



**Approaches to Teaching
L2 Writing A Move
towards an Alternative Approach
at the Arab tertiary level**

Sami A. Al-asadi (M.A, Ph.D.)

Al-Qadisiya University

College of Education

Department of English Language and Literature

البريد الإلكتروني : san_san53@yahoo.com

تاريخ تقديم الطلب : ٢ / ٧ / ٢٠١٧ م

قبول النشر : ٢٧ / ٨ / ٢٠١٧ م

ملخص

اساليب تدريس الكتابة في اللغة الانكليزية لغةً اجنبية: نحو بديل واحد في السياق العربي

ان تطور تدريس الكتابة الاكاديمية في اللغة الانكليزية بوصفها لغة اجنبية امتاز بوجود اساليب تدريس رئيسة وهي كلها موجودة في كتابة البحوث في اللغة الانكليزية بوصفها لغة أم. واستنادا للدراسات في هذا المجال، هيمنت ثلاثة اساليب مؤثرة في هذا المجال. يمكن تحديد هذه الاساليب على انها اساليب انتاج، اساليب عمليات واساليب نوعية. ان الغرض من هذا البحث اقتراح برنامج بديل لتدريس الكتابة في اللغة الإنكليزية في الجامعات العربية. لتحقيق الهدف تم عرض اسهامات كل من الاساليب الثلاثة بمزاياها ونقاط ضعفها. وتأتي اهمية العرض لسببين: الاول، مساعدة الباحث في

القرار على أفضل مزايا اسلوبي العمليات والنوعية لتدريس الكتابة على مستوى الجامعات العربية. و الآخر يعطي العرض رؤى لتدريسي الكتابة وباحثيها حول الافكار الرئيسة التي شهدت تطورا تاريخيا في مجال نظرية الكتابة الاكاديمية وممارساتها والنقاط التي لا زالت عالقة. قدمت الدراسة جملة من الأسباب التي دفعت لاختيار البرنامج البديل وختمت بالخلاصة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: اساليب انتاج، اساليب عمليات، اساليب نوعية، تعليم الكتابة في البيئة العربية والاسلوب المتكامل.

ABSTRACT

The development of L2 (English as a second language) writing instruction can be seen as a succession of major approaches that have occurred in more or less historical progression all of which are proposed in English as the first language (L1) theory and practice. Based on the relevant existing literature, three approaches are still dominant and influential. They are: product approaches, process approaches, and genre approaches.

The current writing instruction to teach EFL writing at the Arab tertiary level is characteristically inspired by product approaches. Such approaches have come under serious scrutiny for a number of reasons. The purpose of this paper is to propose the introduction of an integrated process-genre approach as an alternative one in this context. To achieve this end, the paper demonstrates a critical review of the theoretical and pedagogical drawbacks and strengths of each of the three approaches. Such review has become significant

and relevant for two reasons: First, it helps derive what counted as the best merits of the two approaches to be amalgamated in the proposed approach. Second, it hopefully offers writing researchers and teachers insights into the major themes that have historically developed in the field of writing theory and practice and the issues that are still unresolved. Rationales for the choice of a process-genre approach are introduced. The paper concludes with a summary

Key words: Product approaches; Process approaches; Genre approaches; integrated approach; EFL Writing instruction in the Arab context.

Approaches to Teaching L2 Writing.

1. Product-oriented

Approaches to Writing Instruction

Two major streams are identified within product approaches:

1.1 Controlled Composition Approach

Controlled composition approach (CCA) has its origin in Charles Fries' (1945) oral

approach, the forerunner to the audio-lingual method of L2 teaching. Underlying CCA, that dominated the teaching of ESL writing classes until the 1980s, are the notions that language is speech (from structural linguistics), and that learning is a process of habit formation (from behaviourist psychology) (Silva, 1990). Under this approach, writing instruction

should begin at the sentence level. Students should receive practice in sentence writing...The essential points to bear in mind is that the students should be made aware of what a sentence is, what it looks like on a paper, and how to write one. (Taylor, 1976, p.312).

CCA primarily focuses on accuracy of linguistic forms, and the use of mechanical skills such as spelling, punctuation and capitalization. It employs a rigidly controlled teaching methodology. The teacher prepares a collection of grammatically accurate sentences that learners are later expected to use when producing a piece of writing. They have to copy and memorize such forms

through a variety of intensive oral drills to help them avoid formal errors caused by their L1 interference and to reinforce appropriate L2 behaviour before they learn to write (Silva, 1990).

1.2 Current-traditional Rhetoric Approach

The 1960s witnessed the development of a new product-based trend that has come to be known as the Current-Traditional Rhetoric Approach (CTRA) (Silva, 1990). Unlike sentence-bound CCA, its writing instruction focuses on learners' needs to generate and produce larger chunks of written discourse (Paltridge, 2004). According to Silva (1990), in CTRA, the central focus is on the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. In its earlier stage of development, the paragraph arrangement is of primary interest. Attention is given not only to the paragraph elements (topic sentences, support sentences, concluding sentences, and transitions), but also to the various functional options for its development (illustration, exemplification, comparison, contrast, partition, classification, definition, causal analysis)

The main pedagogical focus of CTRA is to "give students practice with particular syntactic patterns and/or lexical forms to generate connected discourse by combining and arranging sentences into paragraphs based on prescribed formulae" (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p.7).

The other central concern of CTRA, in the later stage, is essay development. It is actually an extended application of paragraph principles to produce such a larger piece of discourse as an essay. Writing instruction thus consists mainly in exposing learners to authentic exemplar texts, argumentative in particular, provided by the teacher. Such text type is the one learners typically use in the academia. The objective is to make them familiar with its macro- textual organisation, develop awareness of its sequential stages so that they can manipulate it to write a text parallel to the prescribed one (Silva, 1990). In short, "writing is basically a matter of arrangement, of fitting writing into prescribed patterns" (Silva, 1990, p. 14) and the text is still taken as a collection of

structures (sentences, paragraphs, essays), each embedded in the next largest form" (ibid).

1.3 Critiques to Product – Oriented Writing Instruction

Both CCA and CTRA for teaching academic writing suffer from a number of criticisms The effectiveness of the CCA in developing students' writing ability is questioned since it exclusively focuses on "formal accuracy and correctness" (Silva, 1990, p.12). In Hyland's (2002, p.11) words, such emphasis

is exactly the wrong place to look for writing improvement as there is little evidence to show that either syntactic complexity or grammatical accuracy are the best measures of good writing. Many students can construct syntactically accurate sentences and yet are unable to produce appropriate written texts

On the other hand, though CTRA differs from its predecessor (controlled composition) in that rhetorical patterns rather than linguistic accuracy become the central concern, compliance with language formalities continues to be prioritized. Writing

instruction is to “give students practice with particular syntactic patterns and/or lexical forms to generate connected discourse by combining and arranging sentences into paragraphs based on prescribed formulae” (Johns, 1997. p.7). In consequence, "The text becomes a collection of sentence patterns and vocabulary items — a linguistic artefact, a vehicle for language practice” (Silva, 1990, p. 13). Under this condition, writing task, in Johns' view, is perceived as “jars, with predefined configurations into which content is poured” (ibid, p. 8).

Importantly, the emphasis product approaches place on linearity and prescriptivism inhibits writers from generating and expressing their own ideas and thoughts using their original and creative thinking and thus self-motivation and proficiency in writing are scarified (Silva, 1987). In Bizzell's (1986) terms, product approaches’ "exclusive focus on drills, correction and form negates the existence of the writers and their purposes, motivations, opinions and individual histories, thus putting them in a peripheral place in the classroom, instead of at the centre" (p.52) and therefore

writers are conceived as passive recipients of expert instruction (John,1997). In addition, the writing context narrowly focuses on teachers who are still “authorities or fact dispensers” (Johns, 1997, p.9). They are not interested in the quality of students’ ideas "but primarily concerned with formal linguistic features" (Silva, 1987, p.4).

Given this, developing students' writing abilities is of secondary importance since they are judged on the basis of the final output and writing development is simply measured in a mechanical fashion in terms of assessing their overall ability to memorise and manipulate fixed rhetorical and grammatical patterns they previously learned by imitation in the classroom (Pincas, 1962).

In sum, Silva (1987) asserts that “Many felt that neither of these approaches adequately fostered thought or its expression – that controlled composition was largely irrelevant to these goals and that the traditional rhetorical approach’s linearity and prescriptivism discouraged original, creative thinking and writing” (p. 7).

However, despite its weaknesses, the product-oriented approach has its advantages. Badger and White (2000, p.157), for example, state that such trend can enhance learners' linguistic knowledge which is a prerequisite for good writing. Both Arndt (1987) and Badger and white (2000) are supportive of the significance of the use of authentic model texts, not only for imitation purposes, but also for the exploration and analysis of their rhetorical stages, and the key recurrent grammatical and vocabulary choices. Imitation is one efficient way among others through which learners can learn. Myles (2002) further argue that if students are not exposed to native-like models of written texts, their errors in writing are more likely to persist.

2.1 Process-oriented Approach to Writing Instruction

Process approaches emerge in a critical response to the theoretical and pedagogical shortcomings of product approaches. This new trend stresses writing as a “non-linear, exploratory, and generative process through which writers discover and reformulate their

ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning” (Zamel, 1983, p.165) rather than a single-shot endeavour focusing on students' final products.

With the rise of the process approach, writing "is best understood as a set of distinctive thinking processes which writers orchestrate or organize during the act of composing" which is itself "a goal-directed thinking process, guided by the writer's own growing network of goals that may be modified as writing proceeds" (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p. 366). They (1981) propose a widely accepted model and is still considered one of the seminal pieces of research in the field of writing today (Moran & Soiferman, 2010, cited in Wei, Shang & Briody, 2012, p.155). Its objective is to make the student aware of, and gain control over, the cognitive strategies involved in writing (Hyland, 2003). Flower and Hayes (1981) identify three major writing processes that writers need to go through before completing the writing task: “planning, translating, and reviewing” (p.366).

Planning evolves through a sequence of three sub-

processes: generating ideas by brainstorming; organizing ideas through categorizing them into a network of conceptual relationships; and goal setting involving developing subordinate goals to consolidate the top-level ones that guide the direction and the build-up of the text. Translating is the process writers use to convert their brainstormed ideas into a linear piece of written English to produce the first draft. Reviewing is the process that allows them to move backwards and forwards to evaluate, clarify and revise the content and form of their ideas through undertaking simple or major improvements based on the feedback they receive from their peers or the teacher to ensure the coherence and smooth readability of the final draft.

2.2 Critiques to Process-Oriented Writing Instruction

Process approach gives essential contributions to a better understanding of the cognitive complexity of writing. Nevertheless, being mostly centred on describing the cognitive operations involved in composing, its pedagogical instructions recently come under

serious scrutiny by a number of researchers and practitioners. The sets of critiques mostly stems firstly from a socio-cultural perspective and secondly from the proponents of English for academic purposes (Silva, 1990).

With regard to the first stand, one major part of the criticism is the claim that process approaches “have somewhat monolithic views of writing. The process of writing is seen as the same regardless of what is being written and who is writing” (Badger & White, 2000, p.154). This implies the assertion that writing process overlooks the fact that the thinking operation involved in composing “takes place in society, in interaction with other individuals, and this interaction modifies the individual’s reasoning ... and writing within society” (Bizzell, 1992, p.76).

Under these conditions, process approaches view writing as a solitary internal cognitive endeavour operating in a “sociocultural vacuum” (Silva, 1990). In Hyland’s (2003) words, they “have little to say about the ways meanings are socially constructed, they fail to consider the forces outside the

individual which help guide purposes, establish relationships, and ultimately shape writing "(p.18).

With respect to the second stand, advocates of academic writing are suspicious whether the process paradigm is adequate to prepare students to work effectively in the academic context. It fails to develop their awareness of the nature and range of writing tasks for academic purposes (Bizzell, 1986). Horowitz (1986) complains that process orientation "creates a classroom situation that bears little resemblance to the situations in which [writing] will eventually be exercised" (p. 144). He goes further to suggest that its pedagogical orientation "gives students a false impression of how university writing will be evaluated" (ibid, p. 143).

One possible way for process approaches to enjoy continued influence on the writing theory and practice is to seek areas of harmonization, complementarity and integration of its exclusive internal cognitive processing with the social and cultural practices writers bring with them in the learning and teaching of L2

writing (Flower, 1994, cited in Larios & Murphy, 2001, p.37). In Kostouli's (2005) words "Cognition is socially situated" and composing processes of composing cannot be detached from "the genres and the communities within which these strategies operate and which they help construct" (p.18).

3. Genre-oriented Approaches to Writing Instruction

Since the 1980s, genre approaches have come to teaching writing. They are deemed a refusal of the dominance of process approaches. Genre approaches should not be considered as an abandonment of the process writing approach, they are rather seen as an attempt to construct a new and distinct perspective on L2 composition (Silva, 1990). These approaches mark a major shift to a new direction in writing theory and practice (Hyland, 2003). In contrast to process approaches that perceive writing as an individual endeavour that takes place in the writer's head, writing in genre approaches "...is embedded in a social situation, so that a piece of writing is meant to achieve a particular purpose which comes

out of a particular situation” (Badger & White, 2000, p.158).

Genre is generally defined as an “abstract, socially authorized ways of using language” (Hyland, 2003, p.21). It is a social and goal-oriented concept. It is social because it functions to serve a set of communicative purposes shared by the expert members of a particular academic or professional community. It is staged because it takes the members through a predictable sequence of moves to respond to the communicative goals they routinely and continually encounter in specific social situations (Askhave & Swales, 2001; Swales, 1990).

In the field of applied linguistics, genre is conceptualized and researched in a variety of ways. They are strongly influenced by studies in three broad genre schools: Australian linguistics-based genre; English for Specific/Academic Purposes (ESP/EAP); and the North American New Rhetoric (Hyon, 1996). As a result, genre-based methodologies in teaching academic writing has resulted in scholars both within and across the three schools of research

offering different pedagogical foci and perspectives. However, they are “united by a common attempt to describe and explain regularities of purpose, form, and situated social action” (Hyland, 2003, p.22).

3.1 Genre-oriented Writing Instruction

In terms of how to apply genre to teach academic writing in Australian school, the pedagogical emphasis is on “teaching students the formal, staged qualities of genres so that they can recognize these features in the texts that they read and use them in the texts that they write” (Hyland, 2002, cited in Martín-Martín, 2013,p.313).

To achieve this end, scholars in this tradition propose a number of instructional methodologies to teach genre. Common to all of these models is the teaching-learning cycle model developed by a number of researchers and practitioners (Feez, 2002). It is outlined in three phases including text modelling, joint text construction and independent text construction. In the first phase, students guided by the teacher to identify and analyse the generic features and

language resources of an authentic model text. Students work together with the teacher to construct a text in the second phase. Finally, students are assigned with the task of writing their individual texts with the teacher gradually removes support to allow them to work independently (Dudley-Evans, 1997).

Likewise, EAP researchers may appear to overlap and share similar perspectives with the Australian trend concerning genre application into the writing classroom. The focus of its instruction is placed on "teaching formal features of texts, that is, rhetorical structures and grammatical features, so that non-English-speaking background students can learn to control the rhetorical organization and stylistic features of the academic genres of English-speaking discourse communities" (Martin-Martin, 2013, p.332). They both take textual description as their starting point for investigating the role of genre in teaching writing. As is held by Hyland (2007) both EAP and the Australian approaches seek to reveal the rhetorical patterning of a genre

together with its key linguistic features.

Such instructional foci in both trends reside in the assumption that learning to write effectively can happen consciously through imitating and analyzing an input (Badger & White, 2000). In Hyland's (2007) words, imitation "involves studying a representative sample of texts to identify the series of moves, or communicative stages, which make up the genre used in specific contexts" (p.154).

On the other hand, the goal of writing pedagogy in New Rhetoric school focuses more on exploring the relations between genre and the rhetorical environment in which it operates to perform social functions than on the detailed analyses of its language features and macro-organization (Bazerman, 1988, 1994; Freedman & Medway, 1994). In direct contrast to the EAP and SFL genre traditions, NR scholars question the effectiveness of explicit classroom instructions for teaching academic and professional genres. In practice, genre "has not tended to address itself to the classroom, generally

regarding it as an unauthentic environment lacking the conditions for complex negotiation and multiple audiences “(Hyland, 2002, p.114).

3.2 Critiques to Genre-oriented Writing Instruction

Genre writing instructions have become “the main institutionalized alternative to process pedagogy currently on offer” (Atkinson, 2003, p.11). Nonetheless, they are not applied uncritically. Theorists and practitioners are aware of their potential drawbacks.

For example, Bizzell (1986) mounts his criticism against them on the premise that they are text-centred with overemphasis on prescriptive patterns. Thus, academic writing can be perceived as “a matter of pouring one’s thoughts into the ‘formal shells’” (p. 295) resulting in “restricting freedom of expression” (Coe, 1994, p. 158). Similarly, Hyland (2003) observes that “the explicit teaching of genres imposes restrictive formulae which can straightjacket creativity through conformity and prescriptivism; that genres might be taught as moulds into which content is

poured rather than as ways of making meanings” (p. 18).

Another criticism comes from Chandrasegaran (2009) when sustaining that genre approach “primarily focuses on the provision of model texts, often with teacher-guided analysis of the models on the what rather than on the how”. In her words “students learn what stages typically make up the organisation framework of a genre and what linguistic resources are recurrent” (p. 340). Likely, Chen (2008) asserts that raising students' awareness of academic genre is not simply a matter of enabling them to reproduce prescribed rhetorical moves and stages they learn by imitation to construct subsequent texts that mimic them.

4. An Alternative Writing Approach in the Arab Context: Rationales

Writing literature (Al-Hazmi, 2006; Ezza, 2010) has reported that writing education at the Arab university level has long been driven by product approaches characteristic of the 1950s and 1960s. Their theoretical and pedagogical underpinnings have come under a repeatedly articulated

dissatisfaction (See Section 1.3). A situation that constitutes the driving force for this paper to seek a more comprehensive alternative approach to teach/learn academic writing in the Arab context

The main concern to attend to this purpose is that the three dominant approaches are widely debated and questioned, despite their valuable contributions to writing theory and teaching (Badger & White, 2000; Silva, 1990) and that L2 practitioners are still in search of a comprehensive theory to teach writing (Cumminng,1989). Silva (1990) makes his discontent explicit when claiming that none of them is sufficiently supported by empirical research and that none of them can be considered as the appropriate approach to writing instruction.

One possible way to reconcile their weaknesses and to find an appropriate approach to teach writing in the Arab context may emerge, following Badge and White (2000), from the amalgamation of the best merits of both the process approaches and the genre approaches. Evidence from a body of research studies has

shown that such an integrated approach is widely accepted as a pluralistic and coherent one since it responds to students' needs and overcomes some of the difficulties they encounter in achieving quality written essays (Mellow, 2002). In Chandrasegaran's (2009) view, such an integration of the two approaches would yield a socio-cognitive model from which to develop a more effective pedagogical approach to teach writing. Another support comes from Hyland (2002, p.126) who asserts that such approach has "the most influence on L2 writing instruction worldwide; grounding teaching in a solid research base and drawing strength from an eclectic set of pedagogies united by commitment to needs analysis, contextual analysis, genre description and linguistic theories".

Translating this approach into an EFL writing classroom at the Arab tertiary level is hoped to be quite useful to help students overcome some of the challenges that frustrate and discourage them from learning to write in their academia. Unlike product-oriented pedagogy under which the

cognitive operations involved in writing do not receive detailed individual treatment (Fageeh, 2003; Ezza, 2010), the integrated approach has the advantage of making the teaching of these operations feasible and concrete. They are taught through breaking them down into a series of distinctive, hierarchical and manageable stages and strategies so that students can concentrate on and complete one cognitive operation at a time before producing the final written product to lessen their anxiety towards writing (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

Furthermore, unlike the long-held teacher-based teaching method and one-way written feedback, which negates the existence of the writers and their purposes, motivations, and opinions (Bizzell, 1986), a positive aspect of the integrated approach is that it helps create a supportive and productive learning environment that significantly influences the roles of both the teacher and students. A profound benefit of such an environment is that students have ample time and minimal interference to practise together the whole processes that make

up the act of writing as part of classroom activities (Silva, 1990). Such setting can encourage students to engage in a purposeful interaction among themselves with the purpose of discovering how their peers appreciate and evaluate their writing. Students are mobilized to constructively respond to the feedback they receive from their peers and the teacher and reflect on each other's' ideas with the purpose of improving the quality of their final drafts. In consequence, students gradually gain control of the writing processes and strategies and eventually apply them to perform their subsequent writing assignments and tasks independently.

Teachers in such supportive setting are no longer the sole authority and dispenser of knowledge. They are more preoccupied with students' ideas and thoughts (Johns, 1997, p.9). Teachers act as audience, assistant, evaluator and examiner. In their role as an audience, they have the responsibility to react to the students' ideas, providing constructive comments and suggestions. In their role as assistant, they help students use

or extend their knowledge in writing and make sure that the text is effective to perform its purpose. In their role as evaluators and examiners, they provide objective assessment and constructive advice about their overall performance and their strengths and weaknesses (Tribble, 1996).

The positive outcomes that yield from the application of process approaches on improving Arab students' writing competence is accredited by a considerable body of empirical research studies (Al-Hazmi, 2006).

Another major concern with the product-oriented writing instruction is that Arab university students are disadvantaged in that they have limited exposure or even no access to academic genre schema. The concept of genre offers students "a way of seeing how different texts are created in distinct and recognizable ways in terms of their purpose, audience and message" (Hyland, 2004, p. 12).

Seen from this perspective, lack of awareness of genre conventional discursive regularities poses a big challenge to Arab students. This

premise becomes more aggravated recognizing that Arabic and English are stylistically, culturally and linguistically distant languages and that each language has its unique and preferential textual organization that makes up written academic genre (Kaplan, 1966). Thus, they find it difficult to construct a mental representation of the concept of genre into their pre-existing knowledge, activate and act upon it to produce written texts that can satisfy the textual expectations valued and recognized by the members of an English-speaking academic community (Al-Ghamdi, 2009).

The implementation of the integrated approach may account for such concern. With such approach, the textual stages and moves responsible for generating and shaping the template of academic argumentative genre are made transparent to students. In order to bring these discursive behaviours to their conscious awareness, students would have the opportunity to be exposed to instances of representative model texts, and actively participate, and engage in discussing and exploring them

assisted by the teacher (Dudley-Evans, 1997). Such learning practices allow students to attain the knowledge that genre has a coherent and predictable pattern that unfolds in response to institutional and disciplinary communicative ends that members of a particular academic community interact together to achieve. Such knowledge enhances their writing competence and therefore they become better able to successfully produce acceptable written work dictated by the values and norms of academia (Chandrasegaran, 2009).

This advantage appears to meet Kamel's (2000) call that strongly advocates the need to incorporate a range of explicit and systematic instructions to develop Arab EFL learners' conscious awareness of genre schema. It also comes in conformity with other research studies (Fageeh, 2003; Ezza, 2010) whose findings have affirmed that if Arab tertiary institutions fail to allow such a comprehensive pedagogical tool into the writing classroom, writing will continue to be a challenging and stressful skill for students to acquire and thus

they fail to perform their academic writing tasks effectively.

Under the conditions of the integrated approach, Arabic native students have the opportunity to develop awareness of the institutional textual regularities of academic genre as well as to learn and experience the cognitive processes involved in writing in a concrete and feasible way (Al-Khuweileh & Al-Shoumali, 2000). Satisfying these demands is a prerequisite in order for ESL/EFL students to operate successfully in an English-speaking academic community to which they seek admission and acceptance. Perceived as such, the proposed approach can serve to better improve their writing skills and help them become effective writers (Kim & Kim, 2005).

Summary

Overall, the review presents a brief history of L2 writing research and practice. A major theme that is foregrounded is the shift of pedagogical focus from linguistic accuracy and imitating prescribed structural patterns and text modes (product approaches) to students'

creativity and the collaborative learning environment that allow them to independently to generate their ideas and thoughts, plan them, set their communicative goals and revise their drafts (process approaches). The review ends with genre approaches whose focus is on teaching the conventional schematic genre structure that comes out of a particular social situation to achieve specific communicative purposes. The paper also presents the drawbacks and strengths of each of the recent approaches and the issues that are still unresolved in the field of writing theory and application.

However, though each of the three approaches focuses on a particular aspect of writing and that they are marked by competing paradigms, they are largely interdependent and supplementary in that none of them has originated in vacuum. They respond to, and draw on

each other. Importantly, their insights have made valuable contributions to broaden the domain of L2 academic writing in theory as much as in teaching.

In conclusion, the paper argues in support of the assumption that combining the merits of both the process and genre approaches in an integrated approach has the potential to initiate a more comprehensive and coherent writing model as an alternative to the current product-oriented instructional model at the Arab tertiary level. Such assumption is rationalized in terms of the practical and theoretical benefits that the integrated approach may bring to an EFL writing classroom. It can better suit students' needs to improve their writing competence and thus enable them to perform their academic writing tasks and assignments in conformity with the expectations of an English-speaking discourse community.

References

1. Al-Ghamdi, A. (2009). *Academic and Professional Language Needs of Saudi Undergraduate Students in an English Language Programme: A cyclical evaluation model (CEM)*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK.
2. Al-Hazmi, S. (2006). Writing Reflection: Perceptions of Arab EFL Learners. *South Asian Language Review*, XVI (2), 36-52.

- Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/80809477/Writing-and-Reflection-Perceptions-Of#scribd>.
3. Arndt, V. (1987). Six Writers in Search of Texts: a Protocol-based Study of L1 and L2 Writing. *ELT J* 41, 257-267.
 4. Askehave, I., & Swales, J. M. (2001). Genre Identification and Communicative Purpose: A Problem and a Possible Solution. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 195-212.
 5. Atkinson, D. (2003). L2 Writing in the Post-process Era: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12 (1), 3-15. Badger and White (2000)
 6. Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press
 7. Bizzell, P. (1986). "What Happens When Basic Writers Come to College?" *College Composition and Communication*, 37(3), 294-301.
 8. Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
 9. Chandrasegaran, A. (2009). What does Teaching Writing as a Process Mean? In L.J. Zhang, R. Rubdy, & L. Alsagoff (Eds.). *Englishes and literatures-in-English in a Globalized World: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on English in Southeast Asia* (pp. 338-351).
 10. Cheng, Fei-wen. (2008). Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Writing: A Genre Approach to Teaching Narrative Writing. *Asian EFL Journal* 10 (1) 8. Retrieved from: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_2008_EBook_editions.pdf
 11. Coe, R.M. (1994). Teaching Genre as Process. In A. Freedman, & P. Medway, (Eds.), *Learning and Teaching Genre* (pp. 157-169). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann/ Boynton-Cook.
 12. Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81-141.
 13. Dudley-Evans, T. (1997). Genre Models for the Teaching of Academic Writing to Second Language Speakers: Advantages and Disadvantages. In Miller, T. (ED.), *Functional Approaches to*

- Written Text: Classroom Applications*. Washington DC: United States Information Agency.
14. El-Daly, M. H. (1991). *A Contrastive Analysis of the Writing Proficiency of Arabic and Spanish Speakers: Linguistic, Cognitive, and Cultural Perspectives*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
 15. Ezza, E. (2010). Arab EFL Learners' Writing Dilemma at Tertiary Level. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 33–39. Retrieved from <http://ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/37008>.
 16. Feez, S. (2002). Heritage and Innovation in Second Language Education. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the Classroom* (pp. 47–68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
 17. Devitt, A. J. (2004). *Writing Genres*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
 18. Ferris, D.R., & Hedgcock, J.S. (2005). *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 19. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
 20. Freedman, A. & Meadway, P. (1994). Do as I Say: The Relationship between Teaching and Learning New Genres. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the New Rhetoric* (pp.191-210). London: Taylor& Francis. Freedman.
 21. Horowitz, D.M. (1986). Process, not product: Less than meets the eye. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 141-144.
 22. Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A Social Response to Process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 12, 17–29.
 23. Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Pearson Education Limited. Harlow: UK.
 24. Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing*. University of Michigan Press. Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.
 25. Hyland, K. (2007). Genre Pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 Writing Instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 148–164.

26. Hyon, S. (1996). A Genre in Three Traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (4), 693-722. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/3587930/epdf>
27. Johns, A.M. (1997). *Text, Role and Context: Developing Academic Literacies*. New York: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Kamel, S.A. (2000). Categories of Comprehension in Argumentative Discourse: Across-linguistic Study. In I. Zeinab, S. Aydelott & N. Kassabgy (Eds). *Diversity in Language: Contrastive Studies in Arabic and English Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 193–235). Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.
29. Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Communication. *Language Learning*, 16(1-2), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x/epdf>
30. Kim, Y. & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean University Writing Class: Balancing the Process and the Genre Approach. *Asian EFL Journal Online*, 7(2), 69- 90. Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_05_ yk&jk.php.
31. Kostouli, T. (2005). Making Social Meanings in Contexts. In T. Kostouli (Ed.), *Writing in Context(s). Textual Practices and Learning Processes in Sociocultural Settings* (pp. 1–26). New York: Springer.
32. Larios, J.R., and Murphy, L. (2001). Some Steps towards Sociocognitive Interpretation of Second Language Composing Processes. *Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 25-45.
33. Lei X. (2008). Exploring a Sociocultural Approach to Writing Strategy Research: Mediated Actions in Writing Activities. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 217-236.
34. Martín-Martín, P. (2013). The Teaching of Academic Writing to English as Second Language Students: A Functional Genre-based Approach. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, 19, 329-351. Retrieved from <http://www.webs.ulpgc.es/lfe/resources/Cap4RLFE19.pdf>
35. Matsuda, P.K. (2003). Process and Post-process: A Discursive History. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12 (1), 65-83.

36. Matsuda, P., and Silva, T. (2005). *Second Language Writing Research: Perspectives on the Process of Knowledge Construction*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
37. Mellow, J. D. (2002). Towards Principled Eclecticism in Language Teaching: The Two-dimensional Model and the Centering Principle. *TESL-EJ*, 5(4), A-1.
38. Myles, J. (2002). Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts. *TESL-EJ*, 6(2), 1-20.
39. Paltridge, B. (2004). Approaches to Teaching Second Language Writing. *Paper presented in 17th Educational Conference Adelaide 2004, University of Sydney*. Retrieved from http://www.englishaustralia.com.au/ea_conference04/proceedings/pdf/Paltridge.pdf
40. Pincas, A. (1962). Structural Linguistics and Systematic Composition Teaching to Students of English as a Foreign Language. *Language Learning*, 12, 185-194.
41. Silva, T. (1987) ESL Composition: A Historical Perspective. *ERIC document*: 282 442
42. Silva, T. (1990). Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues, and Directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing research: Insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-17). New York: Cambridge University Press.
43. Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
44. Taylor, B. (1976). Teaching Composition to Low-level ESL Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10, 309—313.
45. Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
46. Zamel, V. (1983). The Composing Processes of Advanced ESL Students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (2), 165-187.