The Effect of A training Program Based on the First Package of the Project Zero in Egypt for Teachers of Al-Azhar on the Students' Writing Performance

The Effect of A training Program for Arabic and English Teachers in Al-Azhar Based on the First Package of the Project Zero in Egypt on the Students' Writing Performance

An experimental Study as a Part of the Egyptian Project Zero

By

Dr. Gomaa Abdel-Badea Rodwan Salama

Al-Azhar Undersecretary in Dakahlia Governorate, a ph.d holder in Lingistics Of Arabic Language, Al-Zhar university

Ismail Ibrahim Elshirbini Abdel-Fattah Al-Ashiri

PhD Researcher of Curriculum and Instruction
Faculty of Education,
Mansoura University

2012

The Effect of A training Program Based on the First Package of the Project Zero in Egypt for Teachers of Al-Azhar on the Students' Writing Performance

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed at identifying the necessary writing skills for the second year secondary stage students in Al-Azhar institutes through implementing the second part in the first package of the Egyptian Zero project. These skills are necessary for writing compositions for the second year in Arabic as their mother tongue and in English as a foreign. In this study, this part in the first package is the second and it is called Process-Oriented Approach. A teacher training program was used to develop the students' writing skills, improve their achievement and comprehension in writing section. To achieve these purposes, the study designed activities based on process-oriented approach strategy for the teachers of Arabic and the teachers of English in Al-Azhr institutes. In addition, a Teacher's Guide was prepared to help English language teachers handle writing skill through the process-oriented approach stages.

The study made use of tow Pre-Post Performance Writing Tests to measure the students' development in the writing skills, holistic and analytic scoring rubrics. These instruments were used after implementing the teacher training program. Then the teachers applied what they have learnt in their classes. The research adopted the experimental design. Two classes were assigned to be the experimental group, studying writing through the process-oriented approach stages (one class is in Arabic and another is in English). Another class was assigned to be the control group, studying through the traditional method.

Results of the present study showed that students felt that. Students' involving in such vivid process-oriented approach stages improved their

performance, achievement and writing skills. Thus, it was observed that the students who were the sample of the study enjoyed writing. In addition, Process-Oriented Approach was effective in developing the writing skills of the students

Introduction

By its nature, writing is often a solo activity, done silently, involving physical effort and taking a lot of time. This may not make it attractive to students or teachers as a classroom activity. In addition to this, writing is difficult, even in the first language. There are linguistic, psychological and cognitive problems involved, making teaching and learning it a considerable challenge. The present study is presented as follows:

(1) Rationale
(2) Literature review
(3) Research aims
(4) Research question
(5) Hypotheses
(6) Methodology
(7) Summary, Results, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions
(8) References
(9) Appendices

Rationale

International Project Zero

International project Zero has been established in1967 in Harvard University. It contains many sub-projects; these projects are the following:

Adult Multiple Intelligences Study was five-year (August 1996-August 2001) collaboration between Project Zero and World Education, Inc., investigating and supporting the work of adult literacy educators in developing innovative instructional strategies, curriculum, and assessment based on multiple intelligences theory.

The APPLE Project (Assessing Projects and Portfolios for Learning) was a research and development effort focused on studying effective ways of assessing student performances; fair documentation and assessment of children's work on series projects; and determining how best to implement portfolio assessment in schools.

Artful Thinking was an initiative to develop a research-based approach to developing learners' thinking dispositions through looking at art. Part of Project Zero's Visible Thinking strand, the program was originally created to help K-12 teachers integrate looking at art into subjects across the curriculum. It has since been adapted for use in museums and other organizations. Like all projects in the Visible Thinking family, Artful Thinking foregrounds the use of thinking routines, the documentation of student thinking, and reflective professional practice as part of a dispositional approach to the development of thinking.

Arts PROPEL was a five-year collaborative project with Project Zero, the Educational Testing Service, and the Pittsburgh Public Schools. The project focused on developing a framework for instruction and assessment in music, visual arts, and imaginative writing which united production, perception, and reflection as integrated elements of the artistic process--with making (production) always remaining at the center (in contrast to the approach taken by Disciplined Based Arts Education). The two most important tools to come out of this project were Domain Projects (long-term projects in each art form) and Processfolios (selections of student work in process along with student reflections). The project is fully described in four handbooks: *Arts PROPEL: An introductory handbook; Arts PROPEL: A handbook for the visual arts; Arts PROPEL: A handbook for imaginative writing; and Arts PROPEL: A handbook for music.*

Arts SURVIVE was a three year national study investigating why some arts education partnerships between schools and professional artists and/or cultural institutions survive and others do not. It worked to provide a greater understanding of what survival means to arts education partnerships, as well as determining what is essential to build and sustain them.

Art Works for Schools was a collaborative project with arts organizations and schools that focused on teaching high-level thinking in and through the arts.

Assessing Historical Understanding Project was collaboration between Project

Zero and Facing History and Ourselves to develop tools, criteria, and frameworks for deep understanding of the rise of Nazi Germany and other periods in history.

ATLAS Communities (Communities for Authentic Teaching, Learning, and Assessment for all Students) was a project dedicated to designing "break-the-mold schools" for the 21st century.

ATLAS Seminar was a series of seminars, convened by Principal Investigators of the ATLAS Communities Project, for the purpose of examining central issues in school reform.

Catalyst: Developing Technology for Education was a project that investigated how computers could best be used as teaching machines.

The Creative Classroom Project was a collaboration between Project Zero and the Disney Learning Partnership to produce tools and knowledge to inform and support creativity in teaching.

Early Symbolization and the Transition to Literacy was a group of closely related studies centered on representation capacities in younger children.

The Evidence Project was a three-year effort, working in a small number of Massachusetts schools serving youth from low-income communities, to develop effective methods of assessing instructional practices in K-8 classrooms. Project

staff collaborated on a book with colleagues from the Academy for Educational Development and Coalition of Essential Schools on this work.

Figurative Language was an investigation of the development of figurative language skills in children.

Innovating with Intelligence was an international project that developed a research-based approach to teaching thinking dispositions. Based partly at Lemshaga Akademi in Sweden, and partly at pilot schools in the U.S., the program explored high-leverage ways to develop students' thinking dispositions in such areas as truth-seeking, understanding, fairness, and imagination.

Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum/Project Zero Educational Collaborationwas established for the purpose of developing educational activities and curricula to help make the Museum's unique collections more accessible to schools and other populations.

L@titud was the Latin American Initiative toward Understanding and Development. The L@titud network gathered professionals to promote educational innovations that support understanding and intelligent action in Latin America. L@titud sought to promote regional dialogue and support local initiatives that build on conceptual frameworks developed at Project Zero. It also strove to strengthen local expertise through professional development, the production and dissemination of educational materials in Spanish, and research activities.

Learning in and from Museum Study Centers: Immediately prior to a major renovation of the Harvard University Art Museums (HUAM), Project Zero collaborated with the museums on a research initiative that investigated the nature of visitor learning in HUAM's two study centers--the Agnes Mongan Center for the Study of Prints, Drawings, and Photographs in the Fogg Art Museum, and the Study Room of the Busch-Reisinger Museum. The project examined how object-centered learning in the study centers encourages the development of complex knowledge. The purpose of the project was to inform the physical redesign of the study centers and to suggest ways to enhance their use going forward. The lessons learned have been useful to museums and other settings that emphasize object-centered learning with art and artifacts.

Lincoln Center Institute Project: Curricular Frameworks in Aesthetic Education was an artist-in-residence program designed to expose students to the arts, and to immerse students and teachers in an intensive aesthetic education program.

Making Learning Visible: The Making Learning Visible (MLV) Project was based on collaborative research between Project Zero researchers and educators from the Municipal Preschools of Reggio Emilia, Italy. MLV investigated how best to understand, document, and support individual and group learning for children and adults. In particular, MLV addressed three aspects of learning and

teaching: 1) what teachers and students can do to support the creation of learning groups in the classroom; 2) the role of observation and documentation in deepening and extending children's and adults' learning; and 3) how teachers and students can both create and transmit culture, values, and knowledge. Over the past decade, MLV has worked with hundreds of preschool through high school teachers and teacher educators in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Ohio to promote the development of learning groups in the classroom and staffroom. Today, the ultimate goal of MLV continues to be to create and sustain powerful cultures of learning in and across classrooms and schools, in particular through the use of documentation as a way to deepen and extend learning.

Mather Afterschool Program: A Project-Centered Approach to Literacy Instruction was a collaborative undertaking which resulted in the development of a project-based afterschool program designed to build students' literacy and thinking skills.

MoMA's Visual Thinking Curriculum Project was an investigation of the educational impact and potential of the Museum of Modern Art's Visual Thinking Curriculum.

Multiple Intelligence Schools was a research study examining the many ways Multiple Intelligences theory has been applied in schools, as well as the types of impact it has made.

Parent Partners was a project to develop a website for parents. It aimed to help them understand and support their children's growth in seven areas of development from birth through age 14.

Patterns of Thinking was a multi-year investigation into the nature of critical and creative thinking. The project's focus was the understanding, teaching, and assessment of thinking dispositions.

School was a research project exploring the question "What do students need to know in order to succeed in school?"

Project Co-Arts was a national study of community arts centers in economically disadvantaged communities that focused on education. The project developed a framework to help administrators and teacher/artists make thoughtful decisions regarding the provision of quality education. The project also worked to enable art centers and other educational institutions to document and assess their educational effectiveness.

Project MUSE (Museums Uniting with Schools in Education) was a collaboration of researchers, museum educators, and classroom teachers focused on exploring the potential of art museums to serve as integral elements of education.

Project Spectrum offered an alternative approach to assessment and curriculum development for the preschool and early primary years based on Howard Gardner’s

theory of multiple intelligences and David Feldman's theory of development in non-universal domains. The approach stemmed from the belief that each child exhibits a distinctive profile of abilities, or spectrum of intelligences. These intelligences are not fixed; rather, they can be enhanced by stimulating materials and activities in a nurturing environment. The Spectrum approach emphasizes close observation, identifying children's strengths in seven domains of knowledge (language, math, music, art, social understanding, science, and movement), and using this information as the basis for an individualized educational program.

Project SUMIT (Schools Using Multiple Intelligences Theory) was a research project which identified, documented, and promoted effective applications of Multiple Intelligences in schools

Project Zero/International Schools Consortium Partnership focused on Project Zero's framework, Teaching for Understanding, with secondary attention given to issues about assessment and thinking dispositions, Multiple Intelligences, and the arts in education.

Project Zero/Massachusetts Schools Network was a three-year collaboration between Project Zero, the Massachusetts Department of Education, and eleven Massachusetts elementary schools which brought together practitioners, policy makers and researchers for the purpose of exploring how portfolios can be implemented to provide effective assessment of students and programs.

Qualities of Quality in Arts Education: The Qualities of Quality: Understanding Excellence in Arts Education was a multi-faced study of how arts educators define and strive to create high-quality arts learning experiences for children and youth, both in and out of school. This study focused far less on legislative and preparatory efforts to achieve quality than on the nature of the arts learning experience as it actually occurs. The study used qualitative approaches to gain insight into the complex and ephemeral nature of people's thoughts about quality, what informs those thoughts, and how their ideas guide the decisions they make that impact the quality of arts learning experiences. The project yielded a set of tools for educators and policy makers to help them reflect on and discuss issues of quality in their own settings.

REAP (Reviewing Education and the Arts Project) addressed the question of what studies have shown about the effects of arts instruction on cognition in non-arts domains. The project examined all of the major arts domains (multi-arts, visual arts, music, drama, and dance) and resulted in ten meta-analytic reviews. The analyses revealed little evidence to support commonly cited claims for transfer of learning from arts to other areas of the curriculum. Because arts learning was not clearly assessed in most of the research projects synthesized, the researchers turned their attention to a qualitative study to identify and name what is really taught in visual arts education, which resulted in the Studio Thinking Framework. The analyses are available in a special issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education

(Journal of Aesthetic Education, 34 (3-4), 2000) and in the proceedings of a conference devoted to the study, Beyond the Soundbite: http://www.getty.edu/foundation/pdfs/soundbite.pdf

Rubrics and Self-Assessment Project was aimed at improving writing skills of middle school students by engaging them in regular self-assessment using scoring rubrics.

Shakespeare & Company Research Study was a project which closely examined two components of a professional theater company's school-based educational programs.

Smart Schools provided a structure for schools by envisioning a learning community that is steeped in thinking and deep understanding; that engenders respect for all its members; and that produces students who are ready to face the world as responsible, thinking members of a diverse society.

The Story Work Project: This partnership with the International Storytelling Center in Jonesborough, Tennessee sought to understand the power and role of storytelling in individual and community learning and development. How do communities craft and use stories to learn? How do individuals create personal stories that enhance their growth? Insights into questions such as these are revealed through extensive literature reviews and interviews with leading practitioners who

use stories and storytelling in a variety of fields. Archivists and folklore leaders from the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian also worked with the project to share the work with the broader public. This project was funded by the Krispy Kreme Foundation.

The Studio Thinking Project was an observational study designed to understand what was taught (the Studio Habits of Mind) and how teaching was conducted (the Studio Structures) in rigorous visual arts instruction. This work resulted in the book Studio Thinking: The real benefits of visual arts education (2007), and a second edition is in preparation. The framework continues to be used widely in the US and internationally in visual arts, music, theater, and dance classes, as well as in non-art subjects. It also led to a project supported by the National Science Foundation which investigated the transfer of learning from visual arts to geometry.

Teaching for Understanding: Enhancing Disciplinary Understanding in Teachers and Students was a collaborative effort of researchers and practitioners initially targeting middle and high school for the purpose of developing and testing a pedagogy of understanding. The key idea was "performing" understandings: understanding something as a matter of being able to think and act flexibly with what you know about it, not just passively "having" an understanding. Research showed that learners understood content better when teachers used the Teaching for Understanding framework. Since its development, the framework has been

applied widely to teaching and learning K-12, at the university level, and even to organizational learning.

Visible Thinking was an initiative to develop a research-based approach to teaching thinking dispositions. The approach emphasized three core practices: thinking routines, the documentation of student thinking, and reflective professional practice. It was originally developed at Lemshaga Akademi in Sweden as part of the Innovating with Intelligence project, and focused on developing students' thinking dispositions in such areas as truth-seeking, understanding, fairness, and imagination. It has since expanded its focus to include an emphasis on thinking through art and the role of cultural forces and has informed the development of other Project Zero Visible Thinking initiatives, including Artful Thinking, and Cultures of Thinking.

Egyptian project Zero

Writing

Writing in English is a skill that is often neglected in Egyptian secondary school writing classes, partly because the current textbooks do not have any writing activities and also because teachers find writing quite a daunting prospect in their classes. However, learning to write in English has officially been brought into the curriculum as one of the required skills for Egyptian students, who are in prep

schools (grades 7, 8 and 9) and in secondary schools since the school (grades 10, 11 and 12).

In the secondary school context, where exposure to English is typically limited to four periods each week, students receive little practice in writing in English, only one period (45 minutes) per unit. When they do write, they find themselves confused with word choice, grammatical use, organization and generation of ideas. They tend to translate ideas from mother tongue (Arabic) into English, express ideas in long sentences, and are not aware of different kinds of writing, thus making them unable to write in real life. Because of limited background knowledge, they often feel bored when doing written work, especially when lacking support and motivation from teachers.

Moreover, students show little knowledge about how to write a contextually appropriate paper and how to develop their process of writing. Unfortunately, the pressures of the formative tests and summative examinations force English teachers to focus their attention on grammatical rules, linguistic accuracy and students' final "piece of work" instead of functional language skills. Due to students' low level proficiency, time constraints and low motivation, writing still remains neglected. Teaching English writing in Egyptian secondary schools is a challenging job for many Egyptian English teachers because it requires not only high language competence among the teachers themselves, but also the application of appropriate writing instruction. The reality of teaching English writing in secondary school has revealed that most students have problems in writing. Their problems as well as reasons are as follows:

Emphasis on language accuracy

Writing instruction in Egypt is carried out under the authority of a nationally unified syllabus and the national examination system. Although the Egyptian secondary English Syllabus involves developing four functional language skills, the test and examination formats highly value correct linguistic forms instead of students' development of creative thought. The desire for high graduation pass rates among secondary schools places English teachers in a dilemma. Under immense pressure, English teachers must focus on teaching correct language forms and test-oriented skills rather than helping students develop their creative thinking and language skills for communicative purposes.

Moreover, most writing activities in the Egyptian secondary syllabus, especially Hello7, are designed on the basis of the product-oriented approach, in which students are encouraged to mimic a model text, which is usually presented and analyzed at an early stage. This discourages students' creativity because they cannot use their own experiences to express themselves. All they have to do is to answer comprehension questions, to fill in the blanks with the provided information, or to build complete sentences using the given cues in order to make a meaningful letter, and so on. This controlled writing format hinders teachers in trying new approaches to writing instruction. Teacher feedback focuses more on grammatical and lexical errors instead of meaning-oriented exploration. In brief, under such a syllabus, students are mainly evaluated by their test scores.

The overview of the development of writing ability

Although writing plays an indispensable role in the four basic language skills, it has long been ignored in Egyptian secondary schools. According to the national examination format (*see Appendix 1*), reading ability is still regarded as the most important skill. As for formative and summative tests, writing is included but it doesn't have much weight, thus making it difficult to motivate students to write in class. Compared with the other three skills, writing is considered too complicated to teach. Some teachers do not feel confident about their own English and shy away from designing writing tasks or getting students to write more than just grammatical exercises. Sometimes teachers do not have enough ideas to help students.

In reality, most teachers follow what the tasks in the textbook require, and do nothing more about it. They may even let students study model paragraphs by heart telling them that these models are suitable for all paragraphs. It could be obvious that writing is not important enough to teach in the class and that it occupies a lower position in Egyptian secondary English classrooms. It is not surprising, as a result, that this reading-dominated principle and the test-oriented approach bring about negative effects to secondary graduates, who will later receive many complaints about their lack of competence of listening, speaking and writing skills.

Over-emphasis on the final product

According to Don Dallas (2007), the general editor of Hello 7!, the approach to teaching writing in secondary schools is a combination of a number of approaches

(controlled composition, the free-writing approach, the paragraph-pattern approach, the communicative approach, and the process approach), in which the communicative and the process approaches play a dominant role. However, most language teachers in secondary schools still adopt the product-oriented approaches in the writing class because the writing tasks in the textbook are presented on the base of controlled composition and the paragraph-pattern approach. These product-oriented approaches, therefore, have been the dominant mode of instruction in secondary school writing classes, emphasizing students' final pieces of work rather than the way how they are produced.

As a result, students' quality of EFL writing is evaluated on the basis of the final product and grammatical and linguistic accuracy. Furthermore, due to this product focus, students pay little attention to the whole process of writing and they know very little about writing strategies. And to make the matter worse, the interaction between a teacher and students or between students themselves does not exist.

Lack of variety of assessment

In Egyptian secondary school context, it has long been the tradition that teachers are responsible for correcting their students' writing. Thus, students write for the teacher, not for themselves, and as a result, teachers are the only audience for whom students gain experience writing. One result of this is that writing teachers are often overloaded with the task of giving feedback to and correcting students'

writing. This has led to the situation in which teacher-controlled feedback still remains dominant in Egyptian English writing classrooms.

It is widely held that secondary school English teachers mainly concentrate on the correction of grammar and spelling mistakes. They assume that such errors need to be eradicated immediately, and that the best way to help students is correcting all the errors in their writing in order to help students make progress. However, this traditional treatment is said to have no significant influence on students. From observations, some good students do not like such a way. They feel discouraged and humiliated when having their writing papers marked with a lot of suggested correction. In some cases, some students just take a glance at what the teacher has corrected, while many others may not even look at the corrections.

It is also found that secondary school students are never asked to revise their work for improvements based on the teacher’s feedback. The first drafts are always the final ones. It is simply because there are too many students in a class, and most classes are mixed ability; revision may become a burden to the teachers as marking and correcting is time-consuming. They could not manage it when they have only 45 minutes allocated for each writing lesson. They sometimes feel guilty because they are unable to correct all errors for students or to work through all their written work. This results in a mentality in which students fail to think carefully and deeply about their errors.

Due to the fact that students are passive in the classroom, they naturally feel uncomfortable with cooperative interaction that requires them to take an active

role. Most students are likely to think that writing in English, just like writing in Egyptian, is individual work, not a collaborative effort. They are not accustomed to pair work or group work when they do the writing. They never share their written texts with their peers in order to get feedback as well as to learn from their friends' written products. Consequently, the teacher-led assessment makes writing meaningless and unproductive; student creativity and activeness are hindered, and thus motivation and proficiency in writing remain low.

On realizing students' problems of English writing, It is assumed that the product-oriented approaches and the teacher's traditional treatment of writing, to some extent, have now been disproved, discouraging students from writing in English in writing classrooms. Therefore, what English writing teachers in secondary schools need to do is to improve the quality of students' pieces of writing, to give them a more cooperative learning environment, and to encourage them to share their written products with their peers'.

Many researcherss have been making an effort to seek pedagogical methods which could help deal with the mentioned problems. And many studies assume that adapting the process-oriented approach could be a more effective strategy. Many studies on the effectiveness of this approach have proved that it can be applied in EFL writing classes to solve the above problems. Theoretically, this process approach calls for providing and maintaining a positive, encouraging and collaborative workshop environment (Silva & Matsuda, 2002, pp. 261). Related to the Egyptian students' problems, the researcherss would like to conduct an experimental study in order to test whether adapting the process-oriented approach

could have a positive impact on secondary school students' quality of writing. Furthermore, there is no empirical research on this field in secondary schools in Egypt in general and in Alazhr in particular so far.

Literature review

In this literature review section, the following issues are discussed:

(1) Theoretical backgrounds of teaching writing

(2) Writing performance

Theoretical backgrounds of teaching writing

Some views of writing

A large number of various views of writing show that there has not yet been any consensus of what writing is although its importance has been recognized in its own right.

Traditionally, writing was considered as transcribed speech. It was often assumed that the acquisition of spoken proficiency had to take precedence over the learning of written language, and that students would be able to write once they 'mastered' spoken language and orthographic conventions.

Another view of writing is that writing is '*decontextualized*' (Ellis, 1994: 188) because it assumes that written communication never takes place in the presence of the writer and the reader. According to Grabe and Kaplan (1996) and Matsuda (1997), writing is "*far from decontextualized because every writing task*

is situated in a rhetorical context, involving complex interrelationships among various elements of writing: the writer, the reader, the text and reality". As for Canale and Swain (1980), they defined writing as "*a manifestation of, as well as the process of manifesting, sociolinguistic, strategic and grammatical competences mediated by the use of orthographic systems*" (cited in Silva & Matsuda, 2002, pp. 252).

Moreover, writing is also defined as a social process by Candlin and Hyland (1999, pp. 107, cited in Phung, 2004). They stated "*Writing is therefore an engagement in a social process, where the production of texts reflects methodologies, arguments and rhetorical strategies constructed to engage colleagues and persuade them of the claims that are made*".

However, writing, in language teachers' opinions, is "*a language skill which is difficult to acquire*" (Tribble, 1996, pp. 3). It "*normally requires some form of instruction*" and "*is not a skill that is readily picked up by exposure*" (Tribble, 1996, pp. 11). Besides, writing is also "*a process that occurs over a period of time, particularly if we take into account the sometimes extended periods of thinking that precede creating an initial draft"* (Harris, 1993, pp. 10) (cited in Phung, 2004).

As for Byrne (1988), one of several authors on writing skills, makes the important point that writing is the process of *encoding* (putting your message into your words) carried out with a reader in mind. Nevertheless, it is likely that, in the great majority of situations, our students still write primarily for their teachers, or perhaps for an examiner, both acting in the role of evaluator. Grant (1987) makes

the very useful point that, "*although transferring real-life writing directly to the classroom is problematic, what we should be aiming at is at least the creation of 'plausible contexts'*" (cited in McDonough & Shaw, 1993, pp. 183).

As we have noted several times, the classroom has its own purpose and structure, and is not simply a reflection of the outside world. In this sense, we can think of writing activities both from the 'instrumental' perspective of what is useful for external purposes, but also in terms of their educational function and the reality of the classroom itself.

So far we have looked at the "what" of writing, particularly at the nature of text and the importance of writing with a readership in mind. Obviously, writing continues to serve as a vehicle for language practice, and necessarily so, but this function is integrated into a broader and more diversified perspective. And I totally agree with Byrne when he puts it that teachers need to make students aware that "*any piece of writing is an attempt to communicate something; that the writer has a goal or purpose in mind; that he has to establish and maintain contact with his reader; that he has to organize his material and that he does this through the use of certain logical and grammatical devices*" (1988: 14) (cited in McDonough & Shaw, 1993, pp. 184).

Traditional approaches to teaching writing

In the recent history of second language writing, a number of different approaches to the practice of writing skills have vied for the attention of second language writing professionals. Among these approaches, controlled composition and the

paragraph pattern approaches are the most prominent and widely used in a series of new English textbooks for Egyptian secondary school students.

Controlled composition

Controlled composition can be seen as offshoot of the audio-lingual approach to second language teaching because it sees language learning as a process of habit formation. Thus, it is not surprising to see, within this tradition, that speaking was its primary concern whereas writing was regarded as a secondary one and specially served as reinforcement for oral habits.

In the controlled composition classroom, the primary focus is on formal accuracy. The role of the teacher is to provide accurate and carefully selected language samples that students can repeat and memorize. Besides, the teacher can give structural frames within which students can do controlled substitutions. So, for example, they may be asked to change all the present tense verbs to past tense; in such a case, students may need to alter other time references in the paragraph. Within this tradition, students can write a lot without being afraid of making many errors, and the teacher can deal with these pieces of writing more easily.

Overall, controlled composition sees writing as a secondary activity; as a means of practicing structures and vocabulary learned in the classroom. Therefore, the context for writing is the classroom and the audience is the teacher. This approach focuses on form and accuracy rather than the fluency of the language, and writing is simply a means of assessing students' ability to manipulate the

structures practiced in the classroom. Audience and purpose are not taken into consideration.

The paragraph pattern approach

Increasing awareness of second language writers' need to produce extended written texts led to the realization that there was more to writing than constructing grammatical sentences. The result of this realization was what Raimes (1983b:7, cited in Silva & Matsuda, 2002, pp. 259) has called the 'paragraph pattern approach', which emphasizes the importance of organization at the above-sentence level. This approach owes much to Kaplan's (1966) notion of 'contrastive rhetoric' – the notion that writers' different cultural and linguistic backgrounds was reflected in their 'rhetoric', with rhetoric typically seen as primarily a matter of textual structure.

Within this tradition, the primary concern was the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. In the early years, the paragraph was of primary interest. Its focus was on its elements as well as options for its development such as a topic sentence, supporting ideas, and a concluding sentence. Another important concern was 'essay' development, which grew from paragraph principles to complex texts. This involved larger structural components, namely introduction, body and conclusion.

Classroom procedures associated with this tradition have tended to focus students' attention primarily on 'form'. Students are asked to read and analyze a model text and then write another piece of writing that has the same organization

with the original one. Besides, some common writing activities, within this tradition, require students to group provided relevant facts, rearrange them in the logical order to form an outline, and then write a complete text based on that outline. Or sometimes, students may be asked to complete a paragraph or a story by adding an ending or a beginning or a middle section and so on.

In short, this tradition sees writing as basically a matter of arranging sentences and paragraphs into particular patterns. Typical organizational principles for materials include paragraph structuring, particularly related to functional categories, and the use of a range of linking devices. Sentence-level and grammar practice is not omitted but is set in the context of a longer and purposeful belief of language.

To sum up, these traditional approaches to the teaching of writing focus on the product. In other words, this brief and generalized summary indicates several trends in the 'traditional' teaching of writing:

- There is an emphasis on *accuracy.*
- The focus of attention is the *finished product*, whether a sentence or a whole composition.
- The teacher's role is to be the *judge* of the finished product.
- Writing often has a *consolidating* function.

However, imitating models inhibits writers rather than liberating them. There is little or no opportunity for the students to express their own ideas. It is

inevitable that little attention is paid to the ideas and meaning of students' pieces of writing. Also, over-emphasis over accuracy and form can lead to serious "writing block" (Halsted 1975: 82) and "sterile" and "unimaginative" pieces of work (Mahon 1992: 75, cited in Ho, 2006).

The process approach to teaching writing

The overview of the writing process

Dissatisfaction with controlled composition and the paragraph pattern approach paved the way for the process approach, an 'expressive approach' which became prominent in English-speaking composition classrooms during the 1980s. This approach entered the classroom as the 'process movement': a concentration on personal writing, student creativity, and fluency (Zamel 1982, cited in Reid, 2001)

The understanding of what constitutes the writing process instructional model has evolved since the 1970's, when it emerged as a pedagogical approach. In the early years, it was regarded as a nondirectional model of instruction with very little teacher intervention. In his review of research on composition from 1963 to 1982, Hillocks (1984) concluded that the teacher's role in the process model is to facilitate the writing process rather than to provide direct instruction; teachers were found "*not* to make specific assignments, *not* to help students learn criteria for judging writing, *not* to structure activities based on specific objectives, … *not* to provide exercises in manipulating syntax, *not* to design activities that engage students in identifiable processes of examining data" (p.162; emphasis in original, cited in Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2005, pp. 275). It is not surprising that the research

Hillocks summaries showed minimal impact on the quality of writing products as a result of this “natural process mode”

In the formative years, the process approach model was regarded as applying mainly to stories, was linear and prescriptive, merged proofreading and editing as the same thing, and usually did not involve direct instruction – a sort of anything-goes model whereby the process was valued over the product. In this early model, a simplistic pedagogy resulted: After their teacher describes four stages, students recall and rehearse the steps, use the process to produce a story, and get into groups to share their stories and gain feedback. In the literature in special education, such instruction to help students plan, organize, and carry out a writing task is called teaching “plans of action” (Gersten & Baker, 2001, cited in Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2005, pp. 276). Such plans comprise only some of the procedural tasks of the current process model.

Today, most researcherss of the process model recognize that it involves both procedural knowledge and many other kinds of strategies that can be nurtured and directly taught, including activating schemata to access prior knowledge; teaching self-regulation strategies; helping students understand genre constraints; guiding students in re-visioning and in editing surface errors; providing structured feedback from teachers and peers; teaching the differences between reader- and writer-based prose; developing audience awareness and effects of audience on style, content, and tone; and dealing with emotional barriers. In general, those studies that view the process model as encompassing more teacher direction in the

process show positive effects on the quality of students' writing, on their view of themselves as writers, and on their understanding of the writing process.

The development of multiple drafts to achieve meaningful communication – as well as focus on the problem-solving aspects of identifying and practising discourse conventions – also occupy teachers and L2 students in school-based writing classes. Teachers are designing curriculums based on the balance of institutional, programme and student needs rather than around dogmatic theories or approaches. Placed in the classroom context, this process approach calls for providing and maintaining a positive, encouraging and collaborative workshop environment, and for providing ample time and minimal interference so as to allow students to work through their composing processes. The objective is to help students develop viable strategies for getting started, drafting, revising and editing. From a process perspective, then, writing is a complex, recursive and creative process that is very similar in its general outlines for first and second language writers; learning to write requires the development of an efficient and effective composing process. The writer is engaged in the discovery and expression of meaning; the reader, on interpreting that intended meaning. The product (that is, the written text) is a secondary concern, whose form is a function of its content and purpose (Silva & Matsuda, 2002, pp. 261).

It is clear from the process perspective that writing instruction involves demonstrating and providing practice in composing strategies; and learning to write entails obtaining and using these strategies to manage the creation of a text and monitor its development.

Stages in the writing process

There are different points of view on the number of stages comprising the writing process.

As early and influential model of the writing process was that of Hayes and Flower (1980, cited in Weigle, 2002, pp. 23). They described the writing process in terms of the task environment, which included the writing assignment and the text produced so far, the writer's long-term memory, including knowledge of topic, knowledge of audience, and stored writing plans, and a number of cognitive processes, including planning, translating thought into text, and revising.

Hedge refers to all the components of the process taken together as 'composing' (taken alongside 'communicating' and 'crafting'). She suggests the following as a representation of the stages of writing:

> Getting ideas together ⇒ planning and outlining ⇒ making notes ⇒ making a first draft ⇒ revising, re-drafting ⇒ editing ⇒ final version

(Adapted from Hedge, 1988: 21, cited in McDonough & Shaw, 1993, pp.186)

Byrne (1988, cited in McDonough & Shaw, 1993, pp. 186) has a similar set of steps:

> List ideas ⇒ make an outline ('scaffolding') ⇒ write a draft ⇒ correct and improve the draft ⇒ write the final version

Meanwhile, according to Oshima and Hogue (1991, cited in Phung, 2004), the writing process embraces essentially three stages:

Pre-writing ⇒ planning (outlining) ⇒ writing and revising drafts

Each stage involves certain kinds of task that the writers have to fulfill in order to construct a good piece of work.

As for Ron White and Valerie Arndt, they are keen to stress that 'writing is *re*-writing; that *re*-vision – seeing with new eyes – has a central role to play in the act of creating text' (White and Arndt 1991:5, cited in Harmer, 2002, pp. 258). In their model, process writing is an interrelated set of recursive stages which include:

- Drafting
- Structuring (ordering information, experimenting with arrangements, etc.)
- Reviewing (checking context, connections, assessing impact, editing)
- Focusing (that is making sure you are getting the message across you want to get across)
- Generating ideas and evaluation (assessing the draft and/ or subsequent drafts)

However, Seow (2002, cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, pp. 316-319) offered a more complete description. Process writing as a classroom activity incorporates the four basic writing stages - planning, drafting (writing), revising (redrafting) and editing – and three other stages externally imposed on students by the teacher, namely, responding (sharing), evaluating and post-writing. Therefore, I assume that teachers may plan appropriate classroom activities that support the

learning of specific writing skills at every stage. The planned learning experiences for students may be described as follows.

Planning (Pre-writing)

Pre-writing is any activity in the classroom that encourages students to write. It stimulates thoughts for getting started. In fact, it moves students away from having to face a blank page toward generating tentative ideas and gathering information for writing. The following activities provide the learning experiences for students at this stage:

- *Group brainstorming*

  Group members spew out ideas about the topic. Spontaneity is important here. There are no right or wrong answers. Students may cover familiar ground first and then move off to more abstract or wild territories.

- *Clustering*

  Students form words related to a stimulus supplied by the teacher. The words are circled and then linked by lines to show discernible clusters. Clustering is a simple yet powerful strategy: “Its visual character seems to stimulate the flow of association … and is particularly good for students who know what they want to say but just can’t say it” (Proett & Gill, 1986, pp. 6)

- *Rapid free writing*

Within a limited time of one or two minutes, individual students freely and quickly write down single words and phrases about a topic. The time limit keeps the writers' minds ticking and thinking fast. Rapid free writing is done when group brainstorming is not possible or because the personal nature of a certain topic requires a different strategy.

- *Wh-questions*

  Students generate *who, why, what, where, when* and *how* questions about a topic. More such questions can be asked of answers to the first string of *wh*-questions, and so on. This can go on indefinitely.

Drafting

Once sufficient ideas are gathered at the planning stage, the first attempt at writing – that is, drafting - may proceed quickly. At the drafting stage, the writers are focused on the fluency of writing and are not preoccupied with grammatical accuracy or the neatness of the draft. One dimension of good writing is the writer's ability to visualize an audience because a conscious sense of audience can dictate a certain style to be used.

Responding

Responding to student writing by the teacher (or by peers) has a central role to play in the successful implementation of process writing. Responding intervenes between drafting and revising. It is the teacher's *quick initial reaction* to students' drafts. Responding can be oral or in writing, after the students have produced the

first draft and just before they proceed to revise. This activity is intended to help students rediscover meanings and facilitate the revision of initial drafts. Such responses may be provided in the margin, between sentence lines or at the end of students' texts. Peer responding can be effectively carried out by having students respond to each other's texts in small groups or in pairs.

Revising

When students revise, they review their texts on the basis of the feedback given in the responding stage. They reexamine what was written to see how effectively they have communicated their meanings to the reader. Revising is not merely checking for language errors (i.e., editing). It is done to improve global content and the organization of ideas so that the writer's intent is made clearer to the reader. Another activity for revising may have the students working in pairs to read aloud each other's drafts before they revise. As students listen intently to their own writing, they are brought to a more conscious level of rethinking and re-seeing what they have written. Meanings which are vague become more apparent when the writers actually hear their own texts read out to them.

Editing

At this stage, students are engaged in tidying up their texts as they prepare the final draft for evaluation by the teacher. They edit their own or their peer's work for grammar, spelling, punctuation, diction, sentence structure and accuracy of supportive textual material such as quotations, examples and the like. Formal

editing is deferred till this phase in order that its application does not disrupt the free flow of ideas during the drafting and revising stages.

Evaluating

Very often, teachers pleading lack of time have compressed responding, editing and evaluating all into one. This would, in effect, deprive a student of that vital link between drafting and revision – that is, responding – which often makes a big difference to the kind of writing that will eventually be produced. In evaluating the student writing, the criteria for evaluation should be made known to students in advance. They should include overall interpretation of the task, sense of audience, relevance, development and organization of ideas, format or layout, grammar and structure, spelling and punctuation, range and appropriateness of vocabulary, and clarity of communication.

Post-writing

Post writing constitutes any classroom activity that the teacher and students can do with the completed pieces of writing. This includes publishing, sharing, reading aloud, transforming texts for stage performances, or merely displaying texts on notice-boards. The post–writing stage is a platform for recognizing students' work as important and worthwhile. It may be used as a motivation for writing as well as to hedge against students finding excuses for not writing. Students must be made to feel that they are writing for a very real purpose.

Working process-oriented writing framework

Writing, like reading, is in many ways an individual, solitary activity: the writing triangle of ‘communicating’, ‘composing’ and ‘crafting’ is usually carried out for an absent readership. However, it should be remembered that our students are language learners rather than writers, and it would not be particularly helpful to have them spend all their time writing alone. Although process research points to a need to give learner-writers space and time to operate their own preferred individual strategies, the classroom can be structured in such a way as to provide positive intervention and support in the development of writing skills.

Placed in the Egyptian secondary school context, one of the disadvantages of getting students to concentrate on the process of writing is that it takes time: time to brainstorm ideas or collect them in some other way; time to draft a piece of writing and then, with the teacher’s help perhaps, review it and edit it in various ways before changing the focus, generating more ideas, redrafting, re-editing and so on. This cannot be done in forty-five minutes. However, the various stages could be adapted so that when process writing is handled appropriately, it stretches across the whole curriculum.

From the above reasons, the present study proposes a working process-oriented writing model which is used as a framework for the lesson plans in this study. The classroom can provide the following stages adapted from Seow’s process model (2002):

Stage 1: Pre-writing: helping students to generate ideas and building awareness of discourse organization

One of the hardest tasks in writing is getting started. Therefore, the teacher needs to stimulate students' creativity, to get them thinking how to approach a writing topic. In this stage, the most important thing is the flow of ideas, so the teacher should divide students into groups and ask them to produce words or ideas about the writing. Sometimes, they can be asked to read the model text to explore ideas. This raises students' awareness of the features of different genres of writing in English. Each member can make a plan of the writing and then share and discuss their ideas in groups. Next, each group can present their best ideas to the class; a lot of questions can be generated about the topic. This helps students focus on the audience as they consider what the reader needs to know. The answers to these questions will form the basis to their writing. During their discussion, the teacher helps students develop their ideas in a positive and encouraging way.

Stage 2: Drafting: letting students write freely

This stage involves thinking about which of the many ideas generated are the most important or relevant, and perhaps taking a particular point of view. During this stage, students write without much attention to the accuracy of their work or the organization. The most important feature is meaning. Here, both the teacher and students should concentrate on the content of the writing: Let students write as quickly as possible; if they cannot think of a word in English, they leave a space or write it in Egyptian. Then in groups, they work together and compare what they have written. This collaborative writing is especially valuable because students can help each other with vocabulary and this gives confidence to students before they share their writing to the class. During this stage, the teacher can also give some

advice on some useful structures or vocabulary or collocation. This gives students the helpful tools to better express their own ideas.

Stage 3: Peer evaluation: enabling students to appreciate the criteria for an effective text

During this stage, the products are interchanged and the evaluation is done by other students. They can move around, check the texts for spelling, look for errors, compare their ideas or find the differences or the best ideas, and so on. The teacher gives students some criteria for judging their peers' written texts in the form of an editing checklist, asking them to reduce or to edit the texts concentrating on the most important information. The teacher may also respond at this stage by commenting on the content and the organization of ideas.

Stage 4: Revising: helping students to develop crafting skills

When writing a final draft, students should be encouraged to check the details of grammar and spelling, which may have been ignored in the previous stages. And once again, instead of correcting all the writing, the teacher may guide students how to deal with their own mistakes. The teacher only needs to choose the most common or serious errors for correction in front of the class. This will raise students' awareness of their mistakes because it is a good idea that it would be better for students to learn from their errors rather than to be told about theirs.

Finally, a period of writing may end with the presentation or display of some students' written products.

Writing performance

Evaluation of writing performance

The writing skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements. The following analysis attempts to group the many and varied skills necessary for composing a good piece of writing into five components.

- Language use: the ability to write correct and appropriate sentences;
- Mechanical skills: the ability to use correctly those conventions peculiar to the written language – e.g. punctuation, spelling;
- Treatment of content: the ability to think creatively and develop thoughts, excluding all irrelevant information;
- Stylistic skills: the ability to manipulate sentences and paragraphs, and use language effectively;
- Judgment skills: the ability to write in an appropriate manner for a particular purpose with a particular audience in mind, together with an ability to select, organize and order relevant information (Heaton, 1989, pp. 135).

When writing ability is evaluated, that ability itself is not measured directly, but rather, assessed on the basis of inferences drawn from an individual’s performance. In other words, his or her performance is evaluated through his or her

written text. In terms of written products, then, what is good writing? According to Peha (1996-2003), good writing has all of these qualities:

- Ideas that are interesting and important: ideas are the heart of the writer's piece – what he is writing about and the information he chooses to write about it.
- Organization that is logical and effective: organization refers to the order of the writer's ideas and the way he moves from one idea to the next.
- Voice that is individual and appropriate: voice is how the writer's writing feels to someone when they read it. Is it formal or casual? Is it friendly and inviting or reserved? Voice is the expression of his individual personality through words.
- Word choice that is specific and memorable: good writing uses just the right words to say just the right things.
- Sentence fluency that is smooth and expressive: fluent sentences are easy to understand and fun to read with expression.
- Conventions that are correct and communicative: conventions are the way we all agree to use punctuation, spelling, grammar and other things that make writing consistent and easy to read.

Besides, Ayer (2005) assumes that good writing expresses a clear point, is tightly structured, grammatically and syntactically correct, substantive, and interesting.

With these considerations in mind, I now turn to a discussion of procedures for scoring the written product.

Rating scales used for assessment of secondary school students' written products

As McNamara (1996, cited in Weigle, 2002, pp.109) notes, the scale that is used in assessing performance tasks such as writing tests represents, implicitly or explicitly, the theoretical basic upon which the test is founded; that is, embodies the test (or scale) developer's notion of what skills or abilities are being measured by the test. For this reason the development of a scale (or set of scales) and the descriptors for each scale level are of critical importance for the validity of the assessment.

One of the first decisions to be made in determining a system for scoring is what type of rating scale was used: that is, should a single score be given to each script, or will each script be scored on several different features? This issue has been the subject of a great deal of research and discussion over the past three decades. In the composition literature, three main types of rating scales are discussed: **primary trait scales, holistic scales,** and **analytic scales**. However, for the purpose of this study, there is only one type of rating scales: analytic scales.

In analytic scoring, scripts are rated on several aspects of writing or criteria rather than given a single score. Depending on the purpose of the assessment, scripts might be rated on such features as content, organization, cohesion, register, vocabulary, grammar, or mechanics. Analytic scoring schemes thus provide more

detailed information about a test taker's performance in different aspects of writing and for this reason preferred over holistic schemes by many writing specialists.

One of the best known and most widely used analytic scales in ESL was created by Jacobs *et al*. (1981, cited in Weigle, 2002, pp. 115-116). In the Jacobs *et al*. scale, scripts are rated on five aspects of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The five aspects are differentially weighted to emphasize first content (30 points) and next language use (25 points), with organization and vocabulary weighted equally (20 points) and mechanics receiving very little emphasis (5 points).

ASPECT	**SCORE**	**LEVEL/ CRITERIA**

CONTENT	30-27 26-22 21-17 16-13	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks detail FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate

ORGANIZATION	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate

VOCABULARY	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/ idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage *but meaning not obscured*
	13-10 9-7	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage • *meaning confused or obscured*
		VERY POOR: essential translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate

LANGUAGE USE	25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions *but meaning seldom obscured*
	17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/ complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/ or fragments, run-ons, deletions • *meaning confused or obscured*
	10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate

MECHANICS	5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4 3	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing *but meaning not obscured*
	2	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • *meaning confused or obscured*
		VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate

Figure 2 Jacobs et al.'s (1981) scoring profile

Analytic scoring has a number of advantages. First, some research suggests that analytic scoring is more useful in rater training, as inexperienced raters can more easily understand and apply the criteria in separate scales than in holistic scales (Francis, 1977, and Adams, 1981, both cited in Weir, 1990). Analytic scoring is particularly useful for second-language learners, who are more likely to show a marked or uneven profile across different aspects of writing. Finally, analytic scoring can be more reliable than holistic scoring: just as reliability tends to increase when additional items are added to a discrete-point test, so a scoring

scheme in which multiple scores are given to each script tends to improve reliability (Hamp-Lyons, 1991b; Huot, 1996, cited in Weigle, 2002, pp. 120)

However, the major disadvantage of analytic scoring is that it takes longer than holistic scoring, since readers are required to make more than one decision for every script. An additional problem with some analytic scoring schemes is that, if scores on the different scales are combined to make a composition score, a good deal of the information provided by the analytic scale is lost. It may also be the case that raters who are experienced at using a particular analytic scoring system may actually rate more holistically than analytically if scores are combined into a single score: experienced raters may target their ratings towards what they expect the total score to come out to be, and revise their analytic scores accordingly (Charlene Polio, personal communication, 1998, cited in Weigle, 2002, pp. 120)

Placed in the Egyptian classroom context, adapting analytic scoring is a better choice because the students are learning to write. Exact and objective assessment will create the first motivation to encourage students to write better.

From the above discussion, the present study proposes a working marking scale which is used as a framework for the graders' evaluation in this study. The scale consists of five aspects with four levels for each adapted from Jacobs et al.'s (1981) (cited in Weigle, 2002, pp. 115-116) and from Hoang (2007). (*See appendix 7*)

Purposes of the Study

The present study aimed at:

1- Using direct teacher feedback in improving the writing skills of EFL secondary students.
2- Using indirect teacher feedback in improving the writing skills of EFL secondary students.
3- Using software program feedback in improving the writing skills of EFL secondary students.
4- Using intranet program feedback in improving the writing skills of EFL secondary students.

Significance of the Study

The present study contributed to:

1. Improve writing performance of secondary school student by using various strategies of feedback to improve the writing skills of EFL secondary students.
2. Provide evidence on the effectiveness of computers in improving the writing performance in the Al-Azhar institutes.
3. Provide alternative strategies of feedback on writing.

Limitations of the study

The present study was limited to:

1- Three classes of second year secondary students at Alazhr institute in Satamooni institute for girls and Elmostaamara institute for girls one class for each researcher and one as a control group.

2- The second term of the academic year 2011-2012 as the duration of the application of the second part of the first package of the project zero.

3- English and Arabic compositions only.

Methodology of the study

a) Sample of the study:

This study contained five classes in AlAzhr institutes. Three classes in Satamooni secondary institutes as two experimental groups studying through the

second part of the first package of the project zero other group works as a control group studying through the traditional method.

b) Instruments of the study:

The following instruments were developed by the researchers.

1- A writing performance tests (pre and post). (By the researchers)

2- A holistic scoring rubrics (By the researchers)

3- A writing attitude scales. (By the researchers)

c) Design of the study:

The study adopted the quasi-experimental design

3 Research aims

My study aims to find out whether adapting the process-oriented approach into teaching and learning writing in English has more positive effect than adopting the product-oriented approach on secondary school students' quality of EFL writing. The research also aims to investigate the participants' perception towards the use of the process-oriented writing activities in their EFL writing class.

Research questions

The research included the following questions:

1-To what extent is the process-oriented approach effective in improving the writing performance of EFL secondary students?

2- What are students' perceptions towards the use of the process-oriented writing activities in their EFL writing class?

Hypotheses

The study verified the following hypotheses:

1- There is statistically significant difference between the mean score of students in the first experimental group that learns via process-oriented approach and those of students in the control group concerning writing performance.

2- - There is statistically significant difference between the mean score of students in the first experimental group that learns via process-oriented (positive perception towards the use of the process-oriented writing activities in their EFL writing class approach) and those of students in the control group concerning writing performance.

Methodology

Design

This research is an experimental study in which investigates the cause-effect relationship between adapting the process-oriented approach and writing performance. The two-group pre-test and post-test design in order to determine the effectiveness of teaching and learning writing adopting the product-oriented approach and adapting the process-oriented approach is followed.

In this experimental study, the implementation of the process-oriented approach (the independent variable) was monitored and the students' writing performance was measured. The main purpose of the writing activities adapting the process-oriented approach was to offer secondary school students a cooperative learning environment in order to improve their quality of English writing by sharing their written products and learning from their peers, not only from the teacher.

During the 16-week term, the two writing groups were equally instructed by the same researchers. However, the main difference between the two conditions was that adopting the product-oriented approach was applied in the control group whereas adapting the process-oriented approach was implemented in the experimental group. In both conditions, the other two writing teachers together with the researchers graded the students' written products.

Participants

The participants in the study were 57 non-English major students in Al-Azhar secondary school. All of these participants are in grade 11(second year secondary stage), thus they were supposed to be at the same level of English proficiency. They were permanently arranged in two separate classes by Al-Azhar secondary school, so the researchers randomly choose one for the control group and the other, the experimental one. The same teacher taught two groups with 30 students in the control group and 27 students in the experimental group. The writing class was met every two weeks for 45 minutes. And eight sessions made up one term.

Besides, 57 students at the same level of English proficiency in other two classes of the same school helped the researchers pilot the questionnaires and the writing tests. In addition to the researchers who was responsible for implementing the project of adapting the process-oriented approach to teaching and learning English writing and collecting as well as analyzing data, other two writing teachers in English Department were involved in the project to help the researchers graded and evaluated the pre-tests and post-tests.

Instruments

To answer the above research question in this study, the researchers will measure the students' writing performance in the two groups before and after the study. The study will use (1) the *pre- and post-tests on English writing* to measure students' writing performance, (2) the *pre- and post-questionnaire on students' perception of the writing process* in order to find out whether students have positive perception towards the use of the process-oriented writing activities in their EFL writing class.

Questionnaire on students' perception of the writing process

The *questionnaire* (*see appendices 2, 3 & 4*) aimed at investigating the students' perception of the writing process in English before and after the study. The original version of the questionnaire was from

http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/mla/questionnaire.pdf.

However, the study adapted the questionnaire to focus on investigating students' perception of the writing process in English, which has been adapted to fit the secondary school classroom context.

The questionnaire used in this study was designed both in English because this questionnaire are at a pre-intermediate level of English. The questionnaire consisted of fifteen items in total. Each item includes a statement about students' perception of the writing process in English followed by a five-point scale (strongly disagrees, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). All the items were categorized into four clusters including pre-writing, drafting, and peer evaluating, and revising activities.

Administering the piloting of the questionnaire

Before officially used in the study, the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire were piloted with 30 Al-Azhar secondary school students with the same level of English proficiency (grade 10) to test the reliability of the instrument. To obtain reliable data, I gave careful instructions before students began to answer the pre-questionnaire (Egyptian version). When students had difficulty understanding a certain item in the questionnaire, I tried to make it clearer to them. The participants had 15 minutes to complete this pre-questionnaire.

First, the data obtained from the questionnaire were transferred to SPSS for data analysis. The five-point scale was coded from 1 as *strongly disagree* to 5 as *strongly agree*. Then the researchers ran the scale test to test the reliability of the pre-questionnaire. The result showed that the reliability coefficients of the pre-

questionnaire is relatively high (α = 0.75) (*See appendix 10*). The result showed that the pre-questionnaire on the perception of the writing process was reliable and could be used for collecting the data of the study. Besides, standardized item alpha is consistent (α = 0.74), which indicated that the items of the pre-questionnaire are internally consistent.

Tests on English writing

Designing writing tests

To measure the quality of the participants' written texts before and after the research, the researchers have designed a pre-test (*see appendix 5*) and a post-test (*see appendix 6*) on English writing. The test types selected for this study are popular kinds of writing test similar to those which students were instructed, and those which are often used in the secondary school classroom context. Therefore, the students were supposed to be familiar with the test format.

Actually, the pre-test and the post-test on English writing are similar but not the same. They were similar in format, instruction, length, level of difficulty, and allotted time. However, the specific writing topics between the two tests were different although they both are the same genre, writing a complaint letter. For this reason, the researchers assume that the participants would have no trouble.

Scoring the pre-test and the post-test

To score the pre-test and the post-test, the researchers used the same marking scale (*see appendix 7*). This analytic marking scale with specific evaluation criteria was adapted from Jacobs et al's (1981) and from Hoang (2007). The main reason for

the choice of this analytic marking scale instead of a holistic scale was that it provided more useful diagnostic information about students' writing abilities.

The aspects, criteria, and scale of the instrument were carefully developed and validated three times by eight supervisors and the counselor at the English Department, Al-Azhar secondary schools working in **Presidency-Of-El-Azhar-Institutes-Sector**. The marking scale for evaluation consisted of five aspects: *content, organization, vocabulary, language use,* and *mechanics.* Each aspect was analyzed and graded by specific criteria with four-degree scale, so the total score of each test ranged from 1 as the minimum to 10 as the maximum. This original score was processed by SPSS for data analysis.

Administering the piloting of the pre- test on English writing

After designing the pre-test, the researchers tested it before using it in the present study. The pre-test on English writing was piloted to ensure the validity of this instrument. 57 participants got involved in the pilot test; these participants were of the same level of English proficiency (grade 11(year two) in Al-Azhar secondary school).

Four English writing instructors at the English Department, Al-Azhar Specialized secondary school, to check the consistency of the test format, instruction, the length, level of difficulty and content. After improving the test draft based on the instructors' suggestions, the researchers delivered the revised draft to the participants to validate the instrument.

After the administration of the pre-questionnaire in the preparatory week, the pre-test on English writing was delivered to participants in two piloted groups in the second period of this week. The pre-test was administered to check the participants' EFL writing performance between these two piloted groups.

Participants had 45 minutes to work on the writing pre-test. They were arranged to take this pre-test on the same day to ensure that the writing pre-test was performed in the same condition. To ensure the reliability of the grading, each test paper was graded by three different graders: two English writing instructors at the English Department, Al-Azhar Specialized secondary school and the researchers. Each grader marked the papers on their own marking sheet based on the analytic marking scale adapted from Jacobs et al.'s (1981) and from Hoang (2007). (*See appendices 7 & 8*). It was observed that the grading scores among the three graders were consistent.

The result of the piloted test was then analyzed to make other necessary changes. The reliability of the piloted test was alpha (α) = 0.87 (*See appendix 10*). The result showed that the pre-test was reliable and could be used for collecting the data of the study. Therefore, I can assert that the pre-test on English writing used in this research is valid.

Reporting the result of students' writing performance

In this section, the result of students' writing performance was presented between the two piloted groups.

First, the *Descriptive Statistics Test* was run to analyze the participants' writing performance in the two piloted groups. Next, the *Independent Samples T-Test* was used to compare the mean difference in participants' writing performance. The results of these tests were reported as follows.

Students' writing performance between two piloted groups

Groups	N	Min.	Max.	Mean (M)	MD	SD
1	29	1.50	8.50	5.0000	.0000	2.09
2	28	1.50	8.00	5.0000		1.71

** The writing score scales from '1 as minimum' to '10 as maximum'*

Descriptive statistics of students' writing performance between the two piloted groups

As shown in the above table, the total mean score of students' writing performance of group 1 (M = 5.000) and that of group 2 (M = 5.000) are average on the scale of '1 as minimum' to '10 as maximum'. This value indicates that the initial level of students' writing performance of the two piloted groups was not high, just average.

Comparison of students' writing performance between the two piloted groups

An *Independent Samples T-Test* was conducted to evaluate whether there is a significant difference in writing performance between group 1 and group 2. The

test was not significant (t = .000, df = 55, p = 1.000) *(See appendix 10)*. Students in the two piloted groups did not differ from each other in terms of writing performance level. This result matched my previous assumption that participants' writing performance between the two piloted groups was at the same level.

Materials

The material used in this study was the official textbook Hello 7! Published by the Ministry of Education. It was used as the main course book for two groups. Students were instructed the first eight units of the book, in which eight topics related to the main themes discussed in the course book was used for writing practice.

However, a series of eight lesson plans designed on the basis of the process-oriented approach was applied to teaching and learning writing for the experimental group. It was supposed that students would be provided with a better cooperative learning environment.

Procedures

The procedures of this empirical study were briefly presented as follows:

Procedures of the research

Time	**Research activities**	**Group(s)**
Preparatory week	- Pre-test on writing performance	2 groups
25/8 – 30/8	- Questionnaire on students' perception	Experimental group

	of the writing process	
Week 1-16 Date 5/9 – 27/12	- Intervention: adapting the process-oriented approach	Experimental group
Week 17	- Post-test on writing performance	2 groups
29/12 – 3/1/2012	- Questionnaire on students' perception of the writing process	Experimental group
Week 18- 5/1/2012	- Data analysis - Result report - Conclusion & Recommendation for further research	2 groups

- Stage 1: A pretest was given to students of grade 10 at the beginning of the term; a questionnaire was given to the experimental group.
- Stage 2: The empirical stage was carried out after both groups take the pretest. In this stage, lessons were given every two weeks in 16 weeks with a 360-minute meeting during the term.
- Stage 3: Both experimental and control groups were given a posttest at the end of the term (week 17); a post-questionnaire was delivered to the

experimental group to investigate whether students have more positive perception towards process-oriented writing activities.

- Stage 4: The scores of the writing pre- and post-tests and of the pre- and post-questionnaires collected from the experimental and control groups was collected and subjected to SPSS for data analysis. Then the conclusion and recommendation for further research.

Summary, Results, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions

This section provides a summary of the study, results of the study and the conclusions that can be drawn from the results of this study. Based on the results and conclusions of this study recommendations and suggestions are made.

Summary:

One of the most important aspects of recent educational reform efforts is the increased attention to the skill of writing. Writing is a powerful instrument of thinking because it provides students with a way of gaining control over their thoughts. It shapes their perception of themselves and the world. It aids in their personal growth and it affects change on their environment.

It is claimed that process oriented approach assists students whatever their ability level. Once students understand the process and trust that the teacher will accept and approve of their writing, the ability to write improves dramatically. Jarvis (2000) asserts that many students do not enjoy writing because they feel that

if they cannot do it correctly the first time then they will never get it. Therefore, all students are capable of becoming excellent writers given enough practice and time.

Statement of the problem

There is a weakness in the writing skills of the second year secondary stage students. They often get low scores on their writing tasks. Consequently, they develop a negative attitude towards writing. The problem of the study was stated in the following questions:

1. What were the writing skills that second year Al-Azhar secondary stage students had to acquire?
2. What were the proposed process oriented approach activities for teaching these skills?
3. What was the effectiveness of using the proposed process oriented approach activities in developing writing performance of third year Al-Azhar secondary stage students?
4. What was the effectiveness of using the proposed process oriented approach activities in developing the second year Al-Azhar secondary stage students' attitudes towards writing?

Purpose of the study

This study aimed at:

1. Determining the writing skills that second year Al-Azhar secondary stage students should acquire
2. Developing the writing skills of second year Al-Azhar secondary stage students
3. Identifying the effectiveness of the process oriented approach in developing the writing skills and attitudes of second year Al-Azhar secondary stage students towards writing

Significance of the study

This study gains its significance from the following:

1. Directing the attention of TEFL researchers, teachers, course designers, curriculum developers, learners and language specialists to the importance of using the process oriented approach activities in developing the writing skills and students' attitudes towards writing
2. Preparing a Teacher's Guide for second term of the school year that contains process oriented approach activities and how to teach them.

Limitation of the study

This study is limited to:

1. A sample of second year Al-Azhar secondary stage students
2. The sample of students was limited to two groups - experimental and control - of first year secondary stage students

3. The writing skills of first year Al-Azhar secondary students during the second term
4. Some process oriented approach activities that suit the objectives of the writing skills according to the course of the second term

Design of the study:

The study adopted the experimental design, i.e., using one experimental group and another control group. The experimental group students received training on the process oriented approach and were taught writing skills through process oriented approach activities. On the other hand, the control group students were taught writing skills through the traditional method. A writing pre-post test was given to the two groups before and after the experiment. In addition, a writing attitude pre-post scale was given to the groups before and after the experiment. Subjects in the present study were first year secondary stage female students. Two classes were randomly selected from two different Al-Azhar institutes in the academic year 2011-2012.

Hypotheses of the study

1. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group students and that of the control group students on the writing performance post- test favoring the experimental group.

2. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group students and that of the control group students on the attitude post-scale favoring the experimental group.

Tools of the study:

The following instruments were used:

1. A Writing Performance Test for second term (prepared by the researcher).

2. An Analytic Scoring Rubric.

3. Pre- and Post-questionnaire on students' perception of the writing process

Procedures

1. Preparing a list of the writing skills for the secondary stage through.

a. Studying the literature related to the writing skills for the secondary stage.

b. The objectives of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) for the secondary stage.

2. Studying the literature related to process oriented approach activities to design process oriented approach activities that suit the writing skills of first year secondary.

3. preparing a teacher's guide that contains process oriented approach activities and how they can be taught.

4. Selecting the sample and dividing it into two groups: experimental and control. The experimental group was trained on using process oriented approach activities and the control group was taught in the traditional way.

5. Preparing a pre-post test (for second term) to measure the performance of the sample in the writing skills in English as a foreign language (EFL).

6. Submitting both the pre-post writing performance test to a group of jurors for validity.

7. Measuring the reliability of the test.

8. Preparing an Analytic Scoring Rubric based on the writing skills of second year secondary stage students.

9. Submitting both rubrics to a group of jurors for validity.

10. Constructing an attitude scale to measure students' attitudes towards writing in EFL.

11. Submitting the questionnaire on students' perception of the writing process to a group of jurors for validity.

12. Measuring the reliability of the attitude scale.

13. Administering the pre- and post-questionnaire on students' perception of the writing process to the two groups: experimental and control.

14. Administering the pre-writing performance test to the two groups: experimental and control.

15. The researcher trained the experimental group on using process oriented approach activities.

16. Administering the writing performance post-test and the attitude scale to measure the effectiveness of the experiment.

17. Analyzing the data statistically.

18. Reporting results, conclusions and suggesting recommendations.

Results:

The following results were reached:

1. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group students and that of the control group students on the writing performance post- test favoring the experimental group.

Conclusions:

Upon reviewing the data and analyzing the results, the following points were concluded:

1. Instruction in process oriented approach improves students' performance. This conclusion adds to the validity of other studies such as that of Moerler (1991), Wells (1992), Cox, Holden & Pickett (1997), Kapka & Oberman (2001), Buhrke et al (2002) and Ahmed (2003).

2. Using the process oriented approach has helped develop a positive relationship between students' attitudes and their writing performance. Students who displayed low attitude scores towards writing displayed low writing performance and vice versa. This conclusion is consistent with the

conclusions of other studies such as that of LaRoche, (1993), Adams et al (1996), Robertson, Cumberworth & Hunt (1998), Suzie (2001), Ensio & Boxeth (2000) and Gau et al (2003). This conclusion can be elaborated as follows:

A. Since a positive attitude change occurred due to the introduction and implementation of process oriented approach in this study, it is important to realize that teaching writing as a process encouraged students to become writers. Students learned by being active participants rather than by passively absorbing information. Process oriented approach forced students to become participants in their learning. They were required to take charge of their writing by selecting their own topics to write about, by deciding how their topics would be developed and what the finished product would be. A focus on process oriented approach provided the natural development of written language. It focused attention on the process of learning and not the finished product. It is concluded that all students can write and that they have something worth writing. It allowed for the growth of writing subskills because process oriented approach activities took place in a non-threatening climate where students were not afraid to take risks. It was within this environment that students developed their own style and choices.

B. Through making writing purposeful, students became better writers because they had a sense of audience. The sense of audience developed through various aspects: constructive peer revising / editing, presenting writing to an audience (Author's Chair) and posting writing on pocket bulletin boards; these things were powerful incentives. Additionally, the purpose is motivated by writing on topics that affect them (friendly letter, describing one's hometown, describing the job one likes and for and against TV), it was then that their writing became purposeful. Hence, proposing writing that is real and meaningful was essential in creating a writing-rich environment. The researcher hoped to make writing an everyday reality for students. Other studies reached the same conclusion such as that of Adipattaranun (1992), Goldstein & Carr (1996), Loudermilk (1997) and Ensio & Boxeth (2000).

3. The change in the writing teacher's role from the traditional role which has been evaluating the learner's first draft as if it were the final product, and assuming the role of a consultant, facilitating the learner's step-by-step creation of the piece of writing, is crucial in helping students write better.

4. Providing safe, encouraging, non-threatening environment, i.e. creating settings that motivate students' writing, helps them improve their writing performance. Student-writers need to feel support and acceptance from the teacher and peers to take the kind of risk involved in the process of

producing good writing. When they feel safe from criticism, they become eager to write and to share their writing. Therefore, the class becomes a community of writers and students respond positively to a supportive writing atmosphere. This is consistent with the results of other studies such as Mouritzen (1993), Edwards et al (1995), Tai Po Old Market Public School (2000) and Hill (2000).

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the results and conclusions drawn in this study:

1. Teachers need more training in writing, especially on process oriented approach. For those unfamiliar with writing as a process, it would be advisable to read books by experts in the field. Teachers should talk to other teachers who use the process approach to become familiar with what is happening in the field of writing. They will have a stronger base for discussions concerning what writers do and how they feel when writing. These types of discussions are important to the development of the students' writing subskills.

2. Teachers should also provide students with frequent and lengthy opportunities to write. Collaboration is highly valued and encouraged at

every step of the process, especially during the revising and editing phases.

3. In successful writing classes students need to be reminded of the purpose for their writing: publishing and communicating. Teachers are expected to help students make connections between writing in the classroom and in the world at large.

4. Teachers need to encourage their students, guide and support their hesitant steps, reassure them it is acceptable to make mistakes on first drafts and remind them the purpose of the initial writing is to communicate ideas.

5. Students, whatever their age or level of ability, need to feel that writing is fun.

6. As mastering the writing subskills can be achieved gradually, students need periodical experiences to practice it. Frequency of writing increases fluency. Therefore, sufficient time to writing instruction is needed.

7. As an interested audience is helpful and effective, it is recommended to adopt a sense of audience other than the teacher such as classmates, schoolmates and family members.

8. Student-writers should choose their own topics of writing that are of interest to them and their lives.

9. Teachers should view students as authors and real writers and give them the opportunities to engage in writing as "professionals" do.

10. The use of student-teacher conference is recommended as the teachers ask key questions (such as what kind of help might you need now?) and students raised their problems about using process oriented approach stages (prewriting, drafting, revising, editing and publishing) and the teacher responded to these problems and at the same time invited the whole class for a discussion. The conferencing was effective in tackling students' writing problems.

11. The students' audiences should be real and interested in reading what the writers have to say (peers, friends from other classes, family members and so on).

12. When all teachers are encouraged to use the same scoring rubric, this will greatly enhance the consistency of assessment.

1. Suggestions for further research:

- Further research is needed to seek the effectiveness of using process oriented approach in developing writing subskills for university, preparatory and primary stages.
- Further research is needed to explore the effectiveness of process approach in developing reading subskills for different stages.
- Further research is needed to explore the effectiveness of process oriented approach in developing translation subskills for different stages.
- Further research is needed to find out the relationship between computer-assisted learning (CAL) and process oriented approach.

REFERENCES

1. Ayer, D. (2005). Criteria for a good essay. Retrieved January 4, 2008 from http://www.writingcenter.emory.edu/goodwrite.html
2. Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles.* An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Edition). New York: Longman, Inc.
3. Carlson, S. B., Bridgeman, B., Camp, R. & Waanders, J. (1985). *Relationship of Admission Test Scores to Writing Performance of Native and Nonnative Speakers of English.* Retrieved August 5, 2008 from http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-85-21-Carlson.pdf
4. Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge University Press.
5. Cohen, A. D. (1994). *Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom* (2nd Edition). Heinle & Heinle Publishers, Inc.
6. Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd Edition). Cambridge: Longman.
7. Heaton, J. B. (1989). *Writing English Language Tests.* New York: Longman, Inc.
8. Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom.* Oxford University Press.

9. Hoang, V. V. (2007). “Innovations in teaching writing skills to students of English in Egyptian secondaryschools”, VNU. JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, Foreign Languages, T.XXIII, No.1.

10. Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

11. McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (1996). *Materials and Methods in ELT.* A teacher’s guide. Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

12. Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology.* A Textbook for Teachers. Prentice Hall.

13. Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning.* Heinle & Heinle Publishers, Inc.

14. Pavlik, C. & Segal, M. K. (2002). *Interactions 1 – Writing* (4th Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

15. Pavlik, C. & Segal, M. K. (2002). *Interactions 2 – Writing* (4th Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

16. Peha, S. (1996-2003). “What Is Good Writing?” Retrieved August 12, 2008 from

17. http://www.ttms.org/PDFs/13%20What%20is%20Good%20Writing%20v001%20(Full).pdf)

18. Phung, T. K. D. (2004), *A Study on Teacher’s Written Feedback on the Writings by the Second-year Students at the English Department, College of*

Foreign Languages, Egypt National University, Hanoi. Retrieved November 15, 2007 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Thesis_Kim.pdf

19. Pritchard, R. J. & Honeycutt, R. L. (2005). "The Process Approach to Writing Instruction: Examining Its Effectiveness", excerpted from *Handbook of Writing Research*, edited by MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S. & Fitzgerald, J. Guilford Press. Retrieved January 4, 2008 from http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/2384

20. Richards, J. C. & Renendya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching.* An Anthology of Current Practice. Cambridge University Press.

21. Silva, T. & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Writing. In N. Schimitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistic*s (pp. 251-156). London: Arnold.

22. Weigle, S.C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Class 12

Name : _____

Read the following passage and Choose the correct answer from (A, B, C and D).

A combination of water, salt, air pollution, sun, sand, and wind is destroying the huge statue just outside Cairo. This five-thousand-year-old statue, which has the body of a lion and the face of a human being, is too badly damaged to be completely saved. First, there is not a good drainage system around the statue and too much water has been running into the stone statue for several years. As a result, tiny pieces of salt have been left on the stone and have damaged it. Second, air pollution from the increasing amount of traffic in Cairo is also destroying the **ancient** statue. The air is so full of poisonous gases that it is damaging the statue even faster. Third, the statue is being destroyed by extremes of temperature. The air is very cold at night, but during the day the stone of the statue becomes very hot under the strong sunlight. Other natural forces such as severe sandstorms attack the statue as well. Finally, the tourists who visit the statue every day also cause a lot of damage to it.

1: Which of the following is NOT true about the statue?

A. It is in the centre of Cairo. B. It is very big.
C. It is badly damaged. D. Part of it looks like a person.

2: According to the passage, the statue was built_____.

A. in the 10th century. B. 500 years ago.
C. 5,000 years ago. D. in the 5th century.

3: All of the following are mentioned as causes of damage to the statue EXCEPT_____.

A. fires B. tourists C. temperature D. air pollution

4: The word "**ancient**" in the passage mostly means_____.

A. beautiful B. very big C. very old D. modern

5: It can be inferred from the text that_____.

A. tiny pieces of salt have been put on the statue to prevent damage
B. there is little damage to the statue
C. human beings as well as nature cause much damage to the statue
D. the statue was built for entertainment many years ago

Choose the correct answer from (A, B, C and D).

6: Linda: "Excuse me! Where's the post office?" Maria: "_____."

A. Don't worry B. It's over there C. Yes, I think so D. I'm afraid not

7: My sister is very fond_____ eating chocolate candy.

A. about B. at C. with D. of

8: She'll be a billionaire by the time she_____ forty.

A. was B. was C. is D. is going to be

9: Alice: "What shall we do this evening?" Carol: "_____"

A. No problem B. Let's go out for dinner

C. Oh, that's good D. I went out for dinner

10: "Would you like to have_____ coffee?"

A. many B. few C. some D. little

11: I'm going to have my house_____ this weekend.

A. redecorates B. redecorate C. redecorating D. redecorated

12: Paul was_____ disappointed with his examination results that he was sad all week.

A. such B. too C. enough D. so

: He _____ in London at the moment.

A. is studying B. studies C. will study D. has studied

14: _____ I came to see her yesterday, she was reading a magazine.

A. When B. Before C. After D. While

15: It's difficult to_____ what our lives would be like without music.

A. expect B. imagine C. remember D. see

16: Helen: "Where do you come from?" Ann: "_____."

A. In London B. Yes, I have just come here

C. I'm living in London D. I come from London

17: If the weather_____ worse, we won't go to the beach.

A. would get B. gets C. will get D. got

18: You can buy dairy_____ in this shop.

A. producers B. production C. productivity D. products

19: After drinking a big bottle of_____, he got drunk.

A. milk B. orange juice C. water D. liquor

20: The teacher told his students_____ laughing.

A. to stop B. stop C. stopping D. stopped

21: Helen: "Congratulations!" Jane: "_____"

A. What a pity! B. You are welcome C. Thank you D. I'm sorry

22: _____ I were you, I would take a taxi to the airport.

A. If B. Unless C. Because D. When

23: I wish I _____ a car. I'm tired of catching the bus to work every day.

A. will have B. had C. have D. had had

24: Tom: "How did you get here?" John: "_____"

A. I came here by train. B. I came here last night.

C. The train is so crowded. D. Is it far from here?

25: Miss White sang very_____ at my birthday party last night.

A. beautifully B. beautify C. beauty D. beautiful

26: By this time next year, my father_____ here for 25 years.

A. was working B. will work

C. will have been working D. are going to work

27: Hoi An is a famous tourist_____.

A. attraction B. attract C. attracted D. attractive

28: The boy_____ eyes are brown is my friend.

A. who B. which C. whom D. whose

29: I'm learning English_____ I want to get a better job.

A. or B. because C. therefore D. but

30: When my father was young, he _____ get up early to do the gardening.

A. was used to B. use to C. got used to D. used to

Choose the correct answer from (A, B, C and D).

There are a lot of things you should follow to be a welcome guest in America. When you are (31) _____ to have dinner at your friend's house, it's necessary to bring a small present. Flowers are always nice; or you may bring a bottle of (32) _____ if you know that your friend likes drinking.

You are expected to arrive for dinner on time or just a few minutes late. Don't get there early. If you are going to be more than fifteen minutes late, you should call and tell them.

Try to relax and enjoy yourself at the dinner table. If you don't know about choosing the (33) _____ fork or knife, just watch the other people, and follow them. If you still have no idea of (34) _____ to do, ask the person next to you.

When it comes to the food, if you like it, say so. They are looking forward to hearing your compliments. Of course, you will thank them for the meal and for their kindness. It is also a good idea to send a (35) ____ note the day after.

31: A. forced B. invited C. demanded D. made

32: A. Coke B. juice C. wine D. lemonade

33: A. new B. right C. main D. big

34: A. what B. where C. which D. why

35: A. message B. thank−you C. welcome D. goodbye

Choose the correct answer from (A, B, C and D).

36: A. fields B. vehicles C. farmers D. crops

37: A. rained B. followed C. believed D. stopped

38: A. town B. slow C. power D. how

39: A. think B. this C. those D. there

40: A. instead B. leader C. deafness D. headache

Choose the correct answer from (A, B, C, D).

41: He has made a lot of mistakes in his writing because his carelessness.

A B C D

42: Peter earned a large number of money last year.

A B C D

43: He never goes home before he will finish his work.

A B C D

44: You have to study hard to keep pace in your classmates.

A B C D

45: Mr. Smith is going to buy a new Japanese car, doesn't he?

A B C D

Choose the correct answer from (A, B, C and D).

46: Take your money with you _____.

A. if you see any good souvenirs to buy

B. when you see any good souvenirs to buy

C. whenever you see any good souvenirs to buy

D. in case you see any good souvenirs to buy

47: The doctor advised Robert _____ to lose weight.

A. that he takes more exercise

B. that he should take more exercise in order that

C. to take more exercise if he wanted
D. to take more exercise so that he could

48: When you arrived back at the hotel, _____ ?

A. did you notice what time it was B. did you notice what time was it
C. were you noticing what time it was D. were you noticing what time was it

49: The road is _____.

A. so slippery for us to drive fast B. too slippery for us to drive fast
C. so slippery that we drove fast D. too slippery that we can't drive fast

50: Alexander Fleming, _____, received the Nobel Prize in 1945.

A. who discovered penicillin B. he discovered penicillin
C. that discovered penicillin D. which discovered penicillin

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

(On students' perception of the writing process)

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female **Age:** .....

Class:

How do you write in English? Answer the following questions to find out.

Check (✓) the statements that best fit your opinions according to the 5-degree scale.

Statements	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
1. I discuss with my friends about what I am writing.					
2. I make a plan or an outline before I start.					
3. I depend on my own experience/ knowledge to find things to write.					

4. I consider my friends' various ideas about my topic.					
5. I consider the purpose and the audience for my piece of writing.					
6. I write down as many ideas as possible for my first, rough draft.					
7. I use my dictionary to check unknown words when I write.					
8. I talk with my friends about unknown words when I write.					
9. I consult references for ideas and format appropriate to purpose and audience.					
10. I produce subsequent drafts.					
11. I revise the draft for content and clarity of meaning.					
12. I confer with peers and the teacher after revision.					
13. I edit the draft individually and collaboratively.					
14. I rewrite the final, polished draft.					
15. I share/ publish my writing with my					

friends.					

Thank you very much!

APPENDIX 3

SAMPLE WRITING PROCESS ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

(Original version from

http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/mla/questionnaire.pdf)

A = Always = 5 marks U = Usually = 3 marks N = Never = 0				**Comments**
When pre-writing, the student:				
Uses a variety of pre-writing techniques				
Considers the purpose of the piece				
Considers the audience for the piece				
Considers various possible points of view				
Considers possible formats appropriate to purpose and audience				
When drafting, the student:				
Produces a first, rough draft				
Produces subsequent drafts				
Confirms point of view				
Confirms format appropriate to purpose and audience				
Confers with peers and teacher				
Revises the draft for content and clarity of meaning				
Edits the draft individually and collaboratively				

When post-writing, the student:				
Prepares a final, polished draft				
Decides if and how the written work was shared or published				
Shares or publishes a variety of written forms				
Decides which writing pieces become part of the portfolio				
Throughout the writing process, the student:				
Reflects upon the written piece and revises accordingly				
Confers willingly with teacher and peers				
Consults appropriate reference resources as needed				
Monitors continuous progress				

APPENDIX 4

PRE-TEST on Writing

Time allotted: 45 minutes

Student's name: …….

Class: …….

School: …….

Date: ……

Marks	In words	Teacher's signature	Teacher's signature

These days, many people begin to catch fish in the lake behind your house. What makes you worried most is that they use electricity to catch fish. A lot of small fish died and floated on the water surface. Other animals such as frogs, toads, and even birds also died from electric shock waves. You think that local authorities should prohibit and fine heavily anyone catching fish in this way.

Now, write a letter of 100-150 words to the head of the local authorities to complain about the way of catching fish in the lake behind your house. Follow the format provided:

Situation states the reason for writing

Complication mentions the problem

Resolution makes a suggestion

Action talks about future action

Politeness ends the letter politely

(adapted from Unit 6: The Environment – Tieng Anh 9, p. 53)

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX 5

POST-TEST on Writing

Time allotted: 45 minutes

Student's name: ……

Class: ……..

School: ……

Date: ……..

Marks	**In words**	**Teacher's signature**	**Teacher's signature**

Read the following advertisement

Come to Sunny

MANDANGA

Ten good reasons for a visit to the Hotel Superb:

1. You'll enjoy the scenery.
2. The weather is excellent.
3. You'll love the food.
4. You can go riding.
5. You'll be met at the airport.

6. All the hotel staff are friendly.
7. The hotel has got three bars and a restaurant.
8. Every room has got a shower.
9. You can see the beach from the hotel.
10. There are excursions every day.

After spending two weeks at the Hotel Superb for your summer holiday, you noticed that everything was worse than what the advertisement said. Write a letter of 100-150 words to the director of the V&T Company to complain about the poor quality of the service there.

.....

.....

APPENDIX 6

Marking Scale for Graders' Evaluation

(***The scale consists of 5 aspects with 4 levels for each***)

Aspects	Level	Criteria
CONTENT	**3.5-3.25**	Knowledgeable; substantive; thorough development of topic; relevant to assigned topic
	3-2.25	Some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited development of topic; mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks detail
	2-1.25	Limited knowledge of subject; little substance; inadequate development of topic
	1-0	Does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; not pertinent; or not enough to evaluate
ORGANIZATION	**1.5-1.25**	Fluent expression; well-organized; ideas clearly stated/supported; logical sequencing; cohesive
	1-0.75	Somewhat choppy; loosely organized but main ideas stand out; limited support; logical but incomplete sequencing
	0.5	Non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnected; lacks logical sequencing and development
	0.25	Does not communicate; no organization; or not enough to evaluate.

VOCABULARY	**1.5-1.25**	Sophisticated range; effective word/ idiom choice and usage; word form mastery; appropriate mastery
	1-0.75	Adequate range; occasional errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage *but meaning not obscured*
	0.5	Limited range; frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage; *meaning confused or obscured*
	0.25	Essential translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form; or not enough to evaluate
LANGUAGE USE	**2.5-2.0**	Effective complex constructions; fewer errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	1.75-1	Effective but simple constructions; minor problems in complex constructions; several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions *but meaning seldom obscured*
	0.75-0.5	Major problems in simple/ complex constructions; frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/ or fragments, run-ons, deletions; *meaning confused or obscured*
	0.25-0	Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; dominated by errors, does not communicate; or not enough to evaluate

MECHANICS	**1**	Demonstrates mastery of conventions; few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	0.75	Occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing *but meaning not obscured*
	0.5	Frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; poor handwriting; *meaning confused or obscured*
	0.25	No mastery of conventions; dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; handwriting illegible, or not enough to evaluate

(adapted from Jacobs et al.'s (1981) cited in *Assessing Writing by Sara Cushing Weigle* (2002) and from Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hoang Van Van's suggestion cited in VNU. JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, Foreign Languages, T.XXIII, No.1, 2007)

APPENDIX 7

MARKING SHEET

(For graders' evaluation)

Student's name: .....

Class: ……. ***Date:*** ……...

Aspects	*Score(s)*	*Grader's signature*	*Comment(s)*
Content			
Organization			
Vocabulary			
Language use			
Mechanics			
Final Results	**/ 10**		