

## Teaching of Writing in Pakistan: A Review of Major Pedagogical Trends and Issues in Teaching of Writing

Ghulam Haider

*Department of Special Education  
University of the Punjab, Lahore  
email:haider038@gmail.com*

Doi:10.5901/jesr.2012.v2n3p215

---

**Abstract** *To meet the writing requirements of modern society, a model of teaching of writing must provide students a rich and diverse array of writing experiences. This article provides views regarding paradigm shift in teaching of writing which was first introduced by Hairston (1982) a unique model for teaching of writing. Best practices in teaching of writing place great importance on how the students write; here effort has been made to introduce the real essence of process approach of teaching of writing. It is beyond doubt that writers can not be taught skills of writing unless they are aware of the processes involved in writing. In this paradigm response, revision, and editing have been looked upon differently. It is hoped that this article will help teachers and learners build the mental concept that a draft is a "document in flux" that can be edited, revised and improved, in other words it is a cyclic process. Further, this article suggests such an educational system in which teachers should have "the opportunity to ponder over how the students write not over what the students write. In Pakistan there is a dire need of changing a conventional, unprofessional model of teaching of writing. Our students lag behind not due to ability but owing to inadequate pedagogical approach.*

**Key Words:** *teaching of writing, process approach in writing, conventional approach in writing, classroom teaching, creative writing*

---

### 1. Introduction

Writing has always been seen as an important skill in ESL classes. It is the area in which learners are expected to be offered adequate time to develop their writing skill. This is certainly an important element of learning English as a second language. But teaching of writing in Pakistan is carried out under the authority of a nationally unified syllabus and the examination system. The Pakistani English Syllabus highly values correct linguistic forms instead of students' development of creative thought. That is why despite studying English in schools and colleges for about 6-8 years, students, especially coming from rural backgrounds, are not able to communicate in English with relative ease and success (Warsi, 2004).

Like the other developing countries and nations of the world we have big aspirations. And, also like most of them, we are not realistic about our Great Expectations. We would, for instance, very much like to enter the space race, and indulge in the fairy world dream of sending mission to the moon in a couple of years (Abidi, 1991).

We are willing to do a lot but are unable to realize that still we need to do a lot for putting ourselves on the path of development. Every year hundreds and thousands of students get admission to colleges and universities. But unfortunately they fail to satisfy the needs and expectations of their teachers as writers. The reasons lie in the background of the students from where they arrive. According to Sidiqi (2007, pp.150) "most of the students with rural background (about 70 percent people belong to rural areas) are not motivated to learn English". This very attitude really reflects the existing situation of teaching of writing in Pakistan. That is why the students fail to satisfy the expectations of their teachers as writers. This situation is further augmented by the factor of teacher/educators, in the words of Abidi (1991) the large number of failure in English was due to the high borrow attitude of the teachers of English who insisted on maintaining the standards of Oxford and Cambridge in Pakistan. But the ability of these English teachers is questioned by Sidiqi (2007) as, "in a number of schools and colleges English is being taught by the teachers whose own specialty is not English. So most of the teachers teach English as they were taught by their teachers, that are by grammar translation method with a lot of translation and drilling to memorization".

In Pakistan literary genres are overemphasized to extent that non-literary genres are even not taught, because the teachers have a literary background and they bring those typical methodologies with them. Sidiqi (2007, pp.151) claims that at the college level (intermediate and BA) English is being taught by teachers who are MA in English literature. A large majority of them are either unable or resistant to facilitate the process of empowering their students in terms of

linguistic enrichment. The result is that our students can memorize critical appreciations of great poetry and prose but when it comes to verbal or written discourse, they find themselves handicapped.

Humera (2011, pp.112) asserts that "traditionally, in Pakistan, creative writing was known as literature including the variety of its genres. As a result, Pakistani students and teachers are still confused about the term 'creative writing' and so tensions arise in the classroom. Considering the changing trends in teaching and the advantages of creative writing, it is certainly the responsibility of English teachers to give importance to creative writing, to understand the complexity of writing development. Nadeem (2007, p. 2 cited in Humera, 2011) believes that 'Pakistani teachers should keep in view the needs and interests of students to enable them to be expressive in writing'. It is believed that creative writing can be pleasurable and self-developing if our expressive and communicative needs motivate us to write.

Most of the text books are literature based (Sidiqui, 2007). It also shows that non literary genres are least important in the syllabi of Pakistan. That is why teachers of L2 writing do not give due importance to writing. Sidiqui (2007) further claims that these text books are full of too much content. That is why the teachers pay their full time to the teaching of these books.

This situation is further supplemented by the evaluation system in Pakistan, according to Sidiqui(2007) "most of the examinations in the mainstream schools and colleges are memory driven. There are certain set of questions about the text books which are most likely to appear in the examination paper. These questions normally require production of memorized material from the text book. The students without bothering about the text books prepare for the examination with the help of "Get through guides" (help-books specially designed to prepare the examinations) that provide them with a short cut to pass the examination. These help-books contain summaries of the poems and ready-made answers to the comprehension questions of short stories, essays, poems and plays. All this works fine as the assessment system encourages rote learning."

According to Abidi(1991) the greatest need of today is to save the student from a general education which prepares him for nothing, and help him through socialized education, to achieve some definite goal in life. This whole scenario of class room activities provide us a clear picture of the teaching of writing as well.

Almost three decades ago, Maxine Cousine Hairston, in her article, *The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing*", argued that the teaching of writing is currently at the point of a "paradigm shift": composition theory is moving from an inadequate model of inquiry to a new one" (Nislua, 1986). Hairston in her article took her position as "paradigm shift was occurring in the way writing was being taught and if so, how for this shift paradigm had gone" (Totten, 2003). Hairston, in her article introduced paradigm shift as under:

"In 1963, the University of Chicago Press published a book titled *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, written by Thomas Kuhn, a University of California professor of the history of science. In the book Kuhn hypothesizes about the process by which major changes come about in scientific fields, and conjectures that they probably do not evolve gradually from patient and orderly inquiry by established investigators in the field. Rather, he suggests, revolutions in science come about as the result of breakdowns in intellectual systems, breakdown that occur when old methods won't solve new problems. He calls the change in theory that underlies this kind of revolution a paradigm shift. I believe we are currently at the point of such a paradigm shift in the teaching of writing, and that it has been brought about by a variety of developments that have taken place in the last 25 years.

Hairston(1982)briefly, describes Kuhn's thesis as under:

When a scientific field is going through a stable period, most of the practitioners in the discipline hold a common body of beliefs and assumptions; they agree on the problems that need to be solved, the rules that govern research, and on the standards by which performance is to be measured. They share a conceptual model that Kuhn calls a paradigm, and that paradigm governs activity in their profession. Students who enter the discipline prepare for membership in its intellectual community by studying that paradigm.

But paradigms are not necessarily immutable. When several people working in a field begin to encounter anomalies or phenomena that cannot be explained by the established model, the paradigm begins to show signs of instability. For a while, those who subscribe to the paradigm try to ignore the contradictions and inconsistencies that they find, or they make improvised, ad hoc changes to cope with immediate crises. Eventually, however, when enough anomalies accumulate to make a substantial number of scientists in the field question whether the traditional paradigm can solve many of the serious problems that face them, a few innovative thinkers will devise a new model. And if enough scientists become convinced that the new paradigm works better than the old one, they will accept it as the new norm.

This replacement of one conceptual model by another one is Kuhn's paradigm shift. He cites as classic examples the astronomers' substitution of the Copernican model of the solar system for the Ptolemaic model and the development of Newtonian physics. Such shifts are usually disorderly and often controversial, and the period in which they occur is apt to be marked by insecurity and conflict within the discipline.

Kuhn believes that because these shifts are so disruptive, they will occur only when the number of unsolved problems in a discipline reaches crisis proportions and some major figures in the field begin to focus on those unsolved problems. But even with mounting evidence that their conceptual model doesn't work, supporters of the traditional paradigm resist change because they have an intellectual and sometimes emotional investment in the accepted view. The particularly resist abandoning the conventional textbooks that set forth the precepts of their discipline in clear and unqualified terms. Those texts, as Richard Young points out in his essay, "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Theory," are usually so similar that one way to discover the traditional paradigm of a field is to examine its textbooks.

Finally, however, most of the resistance to the new paradigm will dissipate when its advocates can demonstrate that it will solve problems that the traditional paradigm could not solve. Most of the new generation of scholars working in the field will adopt the new model, and the older practitioners will gradually come around to it. Those who cling to the old paradigm lose their influence in the field because the leaders in the profession simply ignore their work. When that happens, the paradigm shift is complete, and the theory that was revolutionary becomes conventional.

This summary of Kuhn's book is sketchy and too simple, but I (Hairston) think it accurately reflects the key points in his theory. When he developed the theory, he considered only the so-called hard sciences, particularly chemistry, astronomy, and physics. He did not claim or even suggest that his model for scientific revolution could or should apply to social science or the humanities, where research is not done in laboratories and usually does not involve measurements or formulas. Nevertheless, I believe that composition theorists and writing teachers can learn from Thomas Kuhn if they see his theory of scientific revolutions as an analogy that can illuminate developments that are taking place in our profession. Those developments, the most prominent of which is the move to a process-centered theory of teaching writing, indicates that our profession is probably in the first stages of a paradigm shift."

In Pakistan the current model of teaching of writing is based on traditional product oriented approach which is no more effective for the teaching of writing. This existing model pertains big problems as mentioned by Kuhn, cited in Hairston(1982).

## 2. Traditional Approach of Teaching of Writing in Pakistan

In order to understand the nature of that shift, we need to look at the principle features of the paradigm that has been the basis of composition teaching for several decades in Pakistan. Richard Young describes it this way: the emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process is the main feature of teaching of writing(Richard Young,) mechanics, usage and style are the real concern in class room teaching along with the reproduction of memorized content(Sidiqui,2007).

According to Young, cited in Hairston(1982) that underlying the traditional paradigm is what he calls the "vitalist" attitude toward composing: that is, the assumption that no one can really teach anyone else how to write because writing is a mysterious creative activity that cannot be categorized or analyzed. This wrong conception of considering writing as gifted faculty is very common.

Still in Pakistan teachers and students are commonly only taught about the tools of the craft of writing: grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, and handwriting, but not about the process of composing a written text itself. As Björk & Räisänen (1996) summarize, the "traditional testing-oriented view" for the teaching of composition which was interested in:

- the code: spelling, punctuation, grammar
- the subject knowledge: testing of factual knowledge in schools

James Berlin and Robert Inkster (1980, cited in Hairston, 1982) describe other features to the conventional paradigm. Basing their conclusions on an analysis of repeated patterns in four well-known and commercially successful rhetoric texts, they add that the traditional paradigm stresses expository writing to the virtual exclusion of all other forms, that it posits an unchanging reality which is independent of the writer and which all writers are expected to describe in the same way regardless of the rhetorical situation, that is, neglects invention almost entirely, and that it makes style the most important element in writing. The same situation still prevails in Pakistan; there is product of written work that takes a major share of the class in a typical product oriented class room in Pakistan.

In Pakistan it is still believed that that the composing process is linear, that it proceeds systematically from prewriting to writing to rewriting (Hairston, 1982). It is also believed that teaching of correcting verb and vocabulary mistakes is teaching of writing.

Despite an acknowledged fact that writing has an indispensable role in the four basic language skills; it has long been

ignored in a typical Pakistani class room. According to the national syllabus, reading ability is still regarded as the most important skill. Compared with the other three skills, writing is considered too complicated to teach or not important enough to teach in the class. In our English classrooms writing occupies a lower position and remains the weak point of students. As a result, this reading-dominated principle brings about negative feedback from the workplace where there are many complaints about graduates' lack of competence their writing and speaking skills. Further in the words of Warsi (2004), despite Chomsky's (1957) groundbreaking work revealing that language is not primarily learned through imitation, the obsolete translation method is still being adopted by most language programs in rural areas.

In Pakistan, it has long been the tradition that teachers are responsible for revising or editing their students' writing. This has led to the situation in which teacher-dominated feedback still remains prevalent in our classrooms. Due to the high pressure from the Examination Board, Institutes and heavy emphasis on linguistic forms, English (L2) teachers mainly concentrate on the correction of grammar and spelling and they believe that students can make progress only after teachers identify the mistakes. However, this over-dependence is said to induce a sense of lack of concern among students about the detailed corrections from their teachers because the teachers' efforts are taken for granted. Some students just take a glance at what the teacher has corrected, while many others may not even look at the corrections. This results in a mindset in which they fail to reflect upon their mistakes (Wang, 2005). Further, teacher-centered assessment is seen as not only time-consuming, but also an inefficient means to improve student writing level. The end result of this lack of independence is that student creativity and activeness are hindered, and motivation and proficiency in writing remain low.

In our country the current traditional product oriented model of writing is borrowed model which according to Hairston (1982) did not grow out of research or experimentation. It borrows all assumptions from the classical rhetorical model that organizes the production of discourse into invention, arrangement, and style, but mostly it seems to be based on same idealized and orderly vision of what literature scholars, whose professional focus is on the written product, seem to imagine is an efficient method of writing. Writing model in Pakistan, is a prescriptive and orderly view of the creative act, a view that defines the successful writer as one who can systematically produce a 500-word theme of five paragraphs, each with a topic sentence (Hairston, 1982). In our country we still lack research to test the traditional product oriented model against the composing processes of actual writers and similarly we have no idea of process approach or in other words still the process model approach is not popular if ever it exists in Pakistan .

Humera (2011) in her study found that the participants in Pakistan provided a variety of definitions of creativity such as, 'creative writing is an expression of inner feelings and emotions' and 'creative writing encourages discussion of social problems prevalent in society'. She (ibid) says, it can be justified to argue that their definitions of creativity are derived from English Literature, which they have studied. The responses of the focus group interview also reinforce closed and open questions' data. For instance, an interviewee affirms 'creativity is a spontaneous overflow of emotions'. It seems that their conception of creativity is artistic, which also involves free thinking. Having said this, none uses words such as 'experimentation', 'risk taking', 'problem solving' or 'intuition' which are commonly used for creativity in a western educational context. The results of the gathered data indicate that most of the teachers choose topics from the textbooks and explain them, whereas a few teachers assert that they like to teach writing using discussion and brainstorming. The remaining teachers claim to teach creative writing using activities and audio visual aids. Nobody considers that 'creativity flourishes where there is a systematic strategy to promote it' (Robinson, 2001, p. 12 cited in Humera, 2011).

Unfortunately this traditional product oriented model is very emphatically encouraged in our class rooms by teachers. We lack writing experts in compare with reading and speaking. Further to Sidiqi(2007) asserts teachers who teach English in Pakistan some of them do not even have specialty in this subject. This questions the existing teaching scenario in Pakistan. Where the basic qualification for English teachers is simply MA in English this does not guarantee that the teachers have enough ability to teach writing as a well effective approach. Due to this teaching of writing is treated as an ordinary approach. The common misunderstanding found in Pakistan is that anyone with MA in English is an expert writing teacher. At this point I would like to opine that the teachers or administrator who think it just a fool's errand to discuss the issue of process approach in teaching of writing have not adopted the process model for teaching composition and have also not attentively gone through the research on the composing process in order to extract some pedagogical principles from it, a majority of college writing teachers in Pakistan are not professional writing teachers. They do not do research or publish on rhetoric or composition, and they do not know the scholarship in the field; they do not read the professional journals and they do not attend professional meetings; they also do not participate in faculty development workshops for writing teachers. They are trained as literary critics first and as teachers of literature second, yet out of necessity most of them are doing half or more of their teaching in composition. And they teach it by the traditional paradigm, just as they had learnt when they were students. Often they do not have enough information about a newer edition of the journals and books which have been publishing regularly in the field.

In Pakistan we still deny the significance of writing as a basic method of learning, takes away any incentive for the writing teacher to grow professionally (Hairston, 1982). We still negate that writing requires intellectual activity and ignore the importance of writing as a key factor that makes or mar the academic career of the students in every field. Teachers in our system are generally less respected and rewarded that might also be the reason of such an assumption. The reason is that there is no external pressure to find a better way to teach writing (Hairston, 1982).

According to Hairston (1982) "many teachers who cling to the traditional paradigm work very hard at teaching writing. They devote far more time than they can professionally afford to working with their students, but because they haven't read Elbow or Bruffee they have no way of knowing that their students might benefit far more from small group meetings with each other than from the exhausting one-to-one conferences that the researchers hold. They both complain and brag about how much time they spent meticulously marking each paper, but because they haven't read Diederich or Irmscher they don't know that an hour spend meticulously marking every error in a paper is probably doing more harm than good. They are exhausting themselves trying to teach writing from an outmoded model, and they come to despise the job more and more because many of their students improve so little despite their time and effort".

According to Sidiqi (2007) most of the textbooks of English are literature based. As in many other developing countries the emphasis is on 'classics' or a 'high caliber' literature. He further claims "another aspect of these books is that they contain too much content". So these textbooks complicate the problem further (Hairston, 1982). As Kuhn repeatedly points out, the standard text in any discipline constitute a major black to a paradigm shift because they represent accepted authority. Many, though certainly not all, of the standard textbooks in rhetoric and composition for the past two decades have been product-centered books that focus on style, us-age, and argumentation; Sheridan Baker's *The Practical Stylist* and Brooks and Warren's *Modern Rhetoric* are typical examples (Kuhan, 1963, cited in Hairston, 1982). And textbooks change slowly. Publishers want to keep what sells, and they tend to direct the appeals of their books to what they believe the average composition teacher wants, not to what those in the vanguard of the profession would like to have (Hairston, 1982). This is further supported by Sidiqi(2007) ".....most of these writers/editors have the background of English literature. Their passion for literature is manifest in the coursebooks designed by them which exposes the students to 'great literature' without helping them to improve their basic language skills."

This view clearly exposes that traditional classrooms in Pakistan are based on teacher controlled, step-by-step, linear sequences, in contrast to the recursive nature of the writing in process oriented models, where teaching languages is teaching and learning languages as communication and, most important, it is neither the practice of forms or linguistic structures, nor the mere practice of skills (reading, speaking, writing and listening), nor just the practice of lexical items:

Traditional-product oriented Paradigm of teaching writing	Process oriented paradigm of teaching of writing
Morphology & Syntax	Pragmatics
Sentence. Individual study of language out of context.	Text. Use of language in context as a tool for social interaction
Linguistic competence can be taught	Communicative competence must be learnt
Form: study of linguistic units and structures	Function: study of processes in communication. Emphasis on creativity depending on use and context
Learning the language is the objective in itself	Learning how to learn and learning how to communicate autonomously in different contexts and situations
Individual knowledge of language	Social use of language
Product-oriented	Process-oriented
"Bottom up" strategies and principles	"Top-down" and "Bottom-up" strategies and principles
Bound to specific context and dependent on teacher	Generalizable and autonomous, leading towards independent writing
Individual/teacher centred work: authority and source of knowledge	Group work and sharing: facilitator and needs analyst
Data-driven processing: focus on language elements present	Concept-driven processing: focus on ideas /concepts expressed

### 3. Paradigm Shift in teaching of Writing in Pakistan

What is the basic flaw in the traditional paradigm for teaching writing? Why doesn't it work? (Hairston, 1982).

People can ask such questions that why we need a new paradigm, if the already existing paradigm is working since many years. I would like to share the remarks of Kuhan, cited in Hairston (1982) "novelty ordinarily emerges only for the man who, knowing with precision what he should expect, is able to recognize that something has gone wrong." This is also supported by the change Rule No-1: People don't change unless they share a compelling reason to change" (Chuck J. Schwan and William G Spady cited in Totten (2003, pp.45). Mina Shaughnessy in her book *Errors and Expectations*, describes the educational experience that made her, a professor at a prestigious university, stop to ask, "What went wrong?"

In the spring of 1970, the City University of New York adopted an admissions policy that guaranteed to every city resident with a high school diploma a place in one of its eighteen tuition-free colleges, thereby opening its doors not only to a larger population of students than any college had probably ever admitted or thought of admitting to its campus.

One of the first tasks these students faced when they arrived at college was to write a placement essay ... Judged by the results of these tests, the young men and women who were to be known as open admissions students fell into one of three groups: 1. Those who met the traditional requirements for college work, who appeared from their tests ... to be able to begin at the traditional starting points; 2. Those who had survived their secondary schooling ... and whose writing reflected a flat competence; [those] who had been left so far behind the others in their formal education that they appeared to have little chance of catching up, students whose difficulties with the written language seemed of a different order from those of other groups, as if they had come, you might say, from a different country.

...The third group contained true outsiders...strangers in academia, unacquainted with the rules and rituals of college life, unprepared for the sorts of tasks their teachers were about to assign them ...

Not surprisingly, the essays these students wrote during their first weeks of class stunned the teachers who read them. Nothing, it seemed, short a miracle was going to turn such students into writers. ... To make matters worse, there were no studies nor guides, nor even suitable textbooks to turn to. Here were teachers trained to analyze the belletristic achievement of the ages marooned in basic writing classrooms with adult student writers who appeared by college standard to be illiterate?

Relying on their previous experience with selectively-admitted students at the City University, Shaughnessy and her colleagues thought they knew what to expect from "college writers." The shock of facing a kind of writing that fit no familiar category, that met no traditional standard, forced Shaughnessy, at least, to recognize an anomaly. If these students had come through schools in which writing had been taught with standard textbooks and standard methods, then one had to conclude that the method and the textbooks did not work, at least not for a substantial and important group of students. The question was, "Why?"

To find the answer, Shaughnessy analyzed the placement essays of 4000 students and over a period of five years worked at trying to get at the roots of their problems and devise a way to overcome them (Hairston, 1982). Eventually she became persuaded:

... that basic writers write the way they do, not because they are slow or non-verbal, indifferent to or incapable of academic excellence, but because they are beginners and must, like all beginners, learn by making mistakes ... And the keys to their development as writers often lie in the very features of their writing that English teachers have been trained to brush aside with a marginal code letter or a scribbled injunction to "Proofread!"

In our country it has been assumed that trial and error is really a good way of teaching that is why the teachers of writing do not go beyond the correction and re-correction of the written products. Any instructional system would come close to collapse under such a strain, and our system for teaching writing has been particularly vulnerable because it has been staffed largely by untrained teachers who have had little scholarly interest in this kind of teaching (Hairston, 1982).

After the above stated findings of Shaughnessy (1960) it can be said that in Pakistan the prevailing methods of teaching of writing and existing models of textbooks do not work, they have failed to produce required outcomes. The reasons are described by Humera (2011, pp.112), the text books have model essays and stories which students memorize for tests. For example, writing a story is recurrent question. The type of question can remain unchanged year after year.

Year, 2008: Write a story with a moral, 'The Boy Who Cried Wolf'

Year, 2007: Write a story with a moral, 'Union is Strength'

Year, 2006: Write a story with a moral, 'A Friend in Need is a Friend Indeed'. (Bullets added).

Humera (2011, pp.112) further states, "these stories are prescribed in the syllabus. The question of story writing is

easy and learners need not think critically and imaginatively. In the tests the students have to remember the logical sequence of the events or paragraphs as they are given in the textbook, otherwise they would lose their score because the examiners would keep the model composition in view. The students do not write the stories by themselves. They are not taught to develop the plot, characterisation or dialogue. Sidiqui(2007, cited in Humera,2011), believes, in Pakistan the assessment system excludes creativity and critical thinking out of its legitimate boundaries. The National Education Policy (1992, pp, 9) says that, we are caught in vicious circle; the cycle begins at a badly constructed syllabi and ends at rag bag system called examination.'

White and Arndt (1991) claim that focusing on language errors 'improves neither grammatical accuracy nor writing fluency' and they also suggest that attention should not be given to what students say but how they say. Findings of different studies have unanimously shown that feedback is more useful between drafts, not when it is done at the end of the task after the students hand in their composition to be marked. Corrections written on compositions returned to the student after the process has finished seem to do little to improve student writing (TE Editor BBC., 2003).

Shaughnessy's insight is utterly simple and vitally important: we cannot teach students to write by looking only at what they have written. We must also understand how that product came into being, and why it assumed the form that it did. We have to try to understand what goes on during the internal act of writing and we have no intervene during the act of writing if we want to affect its outcome. We have to do the hard thing, examine the intangible process, rather than the easy thing, evaluate the tangible product. (Hairston, 1982).

Now in 21st century Pakistan needs to get rid of existing traditional model of teaching of writing that is unprofessional, static and ineffective(Hairston,1982) and consider the process approach in writing.

As a learner and researcher I believe that there is no truth in such an unprofessional attitude towards writing that to write is to sit down in front of a blank page, to begin at the beginning and write through to the end, with no planning, break, editing, or changes in between. And unfortunately in our class rooms we yet, ask our students to do the same static drill. This is acknowledged that good writers plan and revise, rearrange and add, insert and delete text, re-reading and producing multiple drafts before they are able to produce their final written document. In the terms of writing research this approach is called process writing approach. Here, I would like to share what th Writing is not a linear act, one does not just write the first words which come to ones mind at that particular moment with little importance of purpose, interests, and context, while thinking they are the ideal and unchangeable units which express exactly the thoughts one wanted to convey in writing. Instead, while writing (Björk & Räisänen,1996) "you can actually see your thoughts on the paper in front of you... when you visualise your thinking, you can review your thinking, making reflection on and revision of your thinking easier".

Process writing refers to a broad range of strategies that include pre-writing activities, such as defining the audience, using a variety of resources, planning the writing, as well as drafting and revising, where individual & group strategies to writing are equally interesting. These activities collectively referred to as "process-oriented instruction," approach writing as problem-solving, emphasizing the learning of how to write a text for a reason within a context and following both individual & group work and working with collaborative learning groups with a variety of group arrangements for the different stages. Among other, we should mention: Phillips 6/6 or Huddle Method, Buzz Group Method, Panel discussion, Interrogator panel, Lecture, Brainstorming, Role-playing, Case study, Interview, Workshop, Symposium, Round table, Pyramid discussions, and Groups ABC/Groups in rotation.

Writing, then, is a recursive process in which the writer plans, composes and reviews what has been written within a group of learners. Many studies (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hillocks, 1986 and Applebee et al., 1994) show that weak writers spend little time planning, composing and reviewing, whereas better writers spend more time planning, composing and reviewing. Skilled writers, on the other hand, pay attention to content and organization, while poor writers are more interested in the mechanics of writing and, especially, in spelling.

The writing process means writing, rewriting and going back to read what we have written to generate new ideas and refine and recycle what we have just written on the paper. Writing means, as Flower and Hayes (1981) stated" a sequence of differentiated and recursive processes".

This cyclical process when composing texts make writers move forwards and backwards: planning, actual writing on paper and revising, all these subprocesses interacting with one another in contrast to the traditional linear step-by-step procedure of writing where the emphasis was given to the student's mastery of the code and certain subject matter. Although writing in general involves various stages, in reality however, the process of composing is not linear and writers do not follow a systematic sequence of rehearsing (planning), drafting (actual writing on paper) and revising but it is a recursive activity. Writing has been described as a recursive process, in which the writer plans, translates ideas into language, and reviews what has been written. As we have already mentioned previously, more skilled writers pay more attention to content and organization, while weaker writers are more preoccupied with the mechanics of writing, especially

spelling, punctuation and grammar. Good writers are found to use a longer pre-writing period than average writers. The recursive nature of writing sees a writer moving between drafting and revising with stages of replanning in between and this going back and forth makes writing a process that leads to clarity."As a process, writing does not move in a straight line from conception to completion: all planning is not done before words are put on paper; all the words are not on paper before writers review and revise. Writers move back and forth among these subprocesses"(Humes, 1983).

Writing can be explained as a process of exploring our own thoughts, as Shaughnessy cited in Zamel (1982:197) "the record of an idea developing. It is a process whereby an initial idea gets extended and refined."

Writing experts have identified the phases of the writing process which skilled writers follow when they write. For Murray (1980) there are three main phases:

Rehearsing (prewriting),

1. Drafting,
2. Writing.

For May Shih (1986) there are three main stages:

1. Prewriting,
2. Drafting,
3. Writing,
4. Revising

Hedge (1988) distinguishes four main stages:

1. Planning,
2. Composing,
3. Revising,
4. Editing.

White & Arndt (1991) identify the following six:

1. Generating,
2. Focusing,
3. Structuring,
4. Drafting,
5. Evaluating
6. Re-viewing.

Björk & Räisänen (1996) outline the following four steps:

1. Pre-Writing,
2. Drafting,
3. Feedback and Revision,
4. Evaluation and Grading.

Here I would also like to share the division of writing according to Flower (1979) writing can be divided into two main categories:

Writer-oriented writing	Reader-oriented writing
I-oriented writing which mainly takes place, as we shall present later, in the pre-writing stages of process-oriented approaches to teaching, and when using writing as a study tool in subjects.	Reader/audience-oriented writing for communication with others and/or between individuals. which takes place mainly during the response and revising stages of process-oriented models.
Audience: self in most cases.	Audience: others: peers and teacher
Reasons for writing: internal, personal exploration of ideas.	Reasons for writing: communication between individuals.
+INFORMAL LANGUAGE	+FORMAL LANGUAGE
Formal examples: notes, rough drafts,...	Formal examples: essays, papers, letters, ...

*Based on the division of writing by Flower (1979).*

#### 4. A summary of the differences

Process-driven approaches show some similarities with task-based learning, in that students are given considerable freedom within the task. They are not curbed by pre-emptive teaching of lexical or grammatical items. However, process

approaches do not repudiate all interest in the product, (i.e. the final draft). The aim is to achieve the best product possible. What differentiates a process-focused approach from a product-centered one is that the outcome of the writing, the product, is not preconceived.

Process writing	Product writing
text as a resource for comparison ideas as starting point more than one draft more global, focus on purpose, theme, text type, i.e., reader is emphasised collaborative emphasis on creative process	imitate model text organisation of ideas more important than ideas themselves one draft features highlighted including controlled practice of those features individual emphasis on end product

(Adapted from *Product and process writing: A comparison Submitted by TE Editor on 3 May, 2004*)

For the purpose of sharing some basics of process model of writing I have borrowed the features of paradigm for teaching writing from Hairston (1982) that has the following principal features:

- It focuses on the writing process: instructors intervene in students' writing during the process.
- It teaches strategies for invention and discovery; instructors help students to generate content and discover purpose.
- It is rhetorically based; audience, purpose, and occasion figure prominently in the assignment of writing tasks.
- Instructors evaluate the written product by how well it fulfills the writer's intention and meets the audience's needs.
- It views writing as a recursive rather than a linear process; pre-writing, writing, and revision are activities that overlap and intertwine.
- It is holistic, viewing writing as an activity that involves the intuitive and non-rational as well as the rational faculties.
- It emphasizes that writing is a way of learning and developing as well as a communication skill.
- It includes a variety of variety of writing modes, expressive as well as expository.
- It is informed by other disciplines, especially cognitive psychology and linguistics
- It views writing as a disciplined creative activity that can be analyzed and described; its practitioners believe that writing can be taught.
- It is based on linguistic research and research into the composing process.
- It stresses the principle that writing teachers should be people who write.

## 5. The future of this paradigm in Pakistan

Most, if not all, advocates of research-based writing programs would agree that the above features are essential components in a sound writing program and, thus, need to be an integral part of our school's writing programs (Totten, 2003). In the words of Linda Flower (1980), "because we are trying to chart and analyze an activity that goes on largely out of sight, the process is rather like trying to trace the path of dolphin by catching glimpses of it when it leaps out of the water. We are seeing only a tiny part of the whole process, but from it we can infer about what is going on beneath the surface." A large number of studies have proved unanimously that writing is an act of discovery for both skilled and unskilled writers; most writers have only a partial notion of what they want to say when they begin to write, and their ideas develop in the process of writing. They develop their topics intuitively, not methodically. Another truth is that usually the writing process is not linear, moving smoothly in one direction from start to finish. It is messy, review throughout the writing process, moving back and forth among the different operations involved in writing without any apparent plan. No practicing writing will be surprised at these findings: nevertheless, they seriously contradict the traditional paradigm that has dominated writing textbooks for years (Hairston, 1982). This unanimous point of researchers also questions the existing traditional text book model in Pakistan. So this model needs a change that may help us promoting a professional model of writing in Pakistan. This will be very genuine question if some one asks how this paradigm will be implemented in our class rooms. So I have given the answer of this question in the words of Hairston (1982)

"I believe that important events of the recent past are going to speed the revolution and help to establish this new paradigm in the nation's classrooms.

But no revolution brings the millennium nor a guarantee of salvation, and we must remember that the new paradigm is sketchy and leaves many problems about the teaching or writing unresolved. As Kuhn points out, new paradigms are apt to be crude, and they seldom possess all the capabilities of their predecessors. So it is important for us to preserve the best parts of earlier methods for teaching writing: the concern for style and the preservation of high standards for the writing product. I believe we also need to continue giving students models of excellence to imitate.

Kuhn contends that "the transition between competing paradigms cannot be made a step at a time, forced by logic..... Like the gestalt switch, it must occur all at once (thought not necessarily in an instant) or not at all." He says, however, that, "if its supporters are competent, they will improve it [the paradigm], explore its possibilities, and show what it would be like to belong to the community guided by it." I see this last opportunity as the challenge to today's community of composition and rhetoric scholars: to refine the new paradigm for teaching composition so that it provides a rewarding, productive, and feasible way of teaching writing for the non-specialists who do most of the composition teaching in our colleges and universities."

Further we can help student writing by looking only at what they have written, not by neglecting the process.

## 6. Implications for Administrators and Teachers

According to Chuck J. Schwan and William G Spady cited in Totten(2003) there are some change rules that can be helpful for the promotion and implementation of process model writing in class room. I have summarized these rules in the following:

- Rule No-1: People don't change unless they share a compelling reason to change" (45).
- Rule No-2: People don't change unless they have ownership in the change" (46).
- Rule No-3: People don't change unless their leaders model that they are serious about the change" (46).
- Rule No-4: People are unlikely to change unless they have a concrete picture of what the change will look like for them personally" (47).
- Rule No-5: People cannot make a change –or make it last-unless they receive organizational support for the change" (47).

So it is obvious that change needs some conducive conditions to take place. In Pakistan teaching of writing must need change that is subject to research and implication of the results of this research. For the implementation of the new paradigm we need to take the following measures:

- a. We must train fresh teachers
- b. We must start graduate programs
- c. We must enhance enrollment in these programs
- d. We must provide in service training
- e. We must take measure for the promotion of process based text books on the teaching of writing
- f. We must change the trends of publishing houses.

There is need to create a culture that is conducive for paradigm shift. From school to college level and from school administration to national level we need to give process writing a special place in our goals and objectives in every discipline (Totten, 2003). Teachers should be provided pre-service and in service training before the designing or implementation of course especially for teaching of writing.

Here are some recommendations for textbooks, curriculum and policy makers for the promotion of process approach of writing in Pakistan:

- a. There is dire need for the development of special programs that target schools administrators, teachers and publishers to educate them about process writing.
- b. Evaluation and assessment rubrics must be revised if ever exist and if they do not exist they must be developed immediately, so that a unanimous criterion for assessment of written products of the students be designed.
- c. Literature on process writing in schools and colleges must be provided and research in teaching of writing should be encouraged.
- d. Professional workshops, seminars and projects on teaching of writing should be encouraged both at institute level and national level.
- e. Collaborative teaching should be promoted and national awards should be announced for those teachers and publishers who work best for the promotion of process writing model.

- f. A writing project should be started immediately so that in future problems should be tackled in time.

#### Conclusion

In Pakistan it is not an easy task to replace already rooted conventional approach of teaching of writing without the full support, and resources which should be easily accessible. For a paradigm shift mere teachers and school and college administrators are not enough or do not have adequate means and resources, unless the policy makers take decisions. We must realize that this change demands a collective effort, and without such an effort, it seems impossible to give a realistic shape to a change. Many countries across the borders are leading the way of change, and to a major extent have succeeded; now it is time for us to truly make an effort for a better cause.

#### References

- Abedi, Razi (1991) "Educational Chaos". Rohtas Books, Ahmad Chamber, 5-Temple Road, Lahore
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J., Mullis, I.V.S., Latham, A. S. & Gentile C. A. (1994) "NAEP 1992 Writing Report Card", *National Center for Education Statistics, Report No. 23- W01*. Washington, DC. U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 178.
- Björk, L. & Räisänen, C. (1996) *Academic Writing. A University Writing Course*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Flower, L.S. (1979) "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing". *College English*, 41, pp. 19-36.
- Flower, L.S. & Hayes, J.R. (1981) "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing". *College Composition and Communication* 32/4, pp. 365-387
- Fullan, M., with S. Stiegelbauer. 1991. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. Second Edition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Graves, D.H. (1980) "Balance the Basics: Let Them Write," *Report to the Ford Foundation*.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hillocks, G. (1986) *Research on Written Composition*. Urbana, IL: National Conference on Research in English.
- Humes, A. (1983) "Research on the Composing Process", *Review of Educational Research*, 53.
- Hairston, M. 1982, 1994. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing," 113-126. In Sondra Perl (Ed.) *Landmark Essays on Writing Process*. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press.
- Humaira, Khan. (2011). Testing Creative Writing in Pakistan: Tensions and Potential in Classroom Practice. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1 (15) 111-119. Retrieved from [http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_1\\_No\\_15\\_Special\\_Issue\\_October\\_2011/14.pdf](http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_15_Special_Issue_October_2011/14.pdf).
- Jilani, Warsi (2007) Conditions Under Which English Is Taught In Pakistan: An Applied Linguistic Perspective. Retrieved from: <http://www.saridjournal.org/2004/warsi.htm>
- Joyce, B., and B. Showers. 1988. *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*. White Plains, NY: Longman
- Murray, D.M. (1980) "Writing as Process: How writing finds its own meaning", in Donovan, T.R. & McClelland, B.W. (eds.) *Eight approaches to teaching composition*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Murray, D.M. (1984) *Write to Learn*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Shih, M. (1986) "Content-Based Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing", *TESOL Quarterly*, XX, n. 4, pp. 617-648.
- Schwahn, C. J., and W. G. Spady. (1998) "Why Change Doesn't Happen and How to Make Sure It Does." *Educational Leadership*, 55 (7):45-47.
- Siddiqui, Shahid, (2002) English and Our Colonial Past, Pakistan Observer, Islamabad, August 19, 2002.
- Siddiqui, S. (2007). *Rethinking Education in Pakistan: Perceptions, Practices, and Possibilities*. Lahore: Paramount Publishing Press.
- Totten, S. (2003) *Completing the Paradigm Shift to Process Writing: The Need to Lead*. Publication: The Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 1.
- White, R. & Arndt, V. (1991) *Process Writing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978) *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zamel, V. (1982) "Writing: the process of discovering meaning". *TESOL Quarterly* 16/2.

