A Review of The Effectiveness of Process-Oriented English Writing Strategies in Higher Education

Xiaoying Feng

Yinchuan University of Energy, Wangtaibao, Yongning County, Yinchuan City, Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region China ✉

***Corresponding author:** Xiaoying Feng

Yinchuan University of Energy, Wangtaibao, Yongning County, Yinchuan City, Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region China

Abstract

The process-oriented is recognized as an effective English writing strategies. While it has been widely implemented in Western educational settings for many years, universities in Asia, such as Vietnam, China, and Malaysia predominantly rely on the product-based writing approach for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). The current review seeks to analyze EFL research on writing skills to explore the benefits of adopting the process-oriented approach in English language learning. By reviewing and synthesizing findings from prior studies, this review aims to provide insights into how process-oriented writing impacts university students' writing proficiency. The current review serves as a resource for EFL instructors at universities and other institutions interested in this method for teaching English writing. Additionally, the conclusions drawn from this study can guide future empirical research investigating the effectiveness of the process-oriented English writing strategies in enhancing university students' English writing skills.

Keywords: *Process-oriented writing, English as a foreign language (EFL), English writing skills, university students, Product-based writing*

1. Introduction

Writing, as an important skill, forms one of the four fundamental abilities in English learning. This skill is regarded as central to academic success at university and a key method for assessing students' abilities. According to White (1987), writing is a preferred method for assessing English proficiency, particularly in academic contexts, among the four standardized skills. Writing is a cognitive process that gauges a student's focus, thinking abilities, and skill in expressing these thoughts through words (Kellogg & Raulerson, 2008). While university students strive to write high-quality essays, they often make errors, particularly in grammar, cohesion, coherence, and the use of complex sentence structures. A product-based approach to teaching writing typically involves teachers reviewing written work only at the end, without providing adequate guidance throughout the writing process. This method can hinder students' development and continuous improvement of writing skills (Abas and Aziz, 2016).

In contrast, a process-based approach emphasizes the importance of writing as a means of generating meaning and understanding ideas. Unlike the product-oriented method, which focuses on final drafts, the process-oriented approach sees editing as the last step in the writing journey. After drafting, the text is refined through multiple revisions with feedback from both students and instructors. For writers aiming to publish, final editing and revision significantly improve the quality of the work (Murray, 1972).

The process-oriented approach encourages meaningful writing development in stages. Teachers are actively engaged with students throughout the process, providing feedback to minimize errors. The approach involves four key stages: pre-writing, drafting, revising, and editing. Each stage plays a role in shaping ideas and expanding thoughts on the topic to produce a well-structured final product (Seow, 2002). During pre-writing, students explore the topic and understand the core idea, often using authentic resources. In the drafting stage, they write down their thoughts freely, even if not fully polished. The revision stage allows students to refine their ideas, and the final editing phase focuses on correcting mistakes and polishing the draft, resulting in a refined version of the text (Murray, 1972; Seow, 2002).

These stages are interconnected, and writers may move back from revision to pre-writing to introduce new perspectives. University students are encouraged to revise their work repeatedly to improve it, but during the early stages, the focus should be on developing ideas rather than worrying about spelling and punctuation. These elements can be addressed in later stages. The process-oriented approach to writing fosters creativity and collaborative work, making it a more effective method for learning writing skills (Zakime, 2018).

Despite this emphasis on process-based writing, to the best of the author's knowledge, limited review has specifically explored the process-oriented English writing strategies in higher education, particularly in universities. Therefore, this study seeks to review the effectiveness of process-oriented English writing strategies in enhancing university students' writing proficiency.

The current review utilized a literature review methodology, which involved searching, selecting, analyzing, discussing, and synthesizing existing studies related to the process-oriented approach in teaching and learning English writing skills among university's students. The study focused on reviewing literature and exploring the characteristics of a process-based approach to enhancing university students' English writing abilities, particularly in English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL). The insights gained from this review are intended to guide teachers in reconsidering their teaching strategies and to inform future research in this area.

2. Literature Review

2.1. What is Writing

Hedge (2005) describes writing as the process of conveying communication, connecting ideas, and developing information or presenting arguments to a specific audience. This view aligns with Kellogg's perspective, which suggests that writing presents a significant cognitive challenge, involving memory, language, and thinking skills (Kellogg, 2018).

Before one can master the overall writing process, it is essential to first develop the ability to write effective paragraphs, as paragraph writing is a key component of successful writing (Wali and Madani, 2020). As a foundational skill, paragraph writing lays the groundwork for more complex writing tasks (Utami et al., 2021). Furthermore, Nordquist (2019) emphasizes that the primary function of a paragraph is to indicate a shift in thought, offering readers a moment of pause. In this way, paragraph writing serves as an example of how writers introduce new ideas or perspectives within the larger flow of discourse.

2.1.1. Structure of a Paragraph

In the process of paragraph writing, identifying the structure of the paragraph is essential. This structure includes components such as the topic sentence, supporting sentences, and concluding sentence.

The topic sentence presents the main idea of the paragraph, which is supported or explained by the rest of the sentences (Rolls & Wignell, 2013). Its purpose is to inform the reader of the paragraph's focus, providing a clear expectation of what follows. An effective topic sentence typically presents a single main idea, with the rest of the paragraph elaborating on it by providing supporting points and examples. Often referred to as the "focus sentence," the topic sentence organizes the paragraph by summarizing its content. A well-crafted topic sentence should strike a balance, being neither too specific nor too general. If it is too specific, it may result in supporting sentences that fail to adequately expand on the idea.

Supporting sentences, also known as the body of the paragraph, serve to explain, illustrate, or provide evidence for the main idea expressed in the topic sentence. They help clarify and develop the paragraph's key idea, enhancing its persuasive impact. These sentences can be expanded with examples, details, facts, reasons, and incidents to further strengthen the paragraph.

The concluding sentence, the third key component, wraps up the paragraph. It provides a sense of closure by reinforcing the main idea, often by rephrasing it in different words (Warriner, 1988). Therefore, when concluding a paragraph, it is crucial for the writer to restate the core idea from the topic sentence. This can be effectively done by using synonyms or paraphrases to express the idea in a new way.

2.1.2. Key Characteristics of a Paragraph

In addition to paragraph structure, a well-crafted paragraph must exhibit three key characteristics: unity, coherence, and completeness (Warriner, 1988; Forlini and Prentice-Hall, 1990).

Unity refers to the degree to which all ideas within a paragraph are clearly connected, making it easy for readers to follow. Warriner (1988) state that each sentence in a paragraph must be closely connected to the central idea. This unity is achieved when all sentences in the paragraph contribute to the development of the topic sentence. Similarly, Forlini and Prentice-Hall (1990) argue that a paragraph only achieves unity when all the supporting ideas collaborate to elaborate on the topic sentence.

Coherence, on the other hand, concerns how smoothly the ideas flow in the paragraph, making it easy for readers to understand the progression of thought. Coherence is closely linked to unity, as shifting the main ideas or topics within a paragraph can lead to confusion. To ensure coherence, the writer must demonstrate the relevance of each idea to the main topic. Halliday and Hasan (2014) describe cohesion as a semantic connection that defines the text as a whole. Warriner (1988) also adds that in a coherent paragraph, ideas are organized in a logical sequence and flow seamlessly, making the paragraph easily understandable.

Completeness is reached when the idea is fully elaborated and supported. A paragraph is sufficiently developed when it explains, describes, and supports the topic sentence. Rosen and Behrens (1997) emphasize that each idea presented in the topic sentence must be thoroughly explained and backed by evidence and details that collectively clarify the paragraph's central idea.

2.1.3. Three Types of Paragraph Writing

When deciding on the type of paragraph to write, it is important to consider factors such as the purpose of the paragraph, which defines what the writer aims to communicate to the reader. The answers to these questions guide both the content and effectiveness of the paragraph. There are various types of paragraphs, each serving a distinct purpose, with different strategies employed to achieve these objectives. Wali and Madani (2020) identify three types: narrative, descriptive, and expository paragraphs.

A narrative paragraph is described by Wali and Madani (2020) as a paragraph that usually describes events that occurred in the past. True narrative paragraphs resemble short stories, featuring characters, a plot with a conflict that is eventually resolved, and are told from a specific point of view. They may also establish a setting or include a moral.

According to Sari and Wahyuni (2018), a descriptive paragraph describes or explains a particular item or person, and outlines the paragraph's generic structure, including identification, definition, and conclusion. The goal of a descriptive paragraph is to immerse the reader in the experience of the described subject, even though they cannot physically interact with it. Readers might not see it, but they understand its appearance; they may not taste it, but they know its flavor; they may not touch it, but they can imagine its texture. Descriptive paragraphs often include modifiers such as adjectives, and figurative language such as metaphors to enhance the reader's experience.

An expository paragraph serves to explain or inform. Wibowo and Febrinda (2019) define an expository paragraph as a paragraph that gives readers specific details, aiming to provide necessary information. Expository writing often uses examples, illustrations, or ordered sequences (like chronological or numerical order) to help readers understand a typical process. The language is typically direct and easy to understand, though it may occasionally include language devices such as metaphors to further clarify the point.

2.2. Challenges in ESL/EFL Writing

In practice, the learning of English writing among university students remains inadequate. Teachers, having been educated through traditional methods such as translation-based or product-based approaches, typically lack experience with process-based writing instruction. As a result, they tend to teach writing in the same manner they were taught. Rajesh (2017) notes that teaching writing is especially challenging for teachers who are second-language learners themselves. This leads some teachers to avoid teaching writing due to its complexity. On the students' side, they often struggle with low motivation and limited English proficiency. From an early age, students enroll in EFL classes with a focus on speaking and listening skills, which makes written expression difficult for them. This leads to disengagement and boredom in writing lessons. In writing instruction, teachers typically focus on analyzing model essays, outlining structures, and discussing the requirements for assignments, following a product-based approach that overlooks the writing process itself (Nghia & Tran, 2020).

Students face various challenges in EFL writing classes, which can be grouped into linguistic, cognitive, cultural, and pedagogical issues. Linguistically, students often struggle with grammar and vocabulary at the sentence level. Despite being taught grammar since junior high school, writing remains a difficult area, even at the university level. According to Wee et al. (2010), many EFL learners continue to make writing errors after years of study. Lalande (1982) highlights that even after learning grammar rules, some students consistently make the same errors across different essays. These writing difficulties cause confusion among students at various academic stages, with issues like using incorrect words and failing to transition smoothly between ideas within paragraphs. Cognitively, students commonly encounter problems with punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Punctuation is essential for understanding written text, and capitalization is often misused, especially when indicating important topics or headings (Hajar, 2019). Spelling is another critical area, crucial for both reading and writing proficiency, particularly for younger learners. Regarding cultural and language learning, it is important to recognize the interconnection between language and culture. Pedagogical practices should introduce cultural differences to help students better understand contrasting language rules and avoid the negative transfer of their native culture into English learning (Sun, 2010). However, most teaching methods remain traditional, focusing primarily on repetitive exercises and providing limited opportunities for students to engage in actual writing practice.

Besides that, Chokwe (2013) reveals that academic writing is an essential skill for university students, serving as a form of exchange in higher education where students produce written work to earn grades, ultimately leading to graduation. Writing and the development of general communication skills through subject-based modules are central to teaching and learning in higher education. However, many students find the transition to higher education challenging, especially when it comes to writing and academic discourse (Chokwe, 2013). Gambell (1991) also note that professors were often unwilling to teach students how to write in the discipline's preferred mode of discourse. As Yong (2010) points out, the shift from secondary school to higher education is a significant challenge for students in terms of academic writing. Lecturers often express frustration with students' reading and writing deficiencies (Chokwe, 2013; Jackson et al., 2006; Moore, 1998).

2.3. Process-Oriented English Writing Strategies

2.3.1. Definition of the Process-Oriented English Writing

While there is no single, universally accepted definition of the process approach to writing, several key principles are widely recognized. This approach involves students working through cycles that include planning (such as setting goals, generating ideas, and organizing them), translating (executing the writing plan), and reviewing (which includes evaluating, revising, and editing) (Nagin, 2006; Graham & Sandmel, 2011). Process-oriented English writing focuses on guiding students through stages like pre-writing, drafting, receiving feedback, revising, editing, and finally, evaluating to complete specific writing assignments (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). According to Terrible (1996), process-oriented English writing in classrooms often includes an additional step imposed by instructors. This approach first gained attention in the 1970s (Graves, 1983) and has since become popular, particularly with initiatives like the Writers Workshop (Atwell, 1987), largely promoted by the National Writing Project. From the early 1970s, writing instruction began shifting focus away from solely the final product. By the late 1980s, about 40% of educators reported using this method in their teaching (Applebee, 1989). More recently, Process-oriented English writing has been embraced by ESL instructors as an innovative strategy for teaching English writing (Deng, 2005).

2.3.2. Roles of Teachers and Students in Process-Oriented English Writing

Harmer (2007) highlights that in process-oriented English writing, both teachers and students have essential responsibilities. Teachers act as resources, facilitators, motivators, feedback providers, and evaluators. As a resource, the teacher offers accessible and useful inputs by selecting relevant tasks or activities. In their role as a monitor, they oversee the students' diverse activities. As motivators, teachers encourage students to complete assigned writing tasks. Additionally, as feedback providers and evaluators, teachers first give constructive feedback on students' work and respond positively to their content before formally assessing performance.

Students, on the other hand, take on roles as planners, writers, peer reviewers, and editors. They not only organize and create their work but also provide critical and constructive feedback to peers during peer review sessions. This involvement enhances their critical thinking and objectivity. As editors, students are encouraged to refine their own writing during the revision process (Brown & Lee, 2015). Furthermore, students are trained to reflect on their learning experiences, fostering self-awareness and helping them develop into reflective learners.

2.3.3. Activities in Process-Oriented English Writing

Teaching English writing involves helping students recognize the elements of effective text, explaining these features, guiding them to practice crafting texts with such qualities, and providing feedback on their performance. English writing skills are developed by learning to transcribe language into written form, mastering spelling and grammar rules, studying good style through exemplary models, and understanding standard text structures. This approach focuses on the core functions of various types of writing rather than the surface features of the texts themselves (Britton, 1975; Martin et al., 2020).

The modern process approach to writing emphasizes the objectives that texts aim to fulfill over their linguistic traits and highlights the diverse processes involved, such as generating and assessing ideas, rather than simply converting pre-existing ideas into written text. To support process-oriented English writing, numerous activities are designed to familiarize students with the writing process and its components. These activities include journal writing, peer conferencing, group collaboration, brainstorming, outlining, free writing, multiple drafting, peer revision, writing for varied audiences, and class publication.

As noted by Galbraith and Rijlaarsdam (1999), three interrelated approaches are crucial in teaching writing: 1) fostering the ability to target communicative objectives through writing, 2) building skills to coordinate and manage the processes involved in English writing, and 3) developing awareness of the social context surrounding writing and the collaborative nature of the English writing process.

2.3.4. Process-Oriented English Writing versus Product-Based English Writing

Nunan (1999) describes the product-based approach as guiding students primarily toward the final outcome of their writing. This approach prioritizes the important aspects of writing, such as grammatical accuracy and syntactic structures, while encouraging students to replicate model texts. It emphasizes the correctness and format of the finished piece, placing greater importance on the end result rather than the process of creation (Hasan & Ahkand, 2010). Saeidi and Sahebkheir (2011) argue that this method equips learners with strategies to apply consistent plans in various contexts. Students following the product-based method typically engage in pre-writing, drafting, and revising, often imitating teacher-provided models.

Despite this, writing instruction is a multifaceted process that incorporates diverse approaches. Research on product-based English writing often explores comparisons with other methods. To develop an effective, goal-oriented writing program, it is essential to systematically teach students problem-solving techniques relevant to each stage of the writing process.

The process-based approach, frequently discussed in ESL classrooms, offers an alternative. Harmer (2007) explains that this approach emphasizes how writing unfolds through distinct stages, progressively leading to the completed work. Many studies focusing on the process-oriented English writing highlight the importance of metacognitive strategies. For example, Bengisu and Seyit (2016) found that teaching metacognitive skills significantly enhanced students' narrative writing abilities. Similarly, Lam (2015) investigated how direct instruction in process-oriented English writing impacts learners' writing skills, metacognitive understanding, and self-regulation, noting improvements in the students' ability to manage multiple writing tasks. Mourssi (2013) demonstrated that metalinguistic feedback from instructors in process-oriented English writing helps learners achieve greater accuracy and fluency. Moreover, Safari and Bagheri (2017) examined second-language learners' strategies in IELTS writing and confirmed that process-based approaches outperformed product-based strategies in effectiveness.

2.3.5. Pros and Cons of Process-Oriented English Writing

The the process-oriented English writing presents a range of potential advantages (Graham & Harris, 1997). First, it motivates students to engage in planning, drafting, and revising their work. The cognitive processes involved in these stages play a crucial

role, accounting for nearly 80% of the variation in the quality of writing produced by adolescent students (Breetvelt et al., 1996).

Second, integrating minilessons, conferences, and teachable moments into writing instruction can improve the quality of students' work. These methods also provide opportunities for personalized instruction tailored to students' needs.

Third, the process-oriented English writing is likely to boost students' motivation to write, as it focuses on collaboration, responsibility, individualized attention, and fostering a supportive learning environment. These factors are believed to increase students' appreciation for academic tasks (Wigfield, 1994).

One distinct benefit of the process-oriented English writing is that it encourages students to write more frequently. The approach prioritizes regular writing practice, which is thought to enhance students' writing development. Another advantage is that it promotes core principles such as choice, ownership, self-assessment, peer collaboration, and a supportive environment, all of which are believed to foster self-regulation and confidence (Corno, 1992). Self-regulated learning occurs when individuals use personal strategies like goal setting or self-evaluation to manage their behavior or learning process.

Despite these advantages, the the process-oriented English writing is not without its weaknesses (Baines et al,, 1999). Some argue that the instructional methods used in the process-oriented English writing classrooms may not be sufficient for helping struggling students develop essential writing skills (Graham & Harris, 1997). Critics point out that foundational skills such as handwriting, spelling, and sentence construction may not receive adequate attention (Nagin, 2006). Additionally, extensive research indicates that students with special needs often fail to acquire various cognitive and metacognitive strategies unless they receive explicit, detailed instruction (Brown & Campione, 1990).

Given these points, it is suggested that the process-oriented English writing undergo further experimentation. Change in this area should not be viewed as radical. In fact, the most significant experimentation occurs in schools, where many educators combine the process-oriented English writing with traditional skills instruction rather than relying solely on process writing. High-quality research is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the most promising hybrid approaches.

2.4. Theoretical Framework

Social constructivism, a learning theory created by Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky, suggests that individuals are active participants in constructing their own knowledge (Schreiber & Valle, 2013). This approach emphasizes active learning, where learners develop their understanding by interacting with teachers, peers, family members, and the environment. It focuses on hands-on experiences that help students build their learning skills.

Two key concepts in Vygotsky's theory are the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and Scaffolding. Vygotsky (1978) defined ZPD as the gap between a student's current developmental level, determined by independent problem-solving, and their potential development, which can be achieved with guidance or collaboration with more knowledgeable individuals. He explained that ZPD is a dynamic construct, addressing both learning and cognitive growth, and encompasses functions that are in the process of maturation, which may be described as the "buds" or "flowers" of development rather than fully developed skills.

The ZPD concept suggests that students' abilities can improve through guidance from teachers or peers, who help them develop their skills by providing feedback. Polly and Byker (2020) support Vygotsky's idea that every individual has a personal ZPD, and these supportive interactions enable individuals to accomplish tasks beyond their current capabilities.

The ZPD offers a useful framework for understanding the process-based approach. It shows how interdependence, where students engage in activities within their ZPD, can enhance learning. Development occurs when children are presented with tasks that challenge their capabilities within the ZPD. Initially, these tasks require significant assistance, but over time, as students become more independent, they can complete tasks with less help, leading to cognitive growth. This process highlights the importance of a social system actively constructed by both the child and teacher, with interdependence being central to this Vygotskian perspective on education.

However, the effectiveness of ZPD may depend on the scaffolding provided. According to Finnegan and Ginty (2019), scaffolding is integral to social constructivism. It involves teachers helping students identify problems, correct mistakes, and find solutions. Scaffolding provides support and facilitates learning by guiding students through tasks. Bransford et al. (2000) as cited in Van Der Stuyf (2002) outline several scaffolding techniques: 1) engaging students' interest, 2) simplifying tasks to make them more achievable, 3) offering direction to help students focus on the goal, 4) highlighting differences between the student's work and the desired outcome, 5) reducing frustration, and 6) modeling expectations.

Educators with a constructivist approach argue that when learners construct their own knowledge, they develop a deeper understanding and can apply their learning (Harris & Pressley, 1991). In practice, EFL teachers should provide opportunities for students to build knowledge and skills independently. In this collaborative process, students engage in prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing, helping each other through scaffolding, while the teacher plays a similar role for every student. In this way, individuals continuously operate within their ZPD, relying on the support from teachers and peers to progress and complete tasks independently.

2.5. Past Research on the Process-Oriented English Writing

Numerous studies have explored the process-oriented approach to English writing. Nunan (1999) explains that proponents of process writing argue that while achieving a perfect text may not be possible, it is possible to move closer to perfection by producing, reflecting on, discussing, and revising multiple drafts. Chenoweth and Hayes (2003) further emphasize that the process approach challenges the idea of linear text production, as writing involves several recursive stages.

Building on early research, many EFL teachers have explored the process-based approach to see if it can be successfully implemented in their teaching environments. For instance, Sun and Feng (2009) conducted a study on the process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. This research examined two teaching models using the process approach: one with minimal control and another with maximal control. These approaches are applied to students of varying English proficiency levels. The study found that all students showed significant

improvement in their English writing skills when using the process-oriented approach.

VanderPyl (2012) also investigated the effectiveness of the process-oriented English writing in two diverse educational contexts. His study found that the process-oriented English writing was beneficial on multiple levels. The author provided practical examples of how the process-based approach could be applied in English writing instruction, which could be valuable for educators interested in adopting this approach.

Sarhady (2015) also conducted research at the University of Kurdistan focused at the effect of product or process-oriented approach to teaching and learning writing skill on university student performances. This study involved 44 male and female junior university students majoring in English language and literature. The students were divided into two groups: a control group and an experimental group, which received different instructional techniques. The study concluded that the process-oriented approach was more effective than the product-oriented approach in improving students' English writing skills.

Goldstein and Carr (1999) also explored the benefits of process writing, defining it as a set of strategies that include pre-writing activities, audience analysis, using various resources, planning, drafting, and revising. These activities, collectively referred to as process-oriented instruction, view writing as a problem-solving activity. Their study highlighted that the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report supported these aspects of writing. The assessment focused on English writing assignments that allowed for sustained involvement, multiple drafts, and opportunities for reflection and revision. The research from the 1992 NAEP assessment also found that process-oriented techniques were linked to higher levels of English writing proficiency.

Mushtaq et al. (2021) employed a mixed-method approach to examine how the process-oriented method enhances writing skills among eighty first-semester undergraduate students from various Pakistani universities. Data collection was conducted online, with pre- and post-tests administered to evaluate students' language use, vocabulary, coherence, and cohesion in their written work. Participants composed essays of 350-500 words, which served as samples for analysis. The pre-test results highlighted significant challenges faced by students in writing, while the post-test demonstrated noticeable improvement. Findings indicated that students held favorable views toward adopting the process-oriented approach to strengthen their writing abilities.

Mirzaei and Shamsudin (2023) also employed both quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the challenges Iranian postgraduate students encountered with the process-oriented approach in Intensive English Centre (IEC) classes. Thirty participants, selected from various fields at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), had English proficiency scores of 5 or 5.5 on the IELTS, a common issue for students with limited exposure to English outside academic settings. The research utilized questionnaires and interviews to assess students' perceptions of the process-oriented approach and identify the specific elements of this method they adopted. Questionnaire data were analyzed using SPSS version 17 on a Likert scale to evaluate perceptions and pinpoint difficulties. Additionally, interview transcripts were reviewed to examine how the process-oriented approach contributed to improving the resulting English writing skills. The findings revealed that students generally held positive views toward the process-oriented approach, and its challenges could be mitigated through effective strategies aligned with this method.

3. Conclusion

Developing strong English writing skills is essential for university students' future careers, particularly for those graduating with an English major. However, many university students struggle to write English accurately and effectively. Even foundational tasks like English sentences construction remain challenging. This review explores the effectiveness of process-oriented strategies in enhancing English writing skills. Past studies indicate that this approach can significantly improve English writing proficiency. Furthermore, this method can provide valuable insights for EFL instructors at universities in Asia, who might integrate it into their English teaching strategies. English language faculties in universities could consider incorporating these strategies into their curricula to enhance students' English writing skills. Since this approach requires instructors to invest additional time in designing effective lessons, careful planning is necessary. Ultimately, this review aspires to serve as a resource for future researchers, including the author, to delve deeper into methods or strategies of teaching and learning English writing.

References

1. Applebee, A. (1989). *National study of the teaching of literature in the secondary school*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.
2. Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Reading, writing, and learning from adolescents.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
3. Behrens, L., Rosen, L. J., & Behrens, L. (1997). *Writing and reading across the curriculum*. New York: Longman.
4. Bengisu, K. & Seyit, A. (2016). The Effect of Process-Based Writing Focused on Metacognitive Skills-Oriented to Fourth Grade Students' Narrative Writing Skill. *Education and Science, 41* (187), 137-164.
5. Breetvelt, I. et al. (1996). *Rereading and generating and their relation to text quality: An application of mutilevel analysis on writing process data*. In G. Rijlaarsdam, H. Van den Bergh, & M. Couzjin (Eds.), *Theories, models and methodologies on writing research* (pp. 10–21). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
6. Britton, J. (1975). The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18).
7. Brown, A. & Campione, J. (1990). Interactive learning environments and the teaching of science and mathematics. In M. Gardner, J. Green, F. Reif, A. Schoenfield, A. di Sessa, & E. Stage (Eds.), *Toward a scientific practice of science education* (pp. 112-139). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
8. Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson.
9. Chenoweth, A. & Hayes, J. (2003). The inner voice. *Written Communication, 20*(1), 99-118.
10. Chokwe, J. M. (2013). Factors impacting academic writing skills of English second language students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(14), 377-383.
11. Corno, L. (1992). Encouraging students to take responsibility for learning and

12. Deng, X. (2005). Portfolio, student reflections, and the teaching of ESL/EFL writing. *Anthology Series-Seameo Regional Language Centre*, *46*, 111.

13. Ferris, D. R. & Hedgcock, J. S. 2005. *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

14. Finnegan, M. & Ginty, C. (2019). Moodle and social constructivism: Is Moodle being used as constructed? A case study analysis of Moodle use in teaching and learning in an Irish Higher Educational Institute. *All Ireland Journal of Higher Education, 11*(1), 1-21.

15. Forlini, G., & Prentice-Hall, Inc. (1990). *Prentice Hall grammar and composition* (4th ed). Prentice Hall.

16. Galbraith, D. & Rijlaarsdam, G. (1999). Effective strategies for the teaching and learning of writing. *Learning and instruction*, *9*(2), 93-108.

17. Gambell, T. J. (1991). University students' self-perceptions of writing. *Canadian Journal of Education, 16*(4), 420-433.

18. Goldstein, A. A. & Carr, P. G. (1996). Can Students Benefit from Process Writing?. *NAEPfacts*, *1*(3), n3.

19. Graham, S. & Harris, K. R. (1997). Whole language and process writing: Does one approach fit all? In J. Lloyd, E. Kameenui, & D. Chard (Eds.), *Issues in educating students with disabilities* (pp. 239–258). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

20. Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *104*(6), 396-407.

21. Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

22. Hajar, A. (2019). A Critical Review of Research on Language Learning Strategies Used by Arab Learners of English. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, *10*(3).

23. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (2014). *Cohesion in english*. Routledge.

24. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of english language teaching*. Kuala Lumpur: Pearson Education Limited.

25. Hasan, M. K., & Akhand, M. M. (2010). Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL context: Balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA*, *15*(1-2), 77-88.

26. Hedge T. (2005). *Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

27. Hermilinda Abas, I., & Aziz, N. H. A. (2016). Indonesian EFL Students' Perspective on Writing Process: A Pilot Study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *7*(3), 21-27.

28. Jackson, L., Meyer, W., & Parkinson, J. (2006). A study of the writing tasks and reading assigned to undergraduate science students at a South African university. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*, 260-281.

29. Kellogg, R. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of writing research, 1*(1), 1-26.

30. Kellogg, R. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of writing research, 1*(1), 1-26.

31. Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing Composition errors: An experiment. *Modern language Journal, 66*, 140-49.

32. Lam, R, (2015). Understanding EFL Students' Development of Self-Regulated Learning in a Process-Oriented Writing Course. *TESOL Journal, 6*(3), 527-553.

33. Martin, N., D'Arcy, P., Newton, B., & Parker, R. (2020). The development of writing abilities. In *Landmark essays on writing across the curriculum* (pp. 33-49). Routledge.

34. Mirzaei, F., & Shamsudin, S. (2023). Process Oriented Writing Approach by UTM Iranian Students: Difficulties and Features. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and Society*, *5*(2), 248-260.

35. Mourssi, A. (2013). Theoretical and practical linguistic shifting from product/guided writing to process writing and recently to the innovated writing process approach in teaching writing for second/foreign language learners. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(5), 731.

36. Murray, D. M. (1972). Teach writing as a process not product. *Report No Pub Date*, *18*.

37. Mushtaq, R., Taseer, N. A., & Ghori, U. K. (2021). Effectiveness of Process-Oriented Approach in the Development of English Writing Skills of Undergraduate Students. *Global Educational Studies Review, VI*, *6*, 186-194.

38. Nagin, C. (2006). *Because writing matters: Improving student writing in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

39. Nagin, C. (2006). *Because writing matters: Improving student writing in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

40. Nghia, T. L. H., & Tran, L. T. (2020). *Students' Experiences of Teaching and Learning Reforms in Vietnamese Higher Education*. Routledge.

41. Nordquist, R. (2019). *Definitions and examples of paragraphing in essays*. Retrieved December 15, 2024, from https://www.thoughtcom.com>paragraphing-composition-term-1691483

42. Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

43. Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

44. performance. *Elementary School Journal, 93*, 69-83.

45. Polly, D. & Byker, E. (2020). Considering the role of zone of proximal development and constructivism in supporting teachers' TPACK and effective use of technology. *Revista de Educación a Distancia (RED)*, *20*(64).

46. Rajesh, D. (2017). Teaching writing: The problems encountered by the rural students. *Research journal of English (RJOE)*, *2*(3), 134-137.

47. Rolls, N. & Wignell, P. (2013). *Communicating at university: Skills for success*. Darton, Australia, Charles Darwin University Press

48. Rosén, C., & Fredriksson, C. (2021, November). The Effect of Process-Oriented Writing on Text Quality and Students' Attitudes towards Writing in a Third Language. In *Conference Proceedings. Innovation in Language Learning 2021*.

49. Saeidi, M., Sahebkheir, F. (2011). The effect of model essays on accuracy and complexity of EFL learners' writing performance. Middle- East Journal of Scientific Research, 10(1), 130- 137.

50. Safari, S. & Bagheri, B., (2017). A Comparative Study of Strategy Instrument through Process vs. Product Writing on IELTS Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of English Language Studies, 5*(3),18-33.

51. Sarhady, T. (2015). The effect of product/process-oriented approach to teaching and learning writing skill on university student performances. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 7-12.

52. Sari, F., & Wahyuni, S. (2018). The use of clustering technique to improve the students'skill in writing descriptive paragraph. *English Community Journal*, *2*(1), 167-174.

53. Schreiber, L. M. & Valle, B. E. (2013). Social constructivist teaching strategies in the small group classroom. *Small Group Research*, *44*(4), 395-411.

54. Seow, A. (2002). The writing process and process writing. *Methodology in language teaching/Cambridge University Press*.

55. Sun, C. & Feng, G. (2009). Process Approach to Teaching Writing Applied in Different Teaching Models. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 150-155.

56. Sun, F. (2010). Pedagogical implications to teaching English writing. *Journal of language teaching and research*, *1*(6), 867.

57. Terrible, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

58. Utami, et al. (2021). Empowering ICT potentials in English language teaching. *Journal Polingua: Scientific Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Education, 10*(2), 42-48.

59. Van Der Stuyf, R. R. (2002). Scaffolding as a teaching strategy. *Adolescent learning and development*, *52*(3), 5-18.

60. Vanderpyl, G. D. (2012). The process approach as writing instruction in EFL English as a foreign language) classrooms.

61. Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Wali, O. & Madani, A. Q. (2020). The importance of paragraph writing: An introduction. *Organization, 3*(7), 44-50.

62. Wali, O. & Madani, A. Q. (2020). The importance of paragraph writing: An introduction. *Organization, 3*(7), 44-50

63. Warriner, J. E. (1988). *English composition and grammar*: Second course (Benchmark ed.). Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

64. Wee, R., Sim, J., & Jusoff, K. (2010). Verb-form errors in EAP writing. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *5*(1), 16.

65. White, R. V., (1987). Approaches to writing. In M. H. Long & Richards (Eds.), Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings (pp. 259-266). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

66. White, R. V., (1987). Approaches to writing. In M. H. Long & Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings* (pp. 259-266). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

67. Wibowo, A. P., & Febrinda, V. (2019). The use of learning logs strategy in improving students' ability in writing expository paragraph. *Lectura: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *10*(2), 198-211.

68. Wigfield, A. (1994). The role of children's achievement values in the Self-regulation of their learning outcomes. In. D. Schunk & B. Zimmerman (Eds.), Self-regulation of learning and performance: *Issues and educational applications* (pp. 101–124). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA.

69. Yong, F. L. (2010). Attitudes toward academic writing of foundation students at an Australian-based university in Sarawak. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 13*(2), 472-478.

70. Zakime, A. (2018). What-is-Task-based-learning. Retrieved December 10, 2024, from https://www.whatiselt.com/single-post/2018/01/19/.