their mind. They need not give any thought to form, organization, or grammatical accuracy. They gather the dust too with the gold ores only to separate them at leisure. Here fluency of writing is stressed. One advantage of this approach is that the students "perceive that they already have a visible record of their reflections and ideas on the subject. This, they see, is preferable to beginning from a blank page" (Raimes 1987:39). It is believed by the practitioners of this approach that the beginning or intermediate-level students should concentrate on content and fluency first
and not worry about form, and that, once ideas are put down on the page, grammatical accuracy, organization and the other aspects of writing will follow.

4.3 PARAGRAPH-PATTERN APPROACH

The Paragraph-Pattern Approach stresses the organization of ideas with topic sentences and supporting ideas instead of grammatical accuracy or fluency of content. Students are given model passages to copy, imitate or analyse so that they can attempt writing a similar passage themselves. This approach is based on the principle that people in different linguistic communities organize information differently and that the students must be consciously taught those specific ways of organizing ideas in that language. The advantage of organizing one's ideas is that

the reader can more easily follow and understand a writer's ideas when they are clearly separated into neat units or parcels. When a writer's ideas are heaped together in one untidy mass, the reader can neither follow nor understand them easily, and often refuses to try (Chaplen 1970: Preface).

The students are required to rearrange jumbled sentences in order, identify or supply topic sentences, insert or remove sentences from a passage in terms of their relevance, and
develop given topics or topic sentences into paragraphs using illustrations, examples or specific details.

4.4 MODELS APPROACH

The Models Approach to writing has been followed by teachers and even task-oriented course books on writing make use of model texts. Model passages are used to control the direction of students' writing and it is believed that this way of 'controlled writing' provides a functional perspective within which the writing has to be developed.

Models are also extensively used for imitation. Students study a passage, make an outline of the content, or analyse it before writing another piece with a similar organizational pattern (Reid and Lindstrom 1985:81). In other instances, the students read an essay, for instance, one classifying attitudes towards money, analyse its organizational pattern, and write another essay, such as a classification of attitudes towards work or travel, using a similar strategy of writing (Smalley and Ruetten 1986:230-31).

Exposure to models serves the purpose of familiarising the students with the sentence patterns of the target language, and the forms and conventions of writing. Students also manipulate the given passages to practise other sentence patterns and organizational
structures. They convert the first person reporting in the passage given to a second or even third person reporting, manipulate tenses, report the same incident from the points of view of other characters in it, attempt a similar passage with a different theme and content, etc. Sometimes a cloze test is prepared modelled on the original. If students are familiar with the original, they would be able to fill in the blanks in the cloze test as well.

The advantages of exposure to models are many. They familiarize non-native speakers "with rhetorical forms perceived as specifically English, weaning them from the rhetorical patterns of their first language" (Raimes 1987:37). Writing formal and informal letters and reports of various kinds requires an adherence to conventions of form and usage, and in such cases the models acquaint the learners with these conventions. Students imbibe the patterns of the many genres of writing when served with the appropriate models.

Keh (1991) used model passages to focus the students' attention on some specific points of grammar and vocabulary. She identified the common errors among the students and, after determining the frequency of the errors and analysing the probable cause for them, devised passages to present the students with examples of correct usage. The following example given by her shows the use of the
contrastive transition 'on the other hand'. The passage was further analysed to illustrate the use of 'furthermore' in contrast with 'on the other hand', since her students had some confusion about the distinction between them.

We may observe that the animal communication systems are closed, whereas human languages are open-ended. When bees communicate, they will only be able to exchange variants of the same message - in what direction the nectar is and how far away. Apes cannot communicate freely about anything for which they do not have a specific signal, and even in those cases the possibilities are extremely restricted. People, on the other hand, can talk about anything they can observe or imagine. Furthermore, what they can say on any topic is almost unlimited (p.19).

Models become vital when the teaching of writing is language-focussed and writing is a means of reinforcing the language already dealt with in the spoken form. Since the emphasis is on correctness, there is a strict adherence to the models. Even when the focus changes from the language structures to be learnt to the rhetorical features to be mastered, models come in useful for analysis and imitation. Students study a model, manipulate it, and then produce a parallel text using their own information (White 1988).
This model-based approach is quite popular because the teaching of writing is often product-oriented and the mastery of the conventions of writing is what is expected of the learners.

In this approach, however, students never give thought to the ways and means by which the product is arrived at. They see "form as a mold into which content is somehow poured", resulting "in mindless copies of a particular organizational plan or style". Moreover, the model "stultifies and inhibits writing rather than empowering them or liberating them" (Escholz 1980:24, in White 1988:6).

Further, the students perceive a dichotomy between form and content as two distinctive and separable units. They also assume that their writing will be judged not on the ideas they present but on how closely the organization of their composition imitates the model. They thus impose the skeleton of the model on to their content (Raimés 1987:38).

In all these approaches, the concern of the teacher and the taught is with 'the product', 'the finished text'. This is what is subjected to correction and evaluation. Even in evaluation, it is 'accuracy' that is given precedence and priority over 'fluency'.
4.5 COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

The Communicative Approach to language teaching (CLT) came as a reaction to the structure-based approach, in which language is taught by giving the students practice in basic structures, sometimes through situation-based illustrations. The advocates of CLT considered it inadequate and saw the need to focus in language teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures.

CLT "pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language, combining these into a more fully communicative use" (Littlewood 1981:1). To take an example, 'Would you please lend me your pen?' or 'Why don't you take the evening train?', are interrogatives structurally speaking, but as far as their communicative functions are concerned, they are requests or imperatives. Since the relationship between form and function is uncertain, the learner must be given opportunities to explore the language in real-life or simulated life situations. While in the structural-situational approach, the structure is given the focus, in the communicative approach, the communicative function or aspect of the language is given the focus.
Language learning, thus, is learning to communicate effectively. The learners learn the intricacies of the target language system through their efforts to communicate in it. This ability to use the linguistic system effectively and appropriately is the goal of language learning. Teachers help the learners in ways to work with the language in life or simulated life situations. Accuracy is judged with reference to the social context rather than in the abstract, and fluency is the primary aim. Pair and group work among students are encouraged to gain an insight into reader-reaction (Finocchiaro and Brumfit 1983). Learning a language is therefore developing 'a communicative competence' (a term developed by Hymes 1972) and acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions in varied social contexts.

In the classroom, the teacher must devise activities that involve the learners in real communication and in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks. The activities are thus task-oriented. For instance, an activity would involve a set of pictures, similar in content but with a few distinguishing features. One learner may have a duplicate copy of one of the pictures and another learner must find out the details of the picture by asking questions.
Pictures in the form of drawings, photographs, posters, slides, tables, charts, and maps form a rich treasure-mine of interesting and situation-oriented activities - the sketch of a house-plan to write a description, the photograph of somebody in action to describe an activity, a few pictures in sequence to write a story, a table of information to write about facts, a map to write about a locality. Pictures provide "a) a shared experience in the classroom, b) a need for common language forms to use, c) a variety of tasks, and d) a focus of interest for students" (Raimes 1983: 20).

To give an example, the diagram of a village (Appendix - C) can be used for a writing activity. The students may be asked to describe the village - the location of the various landmarks like the temple, the post-office, the cinema hall, etc.. Dialogues may be designed as follows:

1. A man gets down at the bus stop on the main highway. You are a villager standing at the entrance to the village office. On enquiry from the stranger as to the way to the school, you give him the directions to reach the place, mentioning any landmark on the way. Write it in the form of a dialogue.

2. You are a guest to a relative of yours in the village. You happen to meet in the post-office an old
friend of yours. Write a dialogue in which you include the following details besides what you think necessary to make the dialogue interesting and natural in about 100 words — your friend invites you to his house the next day and gives directions to reach the place from the post-office. His house is opposite to the school in the housing colony.

The sketch provides the following advantages:

1. It provides an indirect but natural way of teaching structures (in communicative contexts) like descriptive statements, question forms/imperatives for enquiry, request, and invitation.

2. It provides a meaningful, real-life situation for a dialogue.

3. The diagram acts as a stimulus making the students think, find suitable vocabulary and expressions to describe the place and communicate the ideas. There is nothing vague about what they are attempting to say.

4. Before writing the exercise, they speak out. Necessary reformulation of sentences and grammatical corrections can be made orally so that they are not carried over to the written paper.

Communicative activities improve student motivation as the learners take part in communication and this gives
them a conception of language as a means of social interaction rather than as a structural system. They provide for natural learning as the students are involved in using language for communication. The communicative activity is thus an important part of the total learning process. It creates a context which supports learning, since it provides for positive personal relationships among learners, and between the learners and the teacher (Littlewood 1981:17).

The Communicative Approach basically entails the students asking themselves the two questions: 'Why am I writing this piece/text?' and 'Who would be the reader?' Generally, they write for tests or examinations and hence the teacher is almost always the only reader or the audience. In the Communicative Approach, however, the teacher gives a purpose to the writing tasks other than for the examinations and the readership is also extended to real readers in real-life situations. For instance, instead of merely asking the students to "describe your room at home", a purpose and an audience may be provided by rephrasing the task as follows: "You are writing to a pen pal (in an English-speaking country) and tell him/her about your room. You like your room, so you want to make it sound as attractive as possible" (Raimes 1983: 9). Thus, this approach gives purpose and audience awareness, crucial to writing to the classroom tasks.
4.6 PROCESS APPROACH

4.6.1 The notion of 'how', that is, 'How is the text arrived at?' is added to the 'why' and 'who' of CLT, that is, 'Why is the learner writing?' and 'Who is the reader of the text?', in the Process Approach to writing. The previous chapter dealt with the nature of the writing process, and it was explained on the basis of protocol analysis that it is a complex, non-linear, recursive process. The process approach entails the teacher guiding the learners through these various stages of writing. The focus is therefore shifted from the text produced or the end-product to the process or the learner's attempts at the various stages. The teacher takes the learner along the vital process of writing towards the product. It is this approach which takes into account all the stages described in the previous chapter, for it

sees writing as a process of several steps, beginning first with generating ideas (via various sources/methods), writing to discover what one wants to say, revising, getting feedback from various readers (between revisions), and writing again (Keh 1990: 10).

Why should there be a shift from the product to the process? It is erroneously assumed that the learners get
the ideas to put on paper once the topic is announced and a time-limit is set for the completion of the task. But the complex activity of writing involves thinking, knowledge of content, recall of content from long-term and short-term memory, discourse knowledge such as the organization of content as well as linguistic knowledge such as grammar, punctuation, and spelling, besides the vital factors of the purpose of writing and the audience addressed. The awareness of this complexity has led to the notion that the teacher, rather than look at the product, can facilitate the process to arrive at the product. The teacher is like a committed guide taking an eager tourist to historic spots for the tourist to come out with a neatly penned travelogue. Or the teacher is like a skilled master-craftsman who guides an apprentice through every step to master the skills to perfect the craft. The teacher helps in the process and the product takes care of itself.

Research studies and experiences of teacher-researchers have established the efficacy of the process approach. "The students come to understand writing as a means for intelligent inquiry, for exploring the world around them" (Zamel 1987: 704). Investigating the growth and change in students in the process-oriented classroom, it was found that the approach had not only
prompted more and better writing, but had helped the students feel more confident about their ability to write and succeed in other L2 activities. Writing, which for these students had represented an anxiety-producing, school-imposed activity, became important for its own sake, as a way of acquiring more language, as a way of learning and knowing (Diaz 1985, quoted in Zamel 1987: 705).

In a comparative study of product-based, mechanical correction focussed classroom and a learner-centred, process-oriented one with stress on fluency and appropriacy, it was found that in the former the students continued to view school work as a procedure for testing prescribed forms and accurate information. In stark contrast to this, the process approach helped build in the student an awareness of herself as a writer, gave her a sense of confidence and self-worth that served to counteract the negative influence of other schooling experiences, and enabled her to take risks as she attempted to articulate her thoughts and ideas in writing... (Further,) this approach, because it fostered an appreciation for writing as a means to explore and elaborate
meaning, was particularly effective in preparing students for the demands of academic writing (Hildembrant 1985, quoted in Zamel 1987: 706).

Since writing is an act of discovery (cf. Chapter III) and the final product is a surprise, it is a logical corollary that the teacher should merely facilitate the writing process of the students to arrive at the product rather than concern himself only with the product. The teacher thus is a facilitator and has to be resourceful enough to create a conducive atmosphere for learning to take place. The documentation of the classroom writing attitudes by Dunn, Florio-Ruane and Clark (1985), Newkirk's (1984) exploration of the writing experience of college freshman writers, and the work of Diaz, Moll and Mehan (1986), have highlighted the role of teachers in facilitating the writing process of the students. The teacher's encouraging role instead of a dominant one helps create a supporting atmosphere for the process approach to writing. The freedom that he gives them to write with ease creates in the students the discipline that is necessary to blossom into good writers.

With the shift in emphasis from product to process, model texts are used differently. In the model-based approach, learners analyse a text and study it for form, content, and organization. The linguistic and rhetorical
patterns are manipulated and the students produce a parallel text using their own information.

Study the model --> Manipulate elements --> Produce a parallel text.

In the communicative and process approaches, the model serves to make superficial corrections/changes. The new procedural model is:

Task specified --> Communicate as far as possible --> Study model --> Practice as necessary --> Recycle (White 1988).

Since the model is introduced at a later stage, it only serves as a guide to learn from, not for blind imitation.

The model helps the learners at the redrafting or the editing stage to modify the words or structures already used or to add some more. It may also exemplify an 'accurate' piece of writing. Since the students have already explored the topic on their own, they are hardly led to a blind imitation.

Models also help the learners in self-editing or self-evaluation. Where format or form is important, they are obligatory in the initial stage, and at later stages they help the learners focus on features of writing peculiar to the genre.
The process approach to writing views writing as a process of several stages: planning (pre-writing), drafting (during writing), and revising (post-writing). It is a systematic response to an essay prompt (Garrison 1985; Harris 1984; Moffett 1983). Any design of the process approach incorporates activities at the three stages — pre-writing, writing and revision. The following model (Flower and Hayes 1981:370) takes into account the task environment, the writing process, and the writer's long-term memory. The arrows indicate criss-crossing of information from one box or process to another and not any one-way circuit.

FIGURE 1
The process approach, thus, entails the following stages:

1. Input sessions/Pre-writing activities: The students are helped to generate ideas. They may brainstorm, collect data from texts, listen to lectures and make notes, etc.

2. They write the first draft: The students focus on content giving thought to the organization of ideas without minding the grammar or spelling. Premature attention to the latter impedes the flow of ideas.

3. Peer-evaluation or group work: The students may work in pairs or in groups, and exchange their note-books. The focus here is also on how clearly and effectively the ideas are presented with attention to grammar or structures only if they obstruct the organization or affect the clarity of ideas. Comments by the peers or the guidelines given by the teacher give an audience view of the text to the student so that the text could be suitably modified in the second draft.

4. Writing the second draft: The students write the second draft in the light of the comments and suggestions given.
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PROCESS LINE (Raines 1983:140-41)
5. Teacher-student sessions: The teacher looks for organization of content as well as grammatical structures. The common errors of the class may be taken up for remedial sessions on grammar.

6. Writing the final draft: The students write the final draft.

Viewed in this way, the approach can be defined as a multiple-draft process which consists of: generating ideas (pre-writing); writing a first draft with an emphasis on content (to 'discover' meaning/author's ideas); second and third (and possibly more) drafts to revise ideas and the communication of those ideas (Keh 1990a:294).

Raimes (1983:140-41) gives a process line as in the Diagram appended.

This approach will be useful not only for the imparting of the various skills of writing, but also to help students write project reports and fulfil other subject-specific needs. Of all academic writings, project work has come to be valued very much to assess the students' academic performance in a subject. "Project writing is an example of an activity which is directly relevant to target needs and yet provides the opportunity
for process-oriented language learning" (Bloor and John 1988:85). The Loyola Experiment in ELT included project work for the 'A' Stream (advanced level) students (cf. Chapter II).

The process approach to the writing of a project work at the University of Aston and Warwick needs special mention. It was a series of related processes that involved both the receptive and productive use of language: reading, reference, discussion, summarizing, etc. Its advantage was that it individualized the rate and nature of the learning, and enabled each student to use English in a context related to his specific field (Ibid., 1988:89).

The teacher's attitude to student errors and the way he responds to them are also crucial in the process approach to writing. The teacher's job is not merely to pass judgements on the quality of writing, but to find out how he could help the students improve on it.

Vague comments like 'good' or 'improve' tell the students nothing worthwhile. They need concrete suggestions for improvement, and necessary guidelines and checklists for self-editing. "Suggestions must be specific, giving directions that the student can follow, step by step" (Raimes 1983:143).
By far the most misleading notion about writing is given by teachers who, instead of stressing the 'wholeness' of a composition, emphasise the 'parts'. Students come to see writing as a simple process of stringing words together and grouping sentences into paragraphs. Though the sequence may be logical, this is not the way writing takes place (Corbin 1966:44).

In his approach to writing, the teacher should also stress fluency and appropriateness over accuracy and flawless grammatical forms, though the importance of the latter is not underestimated. This attitude to writing only disputes the belief that if the form of a sentence is flawless, the thought will automatically take care of itself. Rather, "the best sentences grow out of the clearest, most imaginative thinking; that even the best sentences can be improved". It attempts to suggest that "in judging students' writing, the quality of ideas expressed should be the primary concern and should account for the bulk of the credit" (Corbin 1966:41).

The teacher's role in facilitating learning to write through the various stages of the process makes for the learner's success and, though the approach is said to be learner-centred, his influence on moulding the learner's views on writing cannot be underestimated.
4.6.2 A two-day workshop on "A Process approach to Writing" was conducted during one of the Academic Staff College Orientation Courses to 20 participant college/university teachers¹ from various disciplines and states. The aim was to elicit their views on the process approach to teaching writing by subjecting them to the same approach in their own writing. The participants were from diverse disciplines like Botany, Zoology, Chemistry, Physics, Economics, Commerce, and Mathematics, and since writing was required of the students of all subjects, the researcher conducted the workshop as a part of the 28-day training programme.

The workshop was divided into sessions as follows:

First Day – 10 to 11:30 a.m: The twenty participants were divided into five groups and each group was asked to list some issues and problems confronting higher education today. They were then asked to shortlist them to six, considered to be the most crucial in the group's view.

11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.: All the groups met again in the class. A reporter from each group read out to the whole class the issues that the group felt were relevant and

¹. This group was different from the one which answered the questionnaire on their experience of writing a report of the previous day's proceedings, discussed in Chapter III.
important. All the issues were written on the board. Each group then had to take up any two from among those noted on the board, meet again separately to discuss and analyse them in detail, and come out with solutions or changes to be effected in the education system.

2.00 to 3.30 p.m.: A reporter from each group read out the solutions to the problems or suggestions to tone up the education system that the group thought of. The views were open for discussion.

3.30 to 5.00 p.m.: Each participant was asked to take up a theme related to education and write a short essay of about 200 to 300 words.

Second Day - 10.00 a.m to 1.00 p.m.: A session on "Effective Writing" was given by a Resource Person. It was task-based, with the teacher-participants studying and analysing a few short texts. They worked in groups or as individuals depending on the nature of the work. The Resource Person's aim was to help them analyse and strengthen the passages given, thereby creating an awareness in them of the ways by which they could make their own writing more effective.

He dwelt on a) analysing a given piece of writing focussing on various aspects of style, b) recasting the given sentences in simple, clear and acceptably precise
language, c) using logical connectors or transitional words and phrases, and d) using criteria for judging the quality of a paper, like conformity to a format, etc..

2.00 to 3.30 p.m.: The participants were then asked to rewrite their drafts. They had to give their drafts to other participants, and get their feedback/comments on it for modification and improvement.

3.30 to 5.00 p.m.: They were required to modify the drafts and rewrite them in the light of the peer comments offered.

The first three sessions on the first day were spent on pre-writing activities, during which there were heated exchanges on certain issues like the academic community's inability to contain political interference in college affairs, student elections, internal assessment, medium of instruction, research and teaching, the role of distance education, etc.. They generated various points of view on the issues.

A questionnaire (Appendix - D) was later administered to seek the participants' views on this approach to teaching writing. There were seven questions - four multiple-choice, two with two sub-questions each, one yes/no and the other open-ended, and one question open-ended.
Ten of the twenty participants found the group discussions to be helpful in generating/collection ideas "to a great extent", and the other ten "to a small extent". No one felt that they were "Not very much" or "Not at all" helpful. Reading of materials, listening to lectures and collection of information through interviews or enquiries help the learners gather material. But in the classroom, group and pair interaction help them to generate diverse points of view. The usefulness of this aspect of pre-writing activity was borne out by the participants' feedback.

Only one participant termed the writing of the first draft "very easy" with 11 others finding it "easy", whereas eight participants found it "difficult". If for the college teachers of the Orientation Programme, writing was not at all easy even after some pre-writing activity, it is obvious that the young learners would find writing a more laboured activity than an easy affair. This goes to prove the contention made in Chapter I that writing has to be taught and that there is a need for a structured writing course to teach students the skills of writing. Group interaction and classroom discussions are important because one gets diverse points of view on a topic and one sees various angles from which a theme could be explored. When writing follows the discussion, and there is peer
evaluation, there is a common understanding of the topic among the learners.

It was found that peer evaluation/feedback was helpful in improving the first draft of the majority of participants. Four participants found it helpful "to a great extent", 15 "to some extent", and only one "not very much". Three participants found peer evaluation and suggestions very effective because they helped them to avoid repetitive reading of their own draft for correction and improvement. For them, reading one's own draft again was a dull job. In many cases, they said, what would escape their attention could be easily noticed by the evaluating peer.

The peer feedback focussed mainly on "content" in four cases, on "organization" in eight, on "language or style" in one, on "mechanics of writing" in two, and on all aspects of writing in five. The peers' concentration on "content" or "organization" rather than on "mechanics" or "language or style" is also revealing.

The role of the teacher in teaching writing cannot be overemphasised. Even in the present study, it could be seen that nine participants found the Resource Person's session on "Writing" and researcher's conduct of the interactive and group discussions helpful "to a great extent", with 10 of the others finding them to be so "to some extent". The
role of the teacher in teaching writing is therefore crucial. He has the responsibility to initiate, moderate, and direct the discussion in the class.

The workshop was found to be "useful" by all the participants. To the open-ended question on the usefulness of the workshop, it was pointed out by many that the sessions helped them to know how to collect materials through discussion with a peer group. One participant felt encouraged to read more and gain knowledge to make the presentation more effective. One remarked that the process approach could be applied to find solutions to problems in life too. One other participant, however, opined that just one session to know the writing process would be enough and there was no need to have two days for it.

When questioned whether they thought that in all their future writing they would adopt some of those techniques, without any exception, all the twenty participants gave a positive reply. This goes to prove that the process approach takes one beyond the limited requirement of writing classroom compositions to the demands of life at large.

4.7 CONCLUSION

There have been a variety of approaches to the teaching of writing like controlled-to-free approach,
paragraph-pattern approach, models approach, and communicative approach. Of these, the communicative approach aimed at developing in the learners communicative competence by providing a purpose and an audience in the classroom tasks. The process approach, besides giving a sense of purpose and a focus of audience, guided the learners through the several stages of writing like planning, writing and revision. The researcher conducted a workshop on the approach and found that group interaction, peer evaluation and revision make for effective writing. The findings and the theories would form the basis for an effective classroom approach.