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Chapter Four

Description, Analysis, and Discussion of Data

This chapter will throw lights on the aim of each research tool used in the study, the design, administration, and reliability and validity. It will also analyse and discuss in detail the data obtained by means of: (1) classroom observation, (2) teachers' questionnaire, (3) students' questionnaire, (4) teachers' interview, (5) students' interview, and (6) think-aloud protocol. Furthermore, the chapter will provide a summary of the analysis of the findings of each research tool.

4.0 Classroom Observation

The Aim

The classroom observation aims at finding answers to the following questions in terms of: 1) collaborative learning, 2) the objectives of writing, 3) time for writing, 4) composing, 5) teacher's feedback, and 6) context respectively:

1) What kind of composition work did the students go through in class while doing a writing task?
2) What was the aim or the reason for writing in classroom?
3) How much time was given by the teacher 1) before writing, 2) during writing, 3) after writing for feedback?
4) In what ways did the teacher try to develop the students' cognitive skills when writing in class?

5) What kind of feedback was given by the teacher?

6) What did the teacher do in terms of creating a context for non-contextual writing task?

**The Context**

The class which has been observed was a second level English writing class of the B.Ed. programme at Aden University in Yemen. There were 25 students in the class but the total number of the students registered was 43. Three-hour classes were conducted per week. These classes were divided into two-hour and one-hour classes, two days a week. This class was scheduled to be held for two hours, from 12:00 to 2:00. However, the class started at 12:15 p.m as a teacher came at this time.

**Experience 1**

Time : 12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Class : 2nd year students
Day : Saturday
Date : 9th December 2006

As the teacher and I entered the classroom 15 minutes late, the first thing we noticed was that there were few students in the class. As an observer, I chose a seat at the back of the room. The teacher waited for the other students to come. The teacher then wrote the title of the unit on the white board. The unit was entitled 'Writing Dialogue' (Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 60). The unit began with the subtitle 'Discussion' activity:
1.1 Many different jobs depend on interviewing skills. Work with a partner and write at least four jobs where interviewing is important. (Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 60)

Nevertheless, the teacher left this activity out. He also ignored the second task 1.2 which asked the students to assume that they wrote for a magazine. They were given a choice of any famous person they were interested in interviewing without mentioning the name. The students were required to write three questions they would like to ask this person on a piece of paper. They were then required to work with a partner and pretend or play the role of the person they wanted to interview. They should, according to the task, ask the class their questions and see if they could guess the interviewee.

However, the teacher started directly by asking the students about the meaning of 'Dialogue'. The class responded in chorus saying 'conversation'. The teacher was not satisfied with this answer. He clarified that 'conversation' differed from dialogue. Then a student responded immediately that it meant "interview". The teacher then tried to make it clear by saying that 'an interview consists of some steps'. He asked the students about what was included in the interview, what was the form of the interview.

A student answered that in the interview there were questions. The teacher made it clearer that the person who asked questions in the interview was called the 'interviewer', whereas the person who answered the questions was called the 'interviewee'. He then drew a diagram illustrating that particular point.
Next the teacher moved on to task 2, which was under the sub-heading ‘preparing for writing’. He himself read out the task and explained it.

Preparing for Writing

1. Read the following article, which appeared in a local paper in 1988. In order to collect the information she needed for her article, the reporter (Claire Buchanan) had to interview Mrs McFee. Read the article below.

Raiders who totally broke into the sub post office run by Mrs McFee were prevented from taking anything by the bravery of this 64-year-old ex-teacher and her dog, Charley.

Mrs Jenny McFee told our reporter that the two young men came into her shop at about 4.30. She was counting the money that she had taken during the day and completing her records of the official payments that had been made through the office, when one of the men pointed a shotgun at her. Mrs McFee followed post office regulations, which say that you should not risk your own safety in the case of armed robbery, and started to give the men some packets of ten pound notes. However, her dog, sensing that something was wrong, came from behind the counter and bit the man with the gun on the leg.

During the confusion Mrs McFee was able to press the switch for the alarm system and lie down on the floor behind the counter. Once the men heard the alarm they panicked and ran off with Charley in pursuit. They were arrested by a police patrol as they tried to escape in their car.

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 60)

He explained that the reporter (Claire Buchanan) needed to collect information and that she had to meet Mrs. McFee. The teacher pointed out that that text was based on that interview.
The teacher then read the first paragraph of the article along with explanations in English. He explained the meaning of the first word of the first sentence 'raiders' and said that it meant they were armed attackers. After this, he came across a phrasal verb in the same sentence, "broke into" and asked the students about the structure of a phrase. A student answered, 'a verb and a preposition'. The teacher wrote on the board 'V+P' and added that the phrase gave a new meaning. He next came across a verb in the same sentence 'run' and explained that Mrs. McFee was running a post office. He asked the students what was the meaning of 'running' and clarified that the meaning there was different from the literal meaning of "running". A student answered that it meant 'walk'. Immediately after that answer was given, the students answered in chorus, 'manager'.

The teacher then said that it meant 'to manage'. He added that there were transitive and intransitive verbs. He wrote on the board 'she runs' and read those words out. He then asked the students if it was a complete sentence. The class replied in chorus, 'No'. The teacher made it clear that the meaning differed when it was transitive or intransitive. He explained that the meaning in that text was 'to manage' because the verb was intransitive, 'she runs an office' but if it was transitive the meaning of 'run' was 'walk'. However, the literal meaning given by the teacher to the word 'run' as 'walk' is incorrect. This is because the correct literal meaning of the word 'run' is to move using your leg, going faster than when you walk. Such word can, however, have both the literal and the figurative or idiomatic meanings. For example, 'to run as a sport' can have the literal meaning of 'go running', whereas 'to run a race or a post office' can have the figurative meaning of 'managing or organising it', i.e. to be in charge of organising the race or in charge of managing this particular business.
The teacher next returned back to the earlier phrasal verb ‘broke into’ and gave its meaning, ‘entering the house without permission’. He then continued to explain that Mrs McFee and her dog prevented the thieves from stealing. He also gave, in the same paragraph, the meaning of ‘ex’, ‘the former’.

After this, the teacher read the second paragraphs. He stopped at the word ‘regulations’ and gave its meaning, ‘procedures’. He explained that people followed the regulations which meant, ‘rules’. The teacher explained, according to the article, that they should not had a quarrel with thieves if they were attacked and that they should give them what they want. He explained that Mrs. Mc Fee gave some packets of ten pound notes.

The teacher continued to read until he came across the word ‘counter’. He clarified that that was a place where people receive money. He followed the same procedure with the rest of the words in the article. He then stopped at the word ‘However’ and asked the class about the function of that word. The class did not reply as the teacher did not give enough time for students to think and answer. Nevertheless, the teacher himself answered and said that it linked two contradicted ideas. He made it clearer by referring to the first idea it linked in the article, ‘the woman gave the money’ and the second idea, ‘the dog came from behind the counter and bit the man’.

The teacher then gave another example on the board,

‘He studied hard.’

‘Failed the exam.’

He clarified that they also could link those ideas with ‘although’. He instructed the students to stick to such rules in writing otherwise their writing would be poor. The teacher then continued to read the text without giving any further discussions about connectives. He continued to read the text explaining the story of the text. He
explained that the men were afraid as they heard the alarm and ran off. He said that 'ran off' meant 'escape'. He explained that 'ran off' was a phrasal verb and that phrasal verbs differed from verbs, they have different meaning. The teacher ended reading the text and explained that the men were arrested by the police and that that article was made by a reporter and that a journalist had such an interview.

The teacher next instructed the students to turn to task 3 which aimed at preparing students to write, which was under the subheading 'preparing to write'. This task asked the students to organise certain statements into the correct order and to match them against the correct speakers, Claire Buchanan, or Jenny McFee.

Preparing to write 3 When you are writing a dialogue it is important to lay out your work neatly and clearly. Organise the following statements and questions into a sensible order and match them against the correct speakers - either the reporter, Claire Buchanan, or Jenny McFee. Notice how useful it is to leave a space between the speaker and the things they say, and the use of the colon.

Interview: Part one

- Did you think they looked suspicious?
- No. Not at all. They just looked like ordinary people.
- What did they look like?
- Quite ordinary. One of them wore a brown leather jacket - I think they call bomber jackets. The other was wearing a T-shirt and jeans. He was carrying a bag.
- The sort of thing they keep sports kit in. It had Adidas written on the outside.
- What sort of bag was that?
- Well, I was counting my takings for the day when I saw these two young men come in. I thought maybe they wanted some cigarettes.
- When did you realise that there was something unusual?

Reporter: Mrs McFee, I wonder if you could tell me what happened first of all?

Mrs McFee:

Reporter:

Mrs McFee:

Reporter:

Mrs McFee:

Reporter:

Mrs McFee:

Reporter:

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 61)
The teacher, then, clarified that there were points in disorder, and asked the class to read carefully and then they should decide the correct order according to what had already been explained. He stopped his explanation letting the students doing the task without asking them to work in pairs or groups. The teacher then interrupted and explained to the students that they had to guess what was the question of the journalist and what was the answer given by Mrs McFee. He said that the points were questions and answers and that they had to put them sequentially in the spaces. He made it clear that the questions were asked by the reporter and the answers by Mrs McFee.

A student asked the teacher individually in a low voice for more clarification. The teacher also discussed the questions with her in a low voice not within the hearing of the rest of the class or me. He then read the reporter’s question which was given by the writer as a help for the class to start and asked the class to match a sensible answer given above. A student gave the answer and the teacher said: ‘This is a correct answer’. The teacher next asked the class the other questions and sought the answers. The class, then, responded individually. The same procedure was followed with this task.

The teacher next instructed the students to turn to task 4, which was under the subheading 'Focus on language: contractions in speech'.
4 When you write words that people say, it is very common in English to use contractions. It is very important to remember that these contractions are only used in fairly informal writing or where you are quoting the exact words that someone has used. Two of the main types of contraction in writing are personal pronoun + auxiliary verb (e.g., he is: he's) and auxiliary verb + not (e.g., people could not: people couldn't).

Complete the table of Examples given below using appropriate contractions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL PRONOUN+ AUXILIARY VERB</th>
<th>AUXILIARY VERB+ NOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am ...</td>
<td>We are not...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have ...</td>
<td>She did not...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you will ...</td>
<td>They could not ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she is/has ...</td>
<td>It is not...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you would/had ...</td>
<td>I shall not...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is/has ...</td>
<td>We cannot ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we are ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they have ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 61)

The task explained that contractions were only used in fairly informal writing or when quoting the exact words that someone had used. It asked the students to complete the table of examples given using the appropriate contractions. The teacher read the task out and explained the example given in the book as a model. He then asked the class about the meaning of contractions. The class replied in chorus, using the mother tongue, 'Ekhtisar'.

But the teacher said, 'short forms'. The teacher clarified that that task required the class to write the short forms of what was given. He then said that there was no need to do this task since it was simple and done in the basic schools.
The teacher also left out task 5 which was under the sub-heading ‘Writing task’.

5 Work with a partner and rewrite the second part of Claire’s interview with Mrs McFee using contractions in all the places where it would be appropriate (there are eight places where a contraction should be used).

**Interview: Part two**

**Reporter:** When did you realise that there was something unusual?

**Mrs McFee:** When he pointed that horrible gun at me. I could not believe it at first. I said to myself: ‘Jenny, this is not true.’ But it was. He started shouting at me: ‘Give us the money. Do not try anything or I will blow your head off.’ It was terrifying.

**Reporter:** That must have been awful! What happened next?

**Mrs McFee:** It is Charley who was the hero.

**Reporter:** Who is Charley?

**Mrs McFee:** My dog. He is a black poodle and as brave as a lion. He noticed something was wrong.

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 62)

This task asked the class to work with a partner and to rewrite the second part of Claire’s interview with Mrs McFee using contractions in all the appropriate places. The teacher then moved to task 6.
Writing task: question 6 In order to get information from people you often need to use questions which begin with a question word (who, what, when, why, etc.).

Work with a partner to finish the dialogue between Claire and Mrs McFee by trying to write good questions for the answers that Mrs McFee gave. Use wh- questions wherever possible.

**Interview: Part three**

Mrs McFee: My dog. He's a black poodle and as brave as a lion. He noticed something was wrong.

Reporter: 1

Mrs McFee: As I was giving the money to the man with the gun, Charley came from behind the counter and went straight for him. He bit him in the leg and the man couldn't shake him off.

Reporter: 2

Mrs McFee: I think it was because he couldn't stand anyone shouting at me. He just heard this awful shouting and went for the man.

Reporter: 3

Mrs McFee: I lay down on the floor behind the counter the moment the man stopped pointing his gun at me. That was when I pushed the alarm button.

Reporter: 4

Mrs McFee: Oh yes! The moment they heard the alarm they ran for the door. Charley let go of the man's leg and went after them barking as loudly as he could!

Reporter: 5

Mrs McFee: Almost straight away. They were really kind. A young policeman got me a cup of tea while a detective asked me questions like you've been doing.

Reporter: Well I won't ask you any more now. But thank you very much for giving so much of your time.

Mrs McFee: Just make sure you get a picture of Charley!

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, pp. 62-63)
This task asked the students to work with a partner to finish the dialogue between Claire and Mrs McFee by writing good questions for the answers that Mrs. McFee gave. It required the students to use wh - questions wherever possible. The teacher explained the task and asked the class to write questions for the given answers. He, afterwards, stopped the task work in order to distribute the test paper. He said that that was enough for that day and that they could complete the task at home. He did not, even later, collect the students' answers or responses to this task.

_The Analysis of Experience (1)_

_Collaborative Learning_ It is clear from experience (1) that the teacher was in complete authority. He addressed the students. It was completely teacher – directed. The students only reacted to his questions and listened to what he said and learned what he knew. They were not given a chance to initiate a discussion. There was no student to student interaction and therefore they were passive participants.

This was clearly observed, for example, when the teacher started to read task (2), which was about preparing for writing. He read the first paragraph of the article and gave its explanation in English. He explained the meaning of the word 'raiders' and then stopped at the phrasal verb in the same sentence 'broke into' and asked about the structure of a phrase. The class responded to him individually.

The teacher also left out the activities which required the students to work in pairs or work on their own. These activities initiate and encourage an effective process of writing. He left out tasks 1.1, 1.2 and 5, which asked the students to work with a partner. Therefore, the teacher in this experience seemed not to believe in the collaborative work (i.e. group / pair work), which generates discussions and promotes the students' writing development through peer- interaction and peer- feedback.
The Objectives of Writing  It can be noticed from the title of the unit in experience (1) that the actual aim of the writing unit is to enable the students to write a dialogue. However, the observational data revealed that the teacher aimed at promoting the students' conscious understanding of rules and vocabulary and controlling them. This was clearly observed when he explained them in their contexts in detail with giving some illustrating examples.

In this experience, the teacher particularly focused on a particular phrase, which has been dealt with in that article such as 'broke into'. He also focused on particular vocabulary mentioned in the article and explained their meaning such as 'raiders', 'run', 'regulations' and 'counter'.

The writing objective in the classroom, however, should not be a study and practice of grammar and learning of vocabulary since successful writing depends on more than the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences. The aim in the writing classroom should be that which helps students to link and develop ideas for a particular audience.

Time for Writing  As it has been observed in this experience, no time was given to the students to write or practise the act of writing a dialogue. This is because most of the time was spent in the explanation of structures, the meanings of certain words and in asking questions and the students' oral responses to them.

At the end of this experience, the students were to be given some time for writing when they were asked to write wh - questions for the given answers in task ‘6’. But the teacher, afterwards, stopped the writing work in order to distribute the students' test paper and asked them to complete the task at home. Thus, most of the time was used up in the oral work and the distribution of test paper. The teacher did not focus on writing until he finished the unit.
Composing As it has been observed and explained above, the act of writing was not given time in class to take place. This actually and usually happens in the writing classes in the colleges of Aden University. Teachers tend to ask their students to write at home and therefore the absence of both the process of composing in class and the teachers' help and guidance since students are left to work on their own at home.

Nevertheless, the students are sometimes given a chance to practise the process of composing but in tests and exams where help and guidance are inevitably not offered. After the tests and exams have finished, the students' written texts are filled with red marks to be converted later into grades rather than a feedback. This was also clearly understood from the students' questionnaire data which revealed that teachers focused only on their errors rather than commenting positively on their achievements as well.

Teacher's Feedback In this experience, the teacher followed the procedure of reading the text out, explaining it and asking questions to be responded by the students orally. He, as observed, tended to provide the students with the correct meaning of the words or the correct answer to his questions when his students failed responding to them correctly. And this is the kind of feedback that the students got from their teacher.

Context The observational data also showed that the teacher in this experience did not vary the audience of the writing tasks. He only restricted himself to one audience prescribed by the book and was applied to all the writing tasks given. This audience was not authentically relevant to the students' socio-cultural setting.
Experience 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>3:00 – 5:00 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>2nd year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>14th of December 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher and I entered the class 30 minutes late. As the teacher sat on a chair reading silently the remaining part of the previous unit, the class was waiting for him to start. The class was a continuation of unit 14, 'Writing Dialogue'. Twenty one students attended the class for two hours.

The teacher started by saying that a journalist collected information about a problem and said that they had a model of that and they should follow that model. He then moved to task 6 (See pp. 11-12) and said that questions should be formulated if they want to design an interview. He read task 6, which gave the answers and asked students to formulate questions for those answers. The teacher asked the class to read the answers of interview part three and to fill in the blanks with questions. He himself filled in the first blank with a question orally as a model, 'What did he do?' and then asked the students to do the whole task, design questions for all the answers.

The teacher then sat on his seat. He did not ask the class to work in pairs or groups. However, the majority of the students were working individually with very few consulting their classmates about the task. Moreover, the chairs were fixed to the ground and could not be moved in case of dividing the class into groups of more than three students since three chairs were fixed together in a row.

The teacher, however, interrupted the students as they were answering the task giving them insufficient time for answering. He gave them less than 5 minutes. He then said that, if they understood the information given they would be able to put the
questions. He then read the second answer of the interview 'part three', and stopped at the phrase 'went straight' and gave its meaning as it appeared in that context, 'attacked'. He continued reading the second answer and stopped again at the phrase 'the man couldn't shake him off'. He asked the class about the meaning of 'shake off'. The class did not reply. He then explained that phrasal verbs took different meaning. The teacher himself then answered that that meant, 'get rid of'. These two phrases mentioned above have appeared in the following answer for Mrs McFee:

Mrs McFee: As I was giving the money to the man with the gun, Charley came from behind the counter and went straight for him. He bit him in the leg and the man couldn't shake him off.

After this, a student gave the question, which already was said by a teacher. The teacher next wrote the question on the board, 'What did he do?' The question by the way was related to the previous task interview 'part two' left out by the teacher. It was a continuation of the interview. The teacher then read the other answer and the class had to put a question for. But the teacher asked the students about the meaning of a word contained in this answer 'stand' instead.

McFee I think it was because he couldn't stand anyone shouting at me. He just heard this awful shouting and went for the man.

A student answered but it was a wrong answer. However, the teacher responded by saying that 'stand' in this context meant, 'bear', and clarified that a meaning changed from a context to another. He then asked for the question. A student responded correctly. The teacher wrote the question on the board, Why do you think he did it? He then clarified that 'Why' was used for reason. Nevertheless another student put the question with different wording but carrying the same idea.
The teacher then indicated that one function could be expressed by different forms and he made clear that we learned the language first, the spelling, structures and then the function using the language. He then gave an example about how a language was functioned. He gave examples about the function of asking for help and wrote them on the board.

'Could you help me?'

'Would you mind help me'.

It is clear from the second example given above by the teacher on the white board that he made an error in the structure of the function 'asking for help'. This is because the modal verb 'Would' is used to ask someone politely to do something but with using a certain structure which is different from that used by the teacher. This structure, however, should be like this: "Would you mind+ verb+ing". Thus, the teacher must have been written the second example like this: "Would you mind helping me?" or the other way round but without using 'mind', "Would you help me?". Nonetheless, he clarified that it was clear from the examples that different forms could be used for one function.

The teacher next read the next answer and tried to show the meaning of the phrase 'pushed down' that was contained in this answer. 

McFee 'I lay down on the floor behind the counter the moment the man stopped pointing his gun at me. That was when I pushed down the alarm button.'

He pointed out to its meaning through pressing the fan button of the class. He then asked the class to put the question for this answer. A student gave the question and the teacher wrote it on the board.

'What did you do then?'

After this, the teacher read the answer and asked for its question, but no response was given. He then clarified that the answer began with 'Oh yes' and that the
question should start with 'Did' but the class could not think of the question. Therefore, the teacher himself answered and wrote the question on the board.

'And did the men run out straight away?'

The teacher next read the last answer for Mrs. McFee. It was:

Almost straight away. They were really kind. A young Policeman got me a cup of tea while a detective asked me questions like you've been doing.

The teacher clarified that that answer started with, but a student interrupted and said, 'Time'. He then asked the class, 'Who were kind?'. The class responded in chorus, 'The police'. He next asked the students about the question. Two students answered individually. The teacher wrote the question on the board, 'When did the police come?' The teacher read and explained using a few Arabic words.

Finally, the teacher moved to his own task leaving out three tasks. Two tasks under the subheading 'Writing tasks', whereas the final task was under the subheading 'Extension activity'. The first task of the two described real incident and asked students to read the given article and write a dialogue in which the newspaper reporter was interviewing Robert Tolley, the man who ate the frog. The second task asked students to work with a partner and practise the dialogue, once they have written it and checked it against 'improving your writing' checklist in unit 1 and against the key text on page 79, so that this dialogue could be performed by a group of people in their class.

The other task, which was an extension activity, asked the students to find other newspaper articles in their first language or in English and then write similar dialogues using the information and ideas that they found, and to perform three or four that were the most interesting or amusing before the class.
The teacher, in his own task, instructed the students to compose an interview about a problem from life and asked them to create characters. He explained that in this problem, there were events and asked the class to imagine a problem and to make an interview. He asked the class to imagine that a place was exposed to a robbery. He then changed his task. He asked the class to imagine a teaching situation and compose questions about teaching in a secondary school. The teacher clarified that they could make five questions about teaching English as a foreign Language. He then stopped explaining and sat on his seat and asked the class if they had questions. The class did not reply. The teacher then decided to distribute the rest of the test paper ending the class at 4:30 p.m. The task he has given was given as a home work.

**The Analysis of Experience (2)**

*Collaborative Learning* In experience (2), the students acted as passive participants whereas the teacher acted as a transmitter of knowledge. The teacher in this experience, which was a continuation of the unit ‘Writing Dialogue’, started by giving a piece of information about who was a journalist. He also explained and gave the meanings of words and phrasal verbs when the students did not respond correctly.

The teacher in this experience did not ask the students to work in groups or pairs. This was clearly observed with task ‘6’ which asked the students to make questions for the given answers. Nonetheless, there were very few students who tried to enquire their classmates about the task.

Thus, those very few students who consulted their classmates about the task indicated the students’ need for a collaborative work which helps in understanding the task through discussing it among them and therefore the ease of doing it. But the teacher was still ignoring the importance of such work which may contribute to the students’ improvement in writing skill.
The Objectives of Writing

This experience was a continuation of the unit 'Writing Dialogue', which aimed to develop the students' ability to write a dialogue. But it has been observed in this experience that the teacher's aim was to develop the students' knowledge about language function and form along with phrases and vocabulary.

The teacher in this experience gave examples showing how one function could be expressed by different forms. He applied such knowledge in new contexts by giving examples to promote the students' understanding of such knowledge.

To learn to write, the students do not need to practise at the sentence level or to consolidate the learning of new structures and vocabulary of language in this unit. Instead, they need to develop their ability to write a dialogue and such aim will not be achieved by the procedure followed by the teacher in this experience.

Time for Writing

The teacher in this experience seemed to appreciate the time for writing. This was clearly observed with task '6' which asked the students to formulate questions for the given answers. The teacher asked the students to read the answers of interview part three and to fill in the blanks with questions.

But the teacher's appreciation of the time for writing did not last long. He interrupted the students while they were answering the task giving them insufficient time for answering the task. He gave them less than five minutes, which was not enough for doing such task.

Time for writing is very important especially if spent on writing since it allows the students to work together on writing. But the teacher did not feel that such two hours were precious if spent on writing. He did not make the best use of such time. The first hour, for instance, went in vain. The first half of it went in vain since the teacher came late into the classroom. The second half was spent on distributing the
test paper. The other hour was spent only on the oral work but not on the actual act of writing.

Composing At the end of this experience, the teacher left out tasks which required the students to experience the process of composing. He left out the tasks under the subheadings 'Writing tasks' and 'Extension activity', which have whole texts in their outcome.

It is, however, good that the teacher in this experience tried to create a task of his own relevant to the students' social setting but he seemed to be confused about deciding or determining a particular writing task. First, he instructed his students to compose an interview about a problem from life and asked them to create characters. He explained that in that situation there were events and asked the class to imagine that a place was exposed to a robbery.

Then, the teacher changed the task and asked the class to imagine a teaching situation and compose questions about teaching in a secondary school. He then ended the writing class and the task was given as homework. This indicates that the teacher did not believe in writing as a composing process to be learnt in class involving his intervention, providing adequate feedback. But he felt that writing is an activity that should be worked out in the students' own pace. Thus, the class in this experience was not provided with in-class tasks involving the practice of the processes of planning, organising, composing and reviewing.

Teachers should understand that the students need time in the class for writing practice i.e. for a real process of composing. And it is the teacher's task to direct the students for such purpose.

Teacher’s Feedback The teacher in this experience and this is the case of many teachers, seemed not to be aware of the importance of feedback. He devoted the
class time to the oral work but not to writing and therefore the missing of a written work to comment on. This, therefore, will have a negative effect on the students' writing development.

Teachers usually give feedback only on students' test or exam paper. They only look for or pursue the students' errors not the positive side of their writing. This is an easy task for them since it does not consume their time and effort. From experience, such feedback requires the teachers to put red marks on paper and mechanical comments such as 'What is this?', 'It's not clear', 'Not understood', 'I can't understand what is written', etc. Such feedback will definitely have a negative consequence on the part of students. They may underestimate the process of learning writing and they may not give it serious consideration.

Context Considering the teacher's own task given to the students at the end of this experience, it definitely lacked the context of writing. The teacher neither held a discussion on the intended topic nor made the context of writing more clear.

The teacher just said that they could make five questions about teaching English as a foreign language in a secondary school. He did not clarify for his students why should they write about this particular topic? He did not also discuss the audience of this topic. So the students will not more probably write about this topic effectively since they did not understand the context of writing.

Furthermore, the teacher in this experience asked the class if they had questions about the ambiguity of the task. The class did not utter or ask a question. This, however, does not mean that the students understood the context of the task. But this is because the class as a whole was very rarely made to feel involved in asking, discussing, and this may be also due to the general attitude of the teachers, many students prefer not to open their mouths for the fear of being ridiculed.
Experience 3

Time : 12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Class : 2nd year students
Day : Saturday
Date : 17th of December 2006

As the teacher and I entered the class, there were three students in the class. The teacher waited for the others to come. The teacher and I entered the class at 12:30, 30 minutes late from the scheduled time 12:00 p.m. As we were waiting, the teacher wrote the title of the new unit on the board. The unit was entitled 'Writing Persuasively' (Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 64). However, the attendance was 42 students and this increase of the number of students was as the teacher took the attendance in the previous class.

The teacher started by reading the title of the unit out, and explained that 'persuasively' came from the verb 'Persuade'. He wrote the verb on the board. He then clarified that the word 'persuasively' was 'an adverb'. He next wrote the phonemic transcription of 'Persuade' and said that 'to persuade someone' meant 'to convince someone'. He made it clear by saying, 'they refused to go to cinema then he persuaded them to go, meaning to change their mind'. He then clarified that when they wrote something their writing should persuade others to read.

The teacher next started with task 1, which was under the subheading 'Discussion'. He just read it and moved on to task 1.1. Task one, that he left out, said that if they were influenced by a book's cover when they were buying or borrowing it from a library, there was an English proverb that says: 'You can't tell a book by its cover', and that they could all be persuaded to buy a book by the things on its jacket
as well as by the writing inside. The teacher did not direct or made questions or discussion with this task.

As the teacher read task 1.1. and explained it, the students were listening to him reading and explaining in English. The task asked the students to work with a partner and find out about three books, fiction or non fiction, that they had read or used recently. It asked them: 'What did they pay most attention to when they were choosing the book?' It gave a score out of five for importance of the following things, 5 = very important, 0 = completely unimportant. It then asked each to compare his / her results with the rest of their class and decide what makes people buy or borrow books.

However, the teacher did not instruct the students to work in pairs. Instead, he asked the class to respond individually. He started by asking if the book's author was very important when buying a book or unimportant. The class did not respond. Then a student answered: 'It's important'. The teacher next asked about the second point, which was 'Reviews you have need', whether it was important or unimportant. A student responded that, it was important. Thus, the same procedure was followed with the other things in the table. This table was as follows:

| The book's author |  |
| Reviews that you have read |  |
| Cover picture |  |
| The publisher |  |
| Writing on the cover |  |
| Recommendations from friends |  |
| Paper quality |  |

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 64)

After this, the teacher turned to task 2.1 which gave extracts from different parts of three books – the introduction and the writing on the cover (i.e. blurb). The
task asked each student to work with a partner and decide which extracts were from
the ‘cover’ and which ones from the ‘introduction’.

A. Read Chinese Vegetable and Vegetarian Cooking and you will never
of vegetable as dull again. Go one further and try some of the recipes.
B. Of the six novels Foster wrote, A Room with a view had the longest
development.
C. Cooking and serving a Chinese meal, vegetarian or otherwise,
some different problems from serving or cooking a western one, since
Chinese meal is usually communal.
D. The present book is to some extent based on the Complete Book of
Games (written in collaboration with my friend B.C. Westall) which first
appeared in 1939.
E. In this brilliant piece of social comedy Foster is concerned with one
favourite themes.
F. The Pan Book of Card Games-fifty card games and twenty-eight
Patience. Outstanding-no other book of card games explains so many
games so thoroughly or offers so much instruction.

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 64)

Nevertheless, the class did not work in pairs. The teacher started to read the
task and stopped at the word ‘blurb’, and defined it as, ‘The writing on the cover’. He
continued reading and stopped at the word ‘introduction’ and defined it as, ‘Giving
information about what inside the book.’

The teacher made clear that the information on the ‘cover’ differed from
information on the ‘introduction’, and that the class had to decide which extract was
from cover and which one was from ‘introduction’. He read the first extract and as
usual stopped at a word to ask about its meaning. He asked about the word
‘Vegetable’, ‘Do you know what vegetable is?’ The class responded in chorus, ‘Yes’.
Then, the teacher stopped at another word in the same extract, ‘recipes’ and asked
about its meaning. Without giving a chance for a response, he explained that ‘recipes’
were instructions that tell how to cook or prepare something. As he completed the
definition, two students came late to the class and were allowed in. He then asked the
students to decide about this extract. The same procedure was followed with the rest of the extracts asking the class about words and the extracts and the class was responding individually.

The teacher next moved to 2.2, which was related to task 2.3. This task tried to illustrate that when students recognised the cover extracts in the last exercise they noticed certain words and phrases in the passages that showed them that the writer was trying to persuade them to read or buy the book.

In this brilliant piece of social comedy Forster is concerned with one of his favorite themes.

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 64)

Whereas task 2.3 asked each student to work with a partner and mark any words or phrases in the other two book cover extracts that they thought were being used to make the writing persuasive. It then asked them to compare the words they had chosen with other pairs and see if they had many things in common.

Nevertheless, the teacher read task 2.2 and explained it. He then moved to task 2.3 and read it and directly without discussing it moved to task 2.4. Task 2.4 was under the subheading ‘Features’. This task just clarified that writing on the book was intended to cover needs to be persuasive. It explained that that writing described the special features of the books that would attract a reader and described the benefits the book might give to the reader. It underlined the features of the book given in an extract which distinguished it from other books in the market.

The teacher read this task and translated what he read into Arabic. He then moved to another task 2.5, without any kind of discussion of task 2.4. Task 2.5 was related to task 2.4. It asked the students about the verb forms that had been used in the given extracts in task 2.4.
2.5 Verb forms

What verb forms have been used in these four extracts from the blurb.

**A**

| Read Chinese Vegetarian and Vegetarian Cooking... |
| Go one further and try some of the recipes |

INTERROGATIVE [□] IMPERATIVE [□] PASSIVE [□]

**B**

| The methods of preparation and cooking are explained Step by step... |
| The book is arranged according to method of cooking... |

INTERROGATIVE [□] IMPERATIVE [□] PASSIVE [□]

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 65)

The teacher read the extracts and explained that they had interrogative, imperative and passive verbs. The teacher clarified that the verb forms in extract one were imperative. He asked the class about the function of the imperative verbs. The class did not respond correctly. The teacher then said that imperative verbs gave instructions.

The teacher next read extract B, which had two sentences. He asked the class, ‘Where is the verb form in the first extract?’ The class responded in chorus, ‘are explained’, and that they were passive. He asked the students, ‘What is left out in the passive sentence?’ He then himself answered that the subject was left out in the passive sentence and that the action was important not the doer of the action in such sentences.

Finally, the teacher said that that was enough for that day and finished the class at 1.30 pm. He left tasks 2.6 and task 2.7 out. He also left out task 3 ‘improving your writing’ and the task 4.1, which was under the subheading ‘planning your writing’ as well as the last task which was ‘Extension activity’.
Task 2.6 asked the students to read a given blurb from a dictionary and to underline the sections where the reader was talked to directly and to write the main verb that was used in each statement. Task 2.7 clarified that when writing persuasively it was important to be certain about what was being said. It then asked the students to underline the words in the two given sentences that tell about the writer's attitude and to say which sentence sounded more certain 1 or 2? And they have to put a tick beside the one they chose. The task next gave words in a box which would make statements sound more or less certain. It then asked the class to work in pairs to sort them into two different columns - more certain and less certain.

Task 3, 'improving your writing' gave a piece of writing for a book that was not as persuasive as it should be. The task asked the class to work in pairs to improve it. It made it clear that it was necessary to remove or change many words before the writing was persuasive, whereas task 4.1 'Planning your writing' gave very detailed information about the features of a book. This information did not say the benefits that this book would give the person. The task asked the class to work in groups of three or four and brainstorm the possible benefits of the book and to select and write down the most important and interesting points from the notes and the list the group had made.

The task then asked them to use the given ideas to help them write the back cover blurb up to 150 words and asked them to be as persuasive as they could. It next asked them to exchange their writing with a partner and see if they needed to change or add anything and finally asked them to compare it with the key text.

The last task which had been left out was the extension activity. It asked the students to choose a book that was well known either in their country or internationally, and try to write a blurb for that book. It also asked them not to name
the book when they wrote about and exchange their writing with other people in their group, and see if they could guess the book's title.

**The Analysis of Experience (3)**

**Collaborative Learning** It is obvious from experience (3) that the teacher did not give a chance for the students to reflect upon their own learning process and their products through the collaborative learning, which offers such reflection.

This was evidently observed in the class since the teacher ignored the instructions of the tasks, which asked the students to work together (i.e. in pairs) such as tasks: 1.1, 2.1, 2.3, 2.7 and 3. He also left out task 4.1, which asked the students to work in group of three or four to brainstorm certain things. Therefore, this experience missed the work that involves students in writing together.

**The Objectives of Writing** According to the observational data, the aim of the new unit was to develop the ability of writing persuasively. However, most of the writing book tasks in this unit indicated that the aim of writing was the teaching of form of a language. In this unit, there was a strong concern with the usage of a language but not with use.

For example task 2.3 dealt with language items such as words and phrases. Task 2.3 asked the students about the verb forms that have been used in the given extracts such as interrogative, imperative and passive verbs.

Moreover, the teacher's aim in this experience was to teach the students the vocabulary of the target language. For example, he started to read the task 2.1 and stopped at the word 'blurb' and defined it. Then, he continued reading and stopped at the word 'introduction' and he defined it himself. Next, he started reading the first extract in task 2.1 and stopped at the words 'vegetable' and 'recipes' and asked the students about their meanings.
The teacher in this experience and the book tasks writer did not know that students could discover language form as they write. They should know that writing is not a mastery of the prescribed rules and vocabulary, though they have some importance.

*Time for Writing* The actual time for the writing class in this experience was more spent on the teaching of form rather than teaching the process of writing. In this experience, the students did not experience time in activities involving a practice of writing coherent texts. Instead, such activities which required some time have not been discussed and done in class as the teacher spent most of the time on tasks that dealt with some aspects of language. In addition, one hour was not used in teaching writing as the teacher came 30 minutes late and the other half hour was not used as the teacher ended the class 30 minutes earlier. Therefore, the teacher left out activities which required time to be spent on writing such as the task under the subheading, 'Extension activity'.

*Composing* The teacher in this experience seemed not to be aware that writing should be viewed as a means of using language to discover meaning in experience and to communicate it.

This view of writing can be reflected in the processes of planning, organising, composing and reviewing among the students.

The teacher in this experience left out, for instance, task 4.1 under the subheading, 'Planning your writing', which may help in practising the process of composing. This task asked the students to work in a group of three or four and brainstorm the possible benefits of the book and to select and write down the most important and interesting points from the notes and the list the group has already made.
The task then asked the groups to use the given ideas to help them write the back cover blurb up to 150 words and asked them to be as persuasive as they could. It next asked them to exchange their writing with a partner and see if they needed to change or add anything. The task finally asked them to compare it with key text.

Teachers, however, should create or adapt writing situations to help students practise the processes of composing. They should, in such situations, work as facilitators of learning, and as negotiators of the writing topic content and process through their intervention in the process of composing in order to provide the needed information.

**Teacher's Feedback** The teacher in the writing class should be as a responder to the students' needs and as an encourager of learner responsibility during the process of composing. He should provide the students with effective feedback in order to contribute to both developing the students as whole persons and in promoting the students' responsibility and capacity for learning how to learn.

But the teacher in this experience ignored such principles mentioned above and left out tasks which may promote the practice of such principles. He did not act as respondent or encourager of what students needed during the process of composing. This is because such process did not take place in the writing class. Instead, he worked as explainer and transmitter of information related to language form.

During the explanation of the tasks and the articles in this unit, the teacher stopped at certain words such as 'blurb' and 'recipes' and provided the students with the meaning of these words. He, for example, started the unit by reading out the title of the unit 'writing persuasively' and said that 'persuasively' came from the verb 'persuade'. He wrote the verb on the board and clarified that the word 'persuasively'
was an adverb. He finally wrote the phonemic transcription of 'persuade' and clarified it. And this is the kind of feedback, which the students got from the teacher.

**Context** In this experience, the teacher left out some tasks which have a context. The context of writing that helps students write effectively if they understand it.

Task 4.1 'Planning your Writing' asked the class to work in groups of three or four and brainstorm the possible benefits of the book and to select and write down the most important and interesting points from the notes and the list the group has made. The task then asked them to use the given ideas to help them write the back cover blurb up to 150 words and asked them to make it as persuasive as they could.

The task gave the title of the guide book, which was called 'The Blue Guide to Britain'. It also gave details about maps, attractions, general information and other useful information.

| Blue Guide To Britain: Easy to use format; includes following details: | • Cities, Cinemas, theatres, museums, leisure centres, restaurants |
| Maps | General information |
| • Regional routes -motorways and minor roads | • Food, history, traditions, industry, national holidays. |
| • Street plans of Manchester, Leeds, London, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Cardiff, Belfast, Bristol, Cambridge, Oxford | • Art Galleries, Concert halls, hotels, campsites, accommodation, leisure parks |
| Attractions | Useful information. |
| • Regional parks, historic sites (Castles, Cathedrals, great houses) | • Addresses and telephone numbers. |
| | • National and international transport facilities |
| | • Money |

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 67)

It is clear that the reason of writing is to make the blurb as persuasive as possible for the tourists (i.e. readers) to buy it. This context may help them write effectively. However, no one can guarantee the students' familiarity with such given
ideas or their willing to use ideas relevant to different culture from theirs will help them write effectively.

So it is the teacher's task or coursebook writers to create contexts and provide audiences for writing relevant to the students' socio-culture setting. This is because the students would be familiar with the ideas given and would understand the context of writing. Therefore, they would be much more likely willing to write since they understand such context.

**Experience 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>12:00 – 2.00 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>2nd year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>23rd of December 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the teacher and I entered the class, no one of the students was there and it was then 12:25 p.m. We waited for the students to come. They started after then to come in groups. The teacher wrote the title of the unit on the white board while the students were still coming into the class. Twenty three students attended the class. This unit was entitled, 'Writing a Composition: Saying What You Think' (Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 68).

The teacher started the class by writing the five sections on board which organise a piece of writing when an opinion is to be given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Comment</td>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He explained to the students that when they wanted to write, they should write a number of ideas not organised. He clarified that they should think first and write a number of ideas which were to be considered as brainstorming. Therefore, the teacher
defined brainstorming as these ideas they wrote. He tried to make it clear for the students when he said that if they wrote about a topic on TV and its advantages they should think first about that topic and write these ideas which were not organised and that was brainstorming. The teacher defined brainstorming again as thinking about the topic and writing ideas not organised and that these ideas would help them write about T.V. He explained that they should separate and organise these points into those which showed good influence on children and those which had bad influence.

The teacher said that they were going to write about opinions. He talked about mercy killing. He clarified that if someone who was in hospital for two years and lived depending on oxygen and there was no hope of curing, permission might be taken from his family to be killed. The teacher explained that when they expressed their opinion they should provide evidence to... The teacher used Arabic word 'Latiq'na'ahum'. And then he said it in English 'to convince them'. These words were the equivalent of this Arabic Word.

The teacher indicated that he was going to teach them the rules of writing paragraphs, what should be included in these paragraphs and how ideas were connected using language. He said that there was logic. He contended that if they followed the structures of writing an essay, they would be safe when writing. He said that he would get them a handout for writing an essay. He also contended that that handout was very important and that that book did not teach good writing.

The teacher next turned to task one which was under the subheading 'Discussion'. Task 1 indicated that in examinations and many other settings the students were often asked to give their opinion in writing and that that unit would teach them how to write a short composition expressing opinion about a particular topic. The task then asked the students to work in group to find out other people's
ideas about this question: ‘Meat eating is as bad for you as it is for animals’. What is your opinion?’

However, the teacher did not ask the class to work in groups. He did not also give a chance or enough time for discussion. Instead, he just read this task loudly and explained what he had read. Then he asked the class to think and to write reasons and then moved to task 2 leaving out task 1.1 and 1.2 which were related to task 1 without giving some detailed discussion.

Task 1.1, which was under the subheading ‘Brainstorming’ asked the students to work in group of three or four to make a list of all the ideas they had about meat eating. It asked them to write a list of reasons why they thought it could be good to eat meat and list of reasons why they thought it be bad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS FOR</th>
<th>REASONS AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protein, balanced diet,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel, Wasteful of land,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 68)

Whereas task 1.2 raised a question, ‘Does your list contain more good things than bad things?’ It asked the groups to make a total for each of these and compare their ideas. It finally asked: ‘Do people in your class think that meat eating is good or bad for example?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>BAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 68)
The teacher then returned to task 2 and explained it. It was under subheading, ‘Model text’. In task 2, a short composition was given as an example of the common way of organising a piece of writing when giving opinion. It asked the class to read the essay carefully and then work with a partner to use the section labels in the box and name the different parts of the composition. Nevertheless, the teacher did not ask the class to work in pairs. Instead, he read the model text naming or labeling its sections, whereas the students were passive and were not giving a chance to think and answer the task.

The teacher next advised the class that they should give reasons to support their opinion and they should then give justification for their opinion. He said that that was the way they should give their opinion. After this, the teacher moved to task 3, which was under the subheading ‘Preparing for Writing’, and read it. But not all the students were paying attention to the teacher’s reading. For example, there were two female students at the corner of the class talking to each other and the teacher did not know that they were talking from under their veil. Nonetheless, task 3 clarified that when writing an opinion, the same organisation of the model text should be followed. It also clarified that those sections were not always in separate sections but they were usually in the same order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Background Information</th>
<th>2. Problem</th>
<th>3. Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Justification</td>
<td>5. Final Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 69)

The teacher next moved to task 3.1 which was about the Background Information Section. This task asked the class to reread this section of the model text and copy the grammatical subject of each sentence into the given box. The teacher
read the task and asked the class to answer. A female student responded to that task correctly.

Human beings have eaten meat for many thousands of years. We have teeth that can cut and chew meat and stomachs that can digest meat. In many parts of the world it is the main food of most people and perhaps it always will be.

a) b) c)

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 69)

The teacher after this instructed the class to turn to task 3.2.a. This task was about the Problem Section of a composition with a contrast marker. It asked the students to read the next section of the model text and write the word or words that showed contrast between the ideas of the Background Information and the ideas of the Problem, whereas task 3.2.b asked the students to use those contrast markers to connect the given sentences.

b) Use these contrast markers to connect the sentences given below.
   1. When the motor car was invented everyone thought it would give easy, cheap transport to the people of the world.
   2. The car has created problems as well as making life easy for many people.
   3. Life is more difficult in many cities because of this helpful invention.

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 70)

The teacher read what was written about contrast marker. He reminded the students with discourse markers discussed previously. He gave the words 'however' and 'now' as examples and said that they were used to show contrast of ideas. The teacher read that part of the model text which showed contrast and said again that 'However' and 'Now' showed contrast of ideas.
The teacher then moved to task 3.2.b regarding the use of contrast markers. It required the class to connect the given sentences. The teacher as usual, read the sentences and asked the class who responded individually. He gave the answer where the class could not respond correctly.

The teacher then moved to task 3.3 which was about the Opinion Section. This task asked the class to rewrite the Opinion Section of the model text but to say that eating meat was a good thing and that they wanted to go on eating meat.

The teacher made it clearer by saying that that task would teach them how they say their opinion. He asked the class to write their opinion of meat eating but as good not as bad thing. He stopped at that task and said that he would not discuss the remaining tasks. He finally said that he would get another different handout for teaching writing. He ended the class at 1:40 p.m.

Ending this unit, the teacher left out several many tasks which were important to writing an essay. He left out task 3.4 which was about the Justification Section in which they should give reasons that support opinion. This task asked the students to work in pairs and to use the given notes to complete a Justification Section for the composition about meat in which the writer thought that meat was good for them.

The teacher also left out task 3.5 which was related to the Final Comment Section. This task asked the students to use the model text as a guide and write a Final Comment Section for the topic ‘meat eating’ from the point of view of someone who thought it was good to eat meat. It asked the class to start with:

The statement ‘Meat eating is as bad for you as it is for animals’ is too extreme and untrue...

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 71)
There were other tasks the teacher left out such as tasks 4 and 5. Task 4 asked the students to use the title:

"Television has always had a bad influence on society."

What is your opinion?

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 71)

It asked the students to start writing by thinking of answers to the given questions:

- When was television invented?
- What percentage of countries in the world have television systems?
- What proportion of families that you know do not have televisions?

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 71)

The task then asked the students to make a list of all the ideas about the effect of TV on modern society. It asked the students to write down good things and bad things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD THINGS?</th>
<th>BAD THINGS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, entertainment</td>
<td>Violence, political control,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 71)

It asked the students to look back at the model text, using the same sections to write a composition of around 300 words. It finally asked the students to make sure that they had organised it appropriately and to ask a partner to check it through for grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors and then check it with the Key text on page 80, whereas task 5, which was an extension activity, asked the students to write a second composition that uses the same type of planning on:
'Men always make better managers than women'. What is your opinion?

**The Analysis of Experience (4)**

**Collaborative Learning** In experience (4) the teacher started with a new unit, ‘Writing a Composition Saying What You Think’ (Hopkins and Tribble, 1989: 68) that started with tasks, which were actually representing a certain sort of collaborative learning. Task 1, which was under the subheading, ‘Discussion’ asked the students to work in group to find out other people’s ideas about this question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Meat eating is as bad for you as it is for animals.'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what is your opinion?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 68)

But the teacher, who should be responsible for the initiation of the writing process, did not ask the class to work in group and did not give time for the discussion to take place. Instead, he left out task 1 and the other two tasks related to it, 1.1 and 1.2, which were under the subheading, ‘Brainstorming’ moving to task 2, which was under the subheading, ‘Model text’. The task asked the students to work in pairs. The teacher just explained such tasks and made more clarification and then moved to task 3. Again, the observational data indicated that the teacher did not believe in writing as a process in which students should work together on writing. Teachers should contribute to the development of the writing activity through making the class as a writing workshop in which students work in groups on a writing task.

**The Objectives of Writing** The actual aim of this unit in experience (4) was to develop the students’ ability to write a composition expressing their opinions. However, the book tasks seemed to take other direction. Tasks, 1.1, 1.2, 2, 3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 did not take the students to such aim. All of them dealt with the rhetorical structure of a given short composition. They discussed the different sections
of this type of text—the way it can be organised. They presented an explanation of each section of this text type and applied it to the given model text. They also aimed at consolidating the learning of grammar, spelling and punctuation aspects such as task 3.1, which dealt with the grammatical subject of sentences and task 3.2, which dealt with contrast markers at the sentence level. Also task 4.5 in this unit asked the partners to check through for grammar, spelling and punctuation errors when they finished their composition.

Thus, the objectives of tasks did not match the actual intended, objective for which the unit was designed. Students should undergo a real process of writing to achieve the intended objective.

**Time for Writing** In this experience the teacher spent most of the time on reading and explaining the tasks but not in the actual act of writing. He read, explained, clarified the tasks and asked the students to respond orally and individually. He just made use of time in imparting some knowledge to the students and did not help them apply such knowledge in class.

In addition, some of the time went in vain without being used in writing. This is happened when the teacher came 30 minutes late. Time is precious but if it is used in writing.

**Composing** Again the process of writing did not take place in the writing class in this experience. This process should involve a number of stages such as planning, organising, composing, revising, and redrafting.

In this experience, the teacher left out tasks which represented some of the writing stages. Task 1, in this unit, which was under the subheading, ‘Discussion’ was left out. It asked the class to work in groups to find out other people’s ideas about this question: ‘Meat eating is as bad for you as it is for animals.’ What is your opinion?’
He also left out task 1.1, which was under the subheading 'Brainstorming'. This task asked the students to work in a group of three or four to make a list of all the ideas the students had about meat eating. It asked them to write a list of reasons about why they thought it could be good to eat meat and another list of reasons why they thought it might be bad.

Brainstorming is the activity which actually initiates discussion on a topic and generate ideas. It is one of the composing processes, which also called prewriting activity. But the teacher did not go through such an important stage of writing and therefore the negative effect on the students' ability to learn to write.

**Teacher's Feedback** This experience revealed the teacher's abandonment of the group or pair works in all the tasks given in the book. Therefore, the students suffered from the lack of comments which may yield in improving their ability to write. Since there was no such a collaborative work in this writing class, the students did not receive such an effective feedback either from the teacher or from other students.

**Context** In this new unit, the tasks, which underlies the process of composing through asking the students to write whole-text topics, lacked the motivating factors of writing. They lacked the context of writing.

Task 4, which was under the subheading, 'Writing Task' asked the students to write a composition. It asked them to use the title:

```
Television has always had a bad influence on society.
What is your opinion?
```

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 71)

The task tried to help the Students by asking them to start their writing by thinking of answers to the following questions:
• When was television invented?
• What percentage of countries in the world have television systems?
• What proportion of families that you know do not have televisions?

(Hopkins & Tribble, 1989, p. 71)

It asked them to write all ideas they had about the effect of TV on modern society—bad and good things. It finally asked the students to look back at the model text to use the same writing sections and write a text of around 300 words.

Logically, the above task was not clear since there was no context. The students did not know the person who will read the text, which in turn determines the kind of language to be used (formal or informal). Will they address their friends advising them to stop watching it or will they write it to take part in a competition, etc.? Teachers should in such situations create a context of writing to bring in the students’ desire to write.

In conclusion, the undergraduate college students at Aden University used a number of strategies while they were writing. But they were not conscious or aware of their use of these strategies since, as it is clear from the students’ questionnaire and interview, they were not taught or helped to practise them in class. Moreover, the students in class were not given a chance to do the act of writing and this was clearly understood from the classroom observation.

Therefore, the undergraduate college students at Aden University should be aware of the strategies they use and should also know when and how to use them. So, the writing skills of the undergraduate college students at Aden University should be improved by training and instruction. Such training and instruction in the use of strategies will improve the writing skills of these students especially in the field of second or foreign language and thereby help them reach an acceptable level of
communication competence in writing. However, a summary of the findings of classroom observation will be given below.

A Summary of the Findings of Classroom Observation

Following is a summary of the analysis of classroom observation:

- General classroom procedure in a writing class was reading the text loudly in the class by the teacher, explaining the text sometimes in Arabic.

- Classroom procedure was not useful for the students since the students did not receive a chance of experiential learning through classroom discussion, group activity. This, however, supports the researcher's suggestion to include the process approach in the writing syllabus of Aden University since it focuses on the thinking / cognitive processes which can be initiated through group activity.

- The teacher in the writing class played the major role, whereas the students were passive recipients.

- The teacher's aim in the writing classroom was to consolidate the learning of structures and vocabulary. This was supported by most of the tasks which dealt with grammatical items at the sentence level and vocabulary. But the writing tasks should help students write coherent texts for certain purposes.

- Three-hour lecture per week was a satisfactory amount of time for writing but the teacher did not make use of it in writing. Instead, it was used in oral work. Students need time in the classroom but for practising writing.

- Students did not get opportunities to develop their writing / composing skill. They were not given a chance in class to think, draft out sections of texts and to review, revise, and edit them since the process of composing did not take place in the writing class. This also supports the researcher's suggestion to include the process approach in the writing syllabus of Aden University.
• Students did not get an effective feedback which contributes to improving student’s writing ability since there was no process of composing which took place in the writing class. The process approaches require the teacher to intervene and give feedback in the process of writing and therefore the suggestion of including them in the syllabuses of Aden University.

• The teacher neither created adequate contexts nor provided audiences for the writing tasks. Teachers should try to create the context of writing that should be as relevant to the students’ socio-culture setting as possible as they could.

4.1 The Teachers’ Questionnaire

The Aim

A teachers’ questionnaire is designed to find out about:

(a) How well-informed the lecturers were about the new trends in teaching composition?

(b) What were some of the practices they were following in the teaching of writing?

(c) Are they satisfied with the teaching materials and the way writing was being taught in their colleges?

(d) What kind of changes, if any, they might like to bring about, so as to improve their teaching performance and the students’ performance in writing?

The Design

This questionnaire is designed (see Appendix 2) to get information about:

Personal Details

This section is prepared with the aim of getting information about the teachers’ names, address, phone number and e-mail.
Academic Qualifications

This section is organised to obtain background knowledge about the teachers' education, qualifications, degree, university, subjects and the year of obtaining the degree.

Work Experience

This section is designed to get information about the teaching experience of the teachers and the work load at Aden University.

Attitude towards English

This section comprises the questions, which investigate the teachers' views towards English. Question (1) is focused on identifying the main reasons of choosing the profession of teaching. Question (2) investigates the teachers' views about the importance of English. Question (3) tries to elicit information about the medium of instruction they recommend at the school and college levels.

Methodology that you Support

This section asks a question, which is specifically designed to elicit information about the methodology teachers support and the reasons behind this choice. Different methodologies are given in this section for choice along with a space for any other methodology they support.

The Skills that can be Developed in the Classroom

This section asks a question that investigates the receptive and productive skills that can be developed in class but from the teacher's perspective.

Teachers' Views Regarding the Components of Writing Skill

This section is intended for collecting information about the components of the writing skill from the teacher's perspective. Two questions (1-2) are directed to this purpose. Question (1) tries to elicit information about the most important
elements to be taken into account while writing a text. Question (2) is designed to elicit information about the use of model texts and the different classroom activities used in class.

**Attitude towards Students**

This section consisted of five questions (1-5). These questions are designed with the aim of retrieving information from the teachers regarding their views on the main following points:

- the standards of their students in English.
- the reasons behind such standards.
- the main reason of depending the students completely on their writing course book to pass exams.
- The way teachers could help their students become independent writers.
- The needs of the students in English from teacher’s perspective.

**Attitude towards the Writing Syllabus**

This section consisted of four questions (1-4), which aim at retrieving information about teachers’ views towards the writing syllabus. Question (1) is planned for eliciting the teachers’ opinions on whether the present writing syllabus is catering to the needs of the students. Question (2) asks about the changes speculated by teachers in the syllabus. Question (3) is put for eliciting information about the ways through which the prevailing English language teaching situations can be improved. Question (4) aims at finding out about the type of relationship those teachers may have with their students.

**Attitude towards Writing in English**

This section comprises eight questions (1-8), which are related to writing in English. Question (1) examines the teachers’ opinions on what should be included in
the writing course. Question (2) is intended for getting information about the procedures teachers follow when doing a writing task. Question (3) elicits information about the teachers' views regarding text topics that should be dealt with in a writing course.

Question (4) is made to know about the teachers' attitude towards the students' errors. Question (5) is formed to collect data about the abilities the teachers should develop in their students. The teachers' views about the use of the teacher's guide book are elicited by question (6). Question (7) aims at retrieving information about teachers' views towards the model texts on every topic that should be given to the students. The last question (8) is used to know about the teachers' steps that they follow in class regarding the task they used to do.

The Administration

The questionnaire was administered to fifty teachers in the colleges of Aden, Saber, Zingbar, Lowder, and Dhala. Eighteen, eight, and six copies were administered personally to the teachers in the colleges of Aden, Saber and Zingbar respectively. An equal number (9) of questionnaire was sent to the college of Dhala and Lowder because of the far location of these colleges.

Thirty questionnaires were considered for analysis from all colleges of education mentioned above. Fourteen copies of the questionnaire have not received from the colleges of Aden (1), Saber (2), Lowder (5), and Dhala (6). Four forms of the questionnaire have been excluded from the colleges of Aden (3) and Saber (1) as the teachers who filled them claimed that they did not teach writing. In addition, one teacher who did teach writing in Aden College did not complete her questionnaire since she claimed that she was busy with a lot of work. Accordingly, her questionnaire has also been excluded from analysis.
The Analysis of Teachers' Questionnaire

Academic Qualifications

The teachers who participated in filling up the questionnaires had a university degree as shown in table (1) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualifications</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1, A: Teachers' Academic Qualifications: University degree holders

It is obvious from table (1) above that the number of the teachers who had a B.Ed. degree was high. They constituted (50%) of the participants. This indicates that the responsibility of teaching the writing skill is attributed to unqualified teachers, who have little theoretical background in writing. Therefore, they are lacking an awareness of the new ways of teaching writing.

It is worth noting that the B.Ed. holders have studied English as a school subject in the basic (at age of 13) and Secondary schools for an equal number of years (3). They then studied English but as a general specialism in a college for four years.
The second degree of the university is the M.A. The M.A. programme at Aden University is for those who completed the B.Ed. Successfully and it lasts three years. And as it is clear from table (1) above, the M.A. participants are low in number (10). They constitute (33%) of the population.

By comparison, the Ph.D. holders, as shown in the table above, are few (5). They make up the minority (17%) of the population. This indicates that the University lacks sufficient expertise that may help students in getting themselves by or in dealing with the writing skill in particular and English language in general. Therefore, the students in the B.Ed. lack adequate expert knowledge in particular subjects of the target language.

Also all the B.Ed. and M.A. holders who graduated from Aden University are not specialised in the writing skill. As can be seen in table (2, B) below, the B.Ed. holders’ subject is General English whereas the M.A. holders’ subject is applied linguistics. Besides, even the Ph.D. holders who graduated from abroad are not specialised in the writing skill as well. This is illustrated in the following table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. 15</td>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>General English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. 10</td>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. 5</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedrich Shiller</td>
<td>ELT materials for Yemeni School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>ELT materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2, B: Teachers’ academic qualifications: University and Subject

Moreover, a look at table (3) below indicates that the majority of the teachers (90%) had not undergone any special training or course in the English language Teaching. Only (10%) of them had experienced a special training in English Language Teaching.
One teacher had attended a course of one month duration in ELT at Thomas Valley University, Ealing, England, which focused on study skills. The second one had also attended a course of one month duration ran by the British Council. The last teacher said that all her training had been in ELT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training in ELT</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Teachers' special training in ELT

However, any writing course, which is based on communicative use of language and focuses on the functional aspects of English language, requires trained teachers to organise classroom activities focusing more on the use of language than the usage.

Aden University is completely lacking in a continuing in-service teacher training programme. Such programme generally deals with basic teaching skills and techniques for teachers as preparing lesson plans, classroom management, teaching the four skills (i.e. reading, writing, listening, speaking), and techniques for presenting and practising new teaching items, correcting errors etc.

**Work Experience**

This section exemplifies the work experience of the teachers in the unity, secondary and college levels and the load carried out in each level. Table (4, A and B) below illustrates the two points mentioned above:
What is clear from the teachers’ responses in table (4, A) above is that the teaching experience at the unity level is between 1 to 10 years. Whereas the teaching experience at the secondary and college levels varies between 1 and more than 20 years. The teachers who taught in the unity or secondary school and college may be described as experienced teachers and may benefit their students.

But it can be noticed that the teachers’ number at the three levels decreases as the number of the years of teaching experience increases. This indicates that the university lacks adequate experienced staff in teaching. This may undermine the students’ ability to acquire the basic skills, especially writing.

The teachers also vary considerably in the hours they work in the three levels. The work load varies between 1 to 18 hours per week.

As introduced in table (4, B), few hours per week are allotted to all teachers in the unity and the secondary schools for teaching English (1-6 hrs). In the college level, the work load varies between 1 to 18 hours per week. This shows that the teachers in the university may gain teaching experience as their work load is higher in
hours. In addition, those teachers who had the opportunity to teach in the unity, secondary and university levels may have more experience and can benefit their students. But such experience should be allied with special education and training in writing as a subject. More specifically, to become an effective writing skills teacher, the teacher himself needs to do some research and to write.

**Attitude towards English**

This section sheds light on teachers' views on English language. It includes three questions (1-3), which seek the reasons of choosing the profession of teaching English and the importance of learning English. It also seeks the teachers' views on the medium of instruction they recommend at the school and college level.

In response to question (1): **why did you choose the profession of teaching?**

The following table shows the result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I like it</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Source of knowledge for all students and I love it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A good chance of getting a job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Reasons of choosing teaching as a profession

Considering table (5) above, the majority of the teachers (80%) joined the profession of teaching because they liked it. This high percentage gives those teachers an advantage over the other teachers in benefiting the students. This is because they are perfectly willing to do such profession. But this type of job needs special training or skill and a high level of education which are absent in the majority of teachers (B.Ed. holders).

The other two percentages (17%) and (3%) were given to 'A good chance of getting a job' and 'A source of knowledge for all students and I love it' respectively.
The importance of learning English was investigated by question (2): **Why do you think learning of English is important?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) A world language</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A world language and the language of technology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For cultural purposes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Reasons of learning English

It is clear from the table (6) above that (50%) of the respondents attached the importance of learning English to its being a world language and the language of technology. (43%) of the teachers stated that it was important to learn English since it is a world language, whereas the lowest percentage (7%) was given for the reason of cultural purposes.

To ask about the medium of instruction that teachers recommend at the school and college levels, the last question (3): **What is the medium of instruction do you recommend at school and college levels? Please give reasons,** was set out. The results that have been obtained are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium of instruction</th>
<th>At school</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic and English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The medium of instruction that teachers recommend at school and college levels

Table (7) above clarifies, that (43%) of the teachers recommended 'English' to be used at school level. (37%) of them recommended ‘Arabic and English’ to be the medium of instruction in that level. Only (20%) of them recommended ‘Arabic’ to be used as a medium of instruction at the school level.
Those (43%) who recommended 'English' as a medium of instruction at the school level gave some reasons to support their attitudes. They said that such medium of instruction would develop the students' competence and practice and familiarise them with the foreign language as they were not specialising in English.

On the other hand, the other teachers who recommended 'Arabic and English' to the student at the school level said that the use of Arabic and English together as a medium of instruction was due to the low level of the pupils who were lacking the background knowledge of the foreign language. They clarified that the use of Arabic along with English might help the students to understand English instructions and motivate them to use the foreign language.

The lowest percentage (20%) was given to 'Arabic' to be used as a medium of instruction at the school level. Those teachers argued for Arabic to be used at the school level as it is the mother tongue, which would help the students understand and think about the foreign language. They also argued that it was one of the international languages that could do the same job as English.

However, it was strongly recommended by the teachers (87%), as can be seen in the table above, that English should be used as a medium of instruction at the college level. They argued for English to be used at the college level since, they said, the students were mature and responsible and had enough knowledge about the foreign language. They recommended its use at the college level to expose the students to as much practice of the foreign language as possible and make them familiar with such language.

The lowest percentages (1%) and (3) were given to the use of 'Arabic' and 'Arabic and English' to be used at the college level respectively.
Those teachers who recommended 'Arabic' and those who recommended 'Arabic and English' at the college level gave the same reasons given to their use at the school level.

Although the teachers recommended strongly the use of English as a medium of instruction, they still use Arabic language along with English and this was clearly understood from the students' responses regarding the medium of instruction used in an English class in the students' questionnaire.

**Methodology that you Support**

This section asks the teachers to choose the methodology they support and they are also asked to mention the reasons behind their choice: Please tick the methodology you support and give reasons. It is worth mentioning here that quite a few questions in the teachers' questionnaire allow the respondents the possibility of choosing more than one option. They may also give an alternative which is not included in the given options. Therefore, the total percentage of the obtained percentages will exceed a hundred percent (100%). Nevertheless, the obtained percentage against each option represents its percentage out the total sample of population. Nonetheless, the results are shown in table (8) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The Methodology</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Audio – lingual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eclectic method</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Teachers' choice of the methodology they support
It can be seen from the results in table (8) above that an overwhelming majority of the teachers (80%) were in favour of the Communicative methodology.

Logically, the teachers were asked to give reasons for their support of the methodology they chose.

According to the teachers' responses the reason of supporting the Communicative method was due to the opportunity that it offered for practising the language. The teachers said that such method enabled the students to use the language in a communicative context and for certain communicative purposes. They also said that the Communicative method enhanced the role of language as a way of communication. Thus, all the teachers who supported this methodology agreed that it encouraged the use of language and helped in practising it.

(27%) of the teachers supported the methodology of Lecture as, they said, it gave the students a chance to discuss different topics and use the language as well as it provided them with information and knowledge. The same percentage (10%) was given to the Direct and Translation methodologies.

The Direct method was supported since, as the teachers clarified, it reinforced the role of the language as a way of communication and helped the students in using the language. It was also supported since it did not allow the use of the mother tongue, whereas the Translation method was supported because it helped the students to understand and participate. Some clarified that the students were poor in the foreign language and had not got knowledge of the meaning of words and therefore supporting its use in teaching.

The lowest percentage (7%) was given to the Audio-lingual method. The teachers' support of this method was due to its enhancement of the role of the
language as a way of communication and because listening for them was very important.

Furthermore, some of the teachers, as it is clear in table (8) above, who supported certain methods suggested the Eclectic method (17%) since it made, they said, the best use of the techniques from the different methods.

The responses of the teachers regarding the methods they supported and the reasons behind that support show the need for and the necessity of having a lot of practice in writing.

It can be predicted from the results that all teachers believed in sufficient practice in writing because writing as a skill must be practised and learned through experiencing it. But their belief contradicts what actually happens in the writing class since the students, as it is clearly understood from the data obtained from the students' interview and the classroom observation, were suffering from the lack of sufficient practice in class. However, the teachers may willing to adopt the communicative approach in the writing class but it may due to syllabus constraints they were forced to use certain method for particular topics.

**The Skills that can be Developed in the Classroom**

This section consists of only one question regarding the language skills: **Which skills can be developed in the classroom?** The teachers' responses to this question are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The language skills</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Understanding spoken English through listening</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The skills that can be developed in the classroom
A look at table (9) above shows that most of the teachers (93%) considered speaking, which is a productive skill, as the one which can mainly be developed in the classroom. This may be due to the very rare opportunity of having to speak outside the classroom since English is considered as a foreign language in the country and which is used within the classroom limits.

The teachers’ response, as clearly shown in the table above, to understanding spoken English through listening (87%) and Reading (83%) indicates their interest in the receptive skills since they considered them respectively to be developed more in the classroom rather than writing. Writing skill received less percentage (80%) in comparison to all, though it is a productive skill like speaking and useful in communication.

Teachers’ response regarding understanding spoken English through listening and Reading might be a reflection of classroom procedure where a teacher stresses more on reading and listening skills to occupy the students either to read the textbook or to listen to his lecture. This is because Reading and Listening demand less work on the part of the teacher as against writing, which requires a teacher to initiate discussion and thought, read and comment on the student’s written work.

**Teachers’ Views Regarding the Components of Writing**

This section comprises two questions (1-2). The first question aims at finding out about the teachers’ views on the most important components to bear in mind when writing. The second question is subdivided into ‘A’, ‘B’, and ‘C’. Question (2.A) enquires about the teachers’ opinions on asking students to imitate model texts. It gives the teachers alternatives to choose from.
Question (2.B) asks the teachers whether they follow such procedure in class. Question (2.C) investigates the classroom activities that are usually encouraged by teachers in class. It also gives alternatives to choose from.

The responses to question (1): **which of the following do you think are the most important to bear in mind while writing a text?** are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The Components of writing</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Grammar rules</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Different sentence structures</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Organization of Information</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Paragraph writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Using cohesive devices</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>The purpose of writing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Teachers' views on the most important aspects of writing

True to the traditional paradigm, and as can be noticed in table (10) above, the majority of teachers believed that organisation (83%), grammar rules (70%), vocabulary (70%), punctuation (67%), and spelling (57%) were the most important aspects to bear in mind when writing and therefore their primary importance in the teaching of writing.

Nevertheless, audience (33%), purpose (43%), different sentence structures (43%), paragraph writing (50%), and cohesive devices (53%) held only a secondary position. This indicates that teachers viewed the main objective of writing skill as to develop among the students the ability to write a grammatically correct and organised form of a written text.
Effective communication in writing demands fluency of language rather than accuracy. In other words, grammatical correctness is important but is not of primary importance. What is important, for example, when communicating in writing is the person or the institution, etc. that someone wishes to communicate with and the recognition of the social setting, the role-relationship with the reader and the type of language that will be used for a certain purpose.

Question (2.A): **What do you think of asking students to imitate model texts?** examined the teachers' views on the use of model texts in a writing class. Their views on such issue are illustrated in table (11):

| a) Essential | 10 | 33% |
| b) May be useful | 20 | 67% |
| c) Not useful at all | - | 0% |
| **Total** | **30** | **100%** |

Table 11: Teachers' views on imitating model texts

It is apparent from the table above that (67%) of the teachers felt safe in saying that it 'May be useful' asking students to imitate model texts. (33%) of them considered the practice 'Essential', whereas none of them (0%) declared it as 'Not useful at all'.

But when the teachers were asked (2.B): **Do you follow the above practice in your class?** (90%) of them replied that they did, whilst (10%) of them said that they did not. This result is shown as follows in table (12):

| Yes | 27 | 90% |
| No | 3 | 10% |

Table 12: Teachers' responses regarding their use of model texts in class
What especially caught attention was that three of the teachers (10%) who had strongly declared such a practice as 'essential' in (2.A) responded 'No' to (2.B). It is probably only a minor mistake made by a minority of the sample population, but it does give an idea of the confusion and contradictions which exist in the minds of writing teachers: nobody has clearly spelled out the aims and methods of writing teaching to them, so they have no principles to abide by.

Question (2.C) tried to elicit information about the type of activities that the teachers encourage their students to work through in class: **Through which classroom activities do you usually encourage your students to work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classroom activities</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Give problem-solving tasks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Give assignments to use grammar at the text-level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ask questions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Give written-assignments relevant to the socio-cultural situation.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Involve them in correcting written compositions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Encourage group discussions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Encourage appreciation and evaluation of English Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Activities encouraged by teachers in the classroom

It is noticed from the results in table (13) above that the majority of the teachers (70%) said that they usually encouraged their students to work through the activity of group discussion. It is actually effective in language teaching when encouraging the collaborative work. However, this teachers' response contradicts the students' response to the question regarding the way the writing task was performed in a writing class in the students' questionnaire.

This is because the majority of the students (98%) stated that the task in the writing class was organised individually very frequent. Moreover, some of the
teachers in the teachers' interview clarified the inability to divide the class into groups due to the large class size.

The second higher percentage above (67%), which was given to 'Ask questions' supports the result obtained from the students' questionnaire regarding the frequent use of individual work in performing the task in a writing class. The writing teacher, as has been observed in the classroom observation, asked the students questions to be responded individually or sometimes in chorus of two or three students randomly. The students, as observed, were not encouraged to ask questions. And this is the teaching procedure that is usually done by the majority of teachers, if not by all.

(63%) of the teachers, as can be seen in table (13) above, usually gave assignments to use grammar at the text level. This may be a convincing evidence of exposing students to practising writing at the discourse level at the college level. But the students are still suffering from inability to write coherent texts since, as it is clear from the data obtained from the students' questionnaire, what they needed to develop in their writing was the use of cohesive devices (81%).

In addition, the students, as stated in the students' interview by some students, suffered from the problem of using the cohesive devices as well as their unawareness of the other devices and their use because they were only exposed to certain devices.

So what are the reasons behind the students' suffering from writing at a higher level at the college level? This may be due to not having enough practice in writing, as stated in the students' interview, which therefore abstracted them from being aware of the complexity of writing at the discourse level. It may be also due to the teachers' way of teaching writing, as it was also mentioned in the data obtained by means of
interview. This may suggest that the teachers did not supply their students with the adequate strategies that may help them write effectively at the discourse level.

The cultural issue, as it is clear in the table above, was given some importance by the teachers in the colleges of Aden University. (47%) of the teachers usually gave written-assignments relevant to the socio-cultural situation. This is a key issue since writing does not only happen in the writers' minds but also on the social cultural context, which constitutes the written text.

It is worth mentioning that the writing syllabus was designed without taken into account the Yemeni students' and teachers' needs. Students' and teachers' unawareness regarding the syllabus they are learning / teaching is questionable.

Changes in the syllabus for the purpose of satisfying the communicative needs of the students should mainly be done. Such changes were suggested by some teachers in the teachers' interview and who had declared that they were not totally convinced with the writing syllabus.

One of the writing teacher (writing teacher four; WT4) in the teachers' interview said that she was not totally convinced with the syllabus since she believed that there were lots of culture-based texts involved which students did not understand. She then suggested an addition or a supplementation of students' culture-based texts for the syllabus to be beneficial.

Byram (2004) mentions that Huckin (1995 / 96) proves that cultural matters play a key role in one's knowledge and understanding of texts. Byram (2004) displays some of the characteristics, which differ from culture to culture:

- amount of personal information and degree of courtesy (request letter)
- level of formality (submission letters, academic essays)
- type of POLITENESS (apology letters, academic reports)
- point of view (academic essays)
degree of self-reference (job letters)
use of the meta-text (academic reports). (p. 676)

However, different, percentages were given to ‘Give problem-solving tasks’ (37%), ‘Involve them in correcting written compositions’ (23%), and ‘Encourage appreciation and evaluation of English Literature’ (10%).

The three lowest percentages mentioned above may indicate that the teachers may underestimate such activities which may have positive effect on students’ writing. Problem – solving activities, for example, may require from the students higher thinking to solve the problem and therefore require the teacher to intervene and offer feedback while the student is trying to solve the problem.

Feedback is very important in the process of writing as it leads to the students’ improvement in writing. It also helps the students in evaluating their progress in writing.

**Attitude towards Students**

This section aims at eliciting teachers’ views on students’ standards in English. Question (1): **What would you say about the standards of our students in English?** tries to find out the standards of the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards of Students</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Teachers’ views on the standards of students in English

It is observed from the result, as reflected in table (14) above, that the majority (90%) of the teachers said that the standards of the students in English were low, whereas (10%) of them said that their standards were good.
Surprisingly, the three teachers (10%), who said that the students' standard was good, responded to the second question that follows regarding the reasons of the low English language proficiency of the students. The first one said that the reason of the low level of proficiency was due to the lack of practice and using authentic materials. The second one said that it was the lack of care and attention that caused such low level of proficiency. The third one said that the absence of facilities and unqualified teachers was behind the low standards of our students.

The following question (2): What are the reasons for the low English language proficiency of our students? investigated the reasons of such low standards in English language proficiency according to the teachers' point of view.

Responses to this question show that the reasons of the students' low standards were attributed to a number of issues. All these different issues, which are based on teachers' views towards the students, can be subsumed under the following categories:

*Insufficient Exposure* (53%) of the teachers attributed the low level of English language proficiency to the lack of language practice inside and outside the classroom. They clarified that the reason behind such low level was due to speaking Arabic in class.

The teachers' response above supports the data obtained from the students' interview and classroom observation. In the students' interview, for instance, one of the students' problems they complained of was the lack of practice in class.

In the classroom observation, the students have been observed not to be given any opportunity to write any coherent text in class, but to be written at home and not to be checked later in class as well.
The teachers' response, however, indicates that the students are suffering from the lack of sufficient practice in language skills in general and in writing in particular.

The lack of sufficient practice definitely affects the quality of the students' written work. Thus, this indicates the students' urgent need of practice, which contributes to improving the writing ability.

**Lack of Motivation** (23%) of the teachers considered the lack of motivation as one of the reasons behind such low level of the students' language proficiency. Motivation is important in second and foreign language learning since it is the factor that may determine the student's desire to learn a language.

The students' lack of motivation may yield from not having self-confidence in their abilities. Therefore, the students should be encouraged to gain self-confidence. The self-confidence can be obtained through more practice of the language. Adequate practice and encouragement may motivate the students to work more efficiently.

**Large Classes** (13%) of the teachers believed that the large number of students in classes was also the cause of such low level. This may explain the absence of group work in class and this is another support for the absence of collaborative work in the classes.

The data obtained from the students' interview showed that the task in a writing class was organised individually very frequently. In addition, the classroom observation showed the complete absence of a pair/group activity. Thus, the type of class work may have a negative effect on students' level of language proficiency.

A pair/group work is one of the ways through which students' behaviour, movement, interaction during a class can be organised and controlled by the teacher. The result of such organisation and control will enable teaching to take place most effectively.
Lack of well-qualified Teachers The responses to question (2) above showed that (37%) of the teachers perceived that the reason of students’ low proficiency in language was the lack of well-qualified teachers. This result supports the responses obtained from the teachers’ questionnaire regarding the academic qualification and special training.

Most of the teachers at Aden University are B.Ed holders who are not actually well trained in teaching and the absence of well-qualified teachers was reflected in the students’ complaint in the students’ interview. Thus, the students’ low proficiency in language can be attributed to this reason since the unqualified teachers may not be able to handle the direction and management of students’ behaviour, activities and the use of equipment, aids etc. and therefore the negative effect on the students’ level of proficiency.

Old Ways of Teaching The highest percentage (73%) was given to the reason of using old ways of teaching language. The teachers in the colleges of Aden University have not come to know the new trends or views of teaching writing, which are also based on systematic principles and procedures.

The teachers mentioned different reasons of the low proficiency in English, which are related to schools and colleges. These reasons can be subsumed as follows:

- The ways of teaching in schools depended totally on checking students’ understanding of grammar, vocabulary etc. rather than using the language communicatively.
- The students’ weak background of language skills from schools.
- The teachers did not apply the new or latest methods in teaching.
- The teaching of a foreign language starts late in schools in the seventh (7th) class (i.e. at the age of 12).
• The students' dependency on cheating to pass the exams especially in schools.

• The missing of the required technologies in teaching.

• The lack of the necessary learning facilities like:
  
  − the use of audio – visual aids etc.
  
  − the use of authentic materials.
  
  − the references.
  
  − the use of suitable classes with adequate chairs and AC or Vent.
  
  − enough teaching materials and time especially in schools (the class duration is 40 min.).

*The Syllabus* (10%) of the teachers said that the reason of the low language proficiency was due to the unsuitability of the coursebooks. They said that syllabuses were not based on students' and teachers' needs.

The writing syllabus, for example, at Aden University was not based on needs assessment. No any kind of researches had been carried out to determine the needs for which the students need a language. That is, no research, which makes use of both subjective and objective information such as data obtained from questionnaire, tests, interviews, observation had been conducted for designing the syllabus.

Investigating the reason for depending students on their writing coursebook to pass their exams was done by question (3): *Students depend completely on their writing coursebook to pass their examinations. What do you think is the main reason of this problem?* The result is reflected on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Students have not been taught how to think and learn to write for themselves.</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students are not quite confident of their ability to write grammatically correct English</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Students’ main reason of depending on coursebook to pass Exam
Looking at table (15) above, (73%) of the teachers did believe that option (a) was where the fault lies, whereas (27%) was given to option (b). This result indicates the teachers’ awareness of the fact that grammar is not the most important factor in teaching writing or in writing coherent texts.

This awareness was reinforced by their responses to question (4): **How best do you think a writing teacher could help students become independent writers?**

(87%) of the respondents suggested that, as writing teachers, they could best help their students become independent writers by teaching them not only to apply the grammatical rules of a language in order to form correct sentences but also to get them know when, why, and how to write these correct, connected sentences and to whom.

(13%) of the teachers suggested the teaching of how to write grammatically correct sentences paying attention to vocabulary and cohesive devices. The responses to the question above are given in the table below:

| a. By teaching students how to write grammatically correct sentences paying attention to vocabulary and cohesive devices. | 13% |
| b. By teaching students not only to apply the grammatical rules of a language in order to form correct sentences but also to get them know when, why, and how to write these correct, connected sentences and to whom. | 87% |

**Table 16: Teachers’ ways of helping students become independent writers**

But the highest percentages that were given to option (a) for question (3) and option (b) for question (4) above indicate that the teachers are really in confusion about the aims of writing since they actually care more about teaching their students how to write with precision and correctness.

This was clearly understood through their response to question (1) in the section ‘Teachers’ views regarding the components of writing’. The highest
percentages, as it is clear in table (10), were given to organisation, vocabulary, grammar rules, and punctuation.

The last question (6): **What do you feel are the language needs of our students?** enquires the students' language needs according to the teachers' point of view. The teachers' responses can be summed up as follows:

- The authenticity of the materials relevant to their socio-cultural setting.
- Courses with useful and up to date information and knowledge along with adequate activities reinforcing the use of language communicatively.
- The learning of the language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking in conjunction with each other, like involving activities that relate listening and speaking to reading and writing.
- Knowledge of grammar rules and vocabulary (i.e. the linguistic knowledge) along with the communicative competence.
- A language for special purpose; a language for their occupational purpose, such as the language of computer.
- Language functions and language forms.

**Attitude towards a Writing Syllabus**

This section tries to collect information about the writing syllabus used in the colleges of Aden University. This information is based on the teachers' viewpoints. The section consists of four questions (1-4).

Question (1): **In what ways the present syllabus is not catering to (or providing) the needs of our students?** examines the ways through which the present syllabus does not fit the students' needs.
The responses to this question have some similarity with the responses to question (6) above. But there are some other different responses that are mentioned along.

The teachers' responses to question (1) are reflected on the following main points. They stated that:

- The writing syllabus did not include enough activities that encourage the students to use the language creatively.
- It did not integrate the four language skills with each other.
- It did not fulfill the Yemeni students' socio-cultural needs. Moreover, it does not consider the students' weakness areas. It was ready-made.
- It focused on acquiring the grammar and vocabulary knowledge.
- It lacked some of the technological and sociological topics.
- It did not contain up-to-date information. It was outdated.

However, only two of the teachers who saw the writing syllabus was good and suited the students' needs. The first one said that it provided the students with their needs but the second one contradicts herself when she said that it was catering for the students' needs.

This is because she said, in the teachers' interview, when she was asked whether she was totally convinced with such syllabus, that she was not totally convinced with it since she believed that it contained culture-based texts, which students did not understand. And she suggested a supplementation or an addition of relevant culture-based texts. This, therefore, indicates that some teachers still have conflicting inner ideas about writing.

To elicit the teachers' opinions about the changes in the syllabus, they were asked the following: Speculate some changes in the syllabus.
The respondents speculated the following:

- To be based on the students' needs and to use authentic materials and activities related to their culture.
- To offer more activities of free production for practice.
- To suit the students' abilities and understanding.
- To concentrate on other aspects along with grammar rules and vocabulary paying attention to cohesive devices and organisation (i.e. the rhetorical structure).
- To deal with topics from different fields (e.g. sociology).
- To keep in touch with the changes and development taking place in the world focusing on the students' interests.

Investigation of the ways through which the current English language teaching situation can be improved was carried out by question (3). How (or in what ways) can the prevailing English language teaching situation be improved?

The following ways have been suggested by the teachers to improve the prevailing English language teaching situation:

- Reducing the number of students in a class and offering facilities such good classrooms, chairs etc.
- Giving opportunities for qualifying teachers.
- Designing a continuous training programmes and workshops for the teachers.
- Using authentic materials and audio-visual aids.
- Designing new syllabuses or revising the present ones covering the students' socio-cultural needs.
- Offering more opportunities for the students to practise the language in class.
- Changing or modifying the teaching methods followed in teaching.
- Avoiding the use of Arabic.
• Giving the teacher the authority and chance to change.
• Giving the students some problems to solve.

The last question (4): what is your relationship with your students? In the section of ‘Attitude towards a Writing Syllabus’ highlights the role-relationship between the teacher and the students in the class – the kind of relationship they have to one another.

The teachers’ responses to question (4) above showed that all the teachers, except one, said that their relationship with the students was good based on respect between them; the teacher in higher role and the students in low role.

The teacher role, as it has been clearly observed in the classroom observation, was that of a transmitter or explainer of knowledge predetermined in advance; imparting and students acquiring knowledge about certain aspects of language. Only one teacher said that his role was that of a guide, and this may have a positive effect on students.

The role of teacher in the writing classroom in the colleges of Aden University as facilitator of learning or as negotiator of topic content and process is completely absent. This is because the teacher, as it has been observed in the classroom observation and as understood from the data obtained from the students’ and teachers’ interviews, did not provide the conditions in which writing is dealt with as a cognitive process (planning, drafting, revision, and redrafting). Such process can be activated through engaging students in a communicative activity.

Attitude towards Writing in English

The last section in the teachers’ questionnaire helps to focus attention on teachers’ views on writing skill in English. It is divided into eight (1-8) questions.
Question (1): *What do you think a writing course should contain?* was put to investigate the contents that a writing course should contain.

The trend in the responses to question one was more encouraging where (93%) of the teachers suggested option (c): 'a practice of the above option (a) + (b) as well as making every piece of writing fulfills some kind of communicative purpose.

Option (a): 'a practice of various forms (letters, essays, reports) and functions (narrative, description, comparison and contrast) of written texts and the skills involved in producing such texts was given (7%). None of the teachers (0%) chose option (b): "a practice of the processes of planning, organizing and revision.

The result is shown in table (17) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option (Description)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A practice of various forms (letters, essays, reports) and functions (narratives, description, comparison and contrast) of written texts and the skills involved in producing such texts.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A practice of the processes of planning, organizing, and revising.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A practice of the above options (a) + (b) as well as making every piece of writing fulfills some kind of communicative purpose.</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: The contents which should be included in a writing course according to Teachers' views.

It can be noticed from table (17) above that the majority of the teachers have just come to realise that writing does not only involve taking care of forms and functions but taking into account the context of writing along with the processes that take place in writer's mind when writing.

But this kind of realisation is not actually reflected in the writing classroom. The teachers still have a lack of knowledge, for example, about the processes of planning, organizing, composing, revising and redrafting.

The responses given by the teachers to question (2) that follows confirm such lack of knowledge. In addition, the observational data showed that the students did
not get any chance to practise any kind of the cognitive processes in class. Instead, most of the time was spent on reading and analysing the model texts rather than writing.

When the teachers were asked question (2): which of the following procedures do you follow when you do a writing task in class? (93%) of them, as noted in table (18) below, replied that they followed procedure (b), whilst (7%) followed procedure (a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pre-writing - writing - revision - rewriting</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Introducing a topic - writing following a certain model - correction.</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Procedures of teaching writing in a writing class

Once again, the responses were in favour of a linear approach to writing like the response to question (1) in the section of ‘Teachers’ views regarding the components of writing’.

The responses to question (2) above conform so much to the traditional view of teaching error-free writing in a composition course that it leaves no room for doubt that the college teachers are still in the dark about the changes in composition teaching that have spread in the last 20–25 years.

But the majority of the teachers responded positively to question (1) above and their choice of option (c) reflects their strong willing for a future change in the way writing is taught in their colleges. This indicates, however, their unawareness of the processes and therefore this may suggest their acceptance of and agreement on a new combined approach to writing teaching in their colleges.

Question (3): What do you think regarding text topics? asks the teachers about the text topics that the students will write about in class. The topics that may
improve the instruction of writing in their colleges. The responses are clear in table (18) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The syllabus should suggest the text topics so that there is a unity in the topics taught in different colleges.</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Leave the topics to the teachers’ choice</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Choosing topics, which are needed in the students’ setting</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Teachers’ views on text topics

A looking at table (19) above shows that (33%) of the teachers thought it would be a good idea if a syllabus lists out the topics for text-writing so that a certain degree of uniformity is brought about in the teaching of composition in different colleges.

(17%) of them, as obvious in the table above, liked no much imposition and the choice of the topics should be left to individual teachers.

The higher number of teachers (50%) suggested topics that are needed in the students’ social setting. The highest percentage given to such option may be due to the syllabuses imposing different culture–based texts on teachers and their students. This is because the syllabuses were not based on or discussed according to the students’ needs.

Topics chosen for a writing course are very important and should be based on the students’ socio-cultural aspects of a particular community. Topics play an important role in writing since there are different rules which govern different communities about what topics may or may not be discussed and written.

The fourth question: (4) **How do you think a writing teacher should deal with students’ errors?** dealt with views on errors. Following are the trends in the responses:
It is clear from table (20) above that (7%) of the teachers believed that the teacher should correct all the errors in a student's composition paper. (20%) of them said that a writing teacher's job was to look at the ideas conveyed by students in their compositions rather than commenting on the language errors.

The majority of the teachers (73%) positively gave a response, which really needed to be reflected on a student's composition paper. They should take such an option (i.e. 'C') into their account and should become part of the writing process and source of learning for their students.

But this practice does not actually happen in the students' composition paper. The responses to question (3) in the section of, 'assessment' in the students' questionnaire revealed that the teachers responded only to the students' errors in writing but not to the strengths.

Question (5) required the teachers to put a tick against the abilities (five were mentioned in a given list) which they thought be developed amongst students in the writing classes. The question is: Thus, it seems that a composition teacher faces different types of errors. Which abilities do you think a teacher should develop in his / her students?

The results are shown in table (20) below:
As it is noticeable in table (21) above, (60%) of the teachers selected the ability to organise ideas, (40%) of them selected the ability to write with accuracy (correct grammar and vocabulary), (33%) of them selected the ability to write correct English performing a certain purpose, whereas (30%) and (23%) of the teachers selected 'the ability to imitate a model text' and 'all the above options' respectively.

It is clear from the table above that almost the majority of the respondents believed that organisation of ideas and accuracy of language should be developed in the students to help them overcome their weakness in writing.

To investigate the use of teacher's guide book, question (6): What do you think of the teacher's guide book? was asked.

As can be seen from table (22) above that the majority of teachers (73%) was skeptical about it and would not follow it blindly but as a probe of ideas.
(17%) of them welcomed the idea and said that it was more useful since it explained in detail the procedures that a teacher must go through at every stage of a lesson.

(10%) of the teachers objected to the teacher's guide book as it would kill the teacher's ability to be more creative.

The choice of option (C) in the table above by the majority of teachers indicates their strong willing to express their individuality. They may consider the teacher's guide book as a blow to their individuality because every classroom may come alive only by what teachers finally do with their students.

Therefore, the teachers may believe that they should have the right to make their own decisions about the way they teach rather than be controlled by teacher's guide book. However, the teachers do not mind using it but as a probe of ideas to initiate their own ways of instruction.

But what about the model texts that are given in the writing coursebooks. Do they also constitute any kind of encroachment upon the teacher's individuality? Question (7): Do you think the teacher should write a text himself / herself on every topic that he / she assigns to his / her students? investigates the teachers' views on the act of writing a text on every topic to be taught.

The result of such enquiry is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The teacher should not do so because he may not have plenty of time.</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It's a good idea since it will help him / her understand the process of writing and therefore become a better writing teacher.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The teacher has the choice of writing a text as a model or to find one which suffices / suits the purpose.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Teachers' views on a text for every topic
Table (23) above shows that (70%) of the teachers suggested that the teacher had the choice of writing a text as a model or to find one which suffices or suits the purpose.

(17%) of them positively declared that the teacher should not write a text for every topic because he might not have plenty of time.

(13%) of them accepted such act as a good idea since it would help the teacher to understand the process of writing and therefore become a better writing teacher.

Contemporary researchers, however, have made it clear that only those teachers who write themselves can really understand what writing entails which further helps them in their handling of writing classes.

The last question (8): Give an example of a task that you used to teach writing. Explain the steps that you follow in class (e.g. do you organise a discussion before writing), required a little more patience and concentration in answering it. Perhaps that explains why there was such a poor response to it since seven teachers skipped answering it, whereas one teacher apologised for not answering it. This is because she said that she had not time as she had a lot of work to do.

However, the responses that were given by the other teachers (i.e. twenty two teachers) showed that the majority of the teachers believed in some kind of a discussion before asking students to write a text.

Eight of the teachers followed the procedure of conducting a discussion on the topic. Then, they discussed the organisation (i.e. layout) of a model text and the explanation of its grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation. They, next, asked the students to write following the model texts. For example, one of them, when explaining the steps of writing a letter said that he, first, discussed the kinds of letters
and discussed the organisation or the layout of the model text. Next, he said that he discussed examples of letters which contained vocabulary, spelling, layout, punctuation and grammar errors. Finally, he said that he asked his students to write their own letters.

Five of the teachers preferred the procedure of reading out the model text, explaining it and making a discussion on the grammatical rules, vocabulary, organisation of a text and making their students write following the model text. One of them, for instance, when he explained the steps that he used to follow when teaching writing, said that he read out the given model text, discussed it and explained its grammatical and writing rules. Then, he said that he practised the grammatical rules on sentence and paragraph levels along with the vocabulary practice.

Four of the teachers used to make a discussion on the topic. They, then, gave prewriting activities and deal with the rhetorical structure (i.e. organisation) of a text. For example, one of them said that, in the topic 'writing a description', he asked his students to imagine a situation and discussed it with them. Then, he gave them prewriting activity. Next, he dealt with the organisation of ideas and events (places of description). Then, he said that he asked his students to write a description following the given model text. Finally, he said that he corrected their descriptions.

Three of the teachers used to give or write for their students points or linguistic items such as words, questions words or ideas on the board and ask them to write a text with the help of these points. For example, one teacher said, in his explanation of the steps about the topic 'Grandmothers', that he wrote the question words 'what', 'when', 'where', 'how', and 'why' on the board. Then, he said that he asked his students to form questions about their grandmothers using the question words on the board.
Finally, he said that he asked them to answer these questions and put these answers together into a paragraph. The second teacher followed the same steps but with words written on the board and the third one did the same, as he said, but with ideas written on the board according to the priority of occurrence.

The other two teachers followed the steps of introducing the topic and explaining the way the model text was written. One of the teachers, for example, said that he gave a short introduction about the writing topic he used to teach. Then, he said that he gave instruction about how a text should be written. Next, he said that he divided the class into small groups to discuss the outlines, ideas. Finally, he said that he asked his students to write.

Thus, as can be understood from the responses above that the majority of the teachers made a discussion before they ask their students to write a text. But in practice there is "a rare teacher who can lead a discussion the way everybody wants a discussion to go". (Irmscher, 1979, p. 85).

This is mainly because teachers talk too much. This was clearly understood from the students' questionnaire data since the task in a writing class was performed individually very frequently. Moreover, the observational data was also a strong evidence of the frequent use of the individual work in a writing class.

Two other facts one can come up with from the teachers' responses. The first one is that teachers did not believe in asking for a rough draft in a writing class and therefore the absence of the cognitive/composing processes called for by the process approach. The second and final fact is that the responses reveal that the teachers still insist on using the model text discussing its grammar, vocabulary, organisation etc., leaving out the discussion of the exact or the intended message to be communicated.
In brief, most of the teachers in the colleges of Aden University were not aware of the new paradigms of teaching writing which is based on research work. The data of their questionnaire showed that none of them had any access to the changes in the field of writing, and are following the old methods of teaching writing that their predecessors did. They might have gained a few insights through years of teaching experience but otherwise, even at the theoretical level, their knowledge about modern aims, methods and materials for teaching writing is nil; nor do they know anything else about evaluation of student writing except that it should be error-free.

Therefore, the teachers at Aden University should undergo a reorientation programme in order to guide their students in more beneficial ways. Nevertheless, the following lines will reflect the summary of the findings of the teachers' questionnaire.

A Summary of the Findings of the Teachers' Questionnaire

Following is a summary of the findings of the teachers' questionnaire:

• The majority of the teachers were B.Ed. holders, whereas the Ph.D. holders were few. This indicated that the university lacked sufficient expertise that might help students become independent writers.

• Very few teachers received training in English language teaching.

• Some experienced teachers might fill in the gap of lack of training since they taught in the unity and secondary schools and the colleges. But the number of teachers at the three levels decreased as the number of the years of teaching experience increased and therefore the lack of experienced writing teachers.

• The hours per week were a satisfactory amount of time for writing skills mentioned by many teachers.
• The majority of the teachers joined the profession of teaching because they liked it. This would give those teachers an advantage over the others in benefiting their students since they were perfectly willing to do such profession.

• The majority of teachers stressed the importance of learning English since they said that it was a world language and the language of technology.

• English was strongly recommended by teachers to be used as a medium of instruction at the college level. Nevertheless, they used Arabic along with English as understood from students' questionnaire.

• Teachers were generally willing to adopt the communicative approach in the writing class but it may be due to syllabus constraints they were forced to use certain methods for particular topics.

• Most of the teachers considered speaking skill as the one which can mainly developed in the classroom. One possible reason is the very rare opportunity of having to speak outside the classroom. This is because English is considered as a foreign language in the country and which is used within the classroom limits.

• The teachers viewed the main objective of writing skill as to develop among the students the ability to write a grammatically correct and organised form of written text. Grammatical correctness is important but is not of primary importance. The syllabus should include different types of text forms and a scope for creative writing as well as less focus on the grammar topics. Therefore, the aim of a writing course should help students 'write to learn and learn to write' (Parker, 1984, pp. 693-703), to help the students become competent writers. The students should be taught writing as a process of discovery so that they can freed from 'rigid performance and unthinking reproduction' (Rivers, 1983, p. 69). This, however, supports the researcher's
suggestion to include the process and genre approaches in the writing curriculum of the Colleges of Aden University.

- The majority of teachers asked their students to imitate model texts that were in the prescribed syllabus in the writing class. However, the teachers in a writing class should use authentic materials along with the writing tasks that they select for their students. The tasks and the texts should be meaningful to the students. That is, the students should feel that they are writing for genuine purposes of discovery and communication and not because a grade is at stake. This, therefore, suggests the inclusion of the genre approach.

- The majority of teachers said that they usually encouraged their students to work through the activity of group discussion. But this activity did not actually happen in the class very frequently according to the data from the students’ questionnaire.

- According to the teachers’ views, the reasons of the students’ low level of proficiency were mainly insufficient language exposure, lack of motivation, large class size, lack of well qualified teachers, old ways of teaching and the unsuitability of coursebook, which was not based on the students’ needs.

- The students depended completely on their writing coursebook to pass their examination because they had not been taught how to think and learn to write for themselves.

- The majority of teachers suggested that writing teachers could best help their students become independent writers by teaching them not only to apply the grammatical rules of a language in order to form correct sentences but also to get them know when, why, how to write these correct, connected sentences and to whom.

- According to teachers’ views, the students’ language needs were mainly the authenticity of the materials relevant to their socio-cultural setting, up to date.
information and knowledge, communicative activities, learning of integrated skills, knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, a language for their occupational purpose and language functions and forms.

- The teachers acknowledged that the present writing syllabus did not contain enough communicative activities that involve integrated skills and up to date technological and sociological topics. They also acknowledged that it did not also fulfill the Yemeni students' socio-cultural needs nor considered their weakness areas. Instead, it focused more on acquiring the grammar rules and vocabulary. Therefore, this suggests some changes and additions in the present writing syllabus to cover the gaps mentioned by teachers.

- The teachers suggested reducing the class size, qualifying teachers, designing training programmes, using authentic materials, revising the present syllabus, more practice, changing or modifying the teaching methods, avoiding the use of Arabic, giving the teacher the authority to change and giving the students some problems to solve in order to improve the prevailing English language teaching situation.

- The absence of teacher role as facilitator of learning or as negotiator of topic content and process.

- The teachers lacked knowledge of the processes that take place in a writer's mind when writing. Teachers followed the procedure of introducing a topic – writing following a certain model – correction.

- The teachers responded only to the students' errors in writing but not to the strengths.

- The majority of the teachers believed that organisation of ideas and accuracy of language should be developed in the students to help them overcome their weaknesses in writing.
• The majority of the teachers preferred to use the guide book as a probe of ideas.

• The teachers did not write the topics that they assigned to their students. But teachers should work on every topic or assignment since such an act would lead to better instruction in the classroom and would make the teachers appear more human to their students not just someone standing above them in judgement.

4.2 The Students' Questionnaire

The Aim

The Students' questionnaire aims at getting better insights into the students' source of learning English and their activities in and outside the classroom as well as the errors they encounter when writing English, which might influence their learning of the writing skill. It also aims at investigating the needs for developing writing from the students' point of view.

The Design

The Students' questionnaire (see Appendix 3) has been classified into the following sections:

Personal Details

This section contained the students' name, class, address and phone number.

Medium of Instruction

This section is intended for eliciting information about the medium of instruction in an English class. The students here are required to state the medium of instruction in the basic, secondary schools and college, whether it is English, Arabic or Arabic and English.
Use of English in Non-academic Settings

This section investigates the use of English in non-academic settings. The students are asked to answer the questions, which elicit information about the students' background knowledge of English. These questions cover the following points:

- Reading English newspapers or magazines.
- Watching TV programmes like movies, TV serials, news in English language.
- Reading books, novels and stories at home.
- The people they talk to in English.
- The language they use when writing at home.
- The purpose for which they write in English and its frequency.
- The frequency of writing different types of written texts at home.
- How students rate themselves in writing English.

Attitudes towards the English Writing Course

This section tries to elicit the students' views on the English writing course used. It consists of three questions (1-3). Question (1) examines whether the course is useful. Question (2) is formed to get information about the students' views on the usefulness of the course in practical terms. The last question (3) is intended for eliciting information about the extent to which this course may achieve improvement in the students' writing after its completion but from the students' viewpoint.

Teaching Method

This section is made with the aim of finding out about the teaching procedures that take place in a writing class but from students' perspective. It includes two questions (1-2). Question (1) is subdivided into two questions (a and b). Question (1,
a), which is related to question (1, b), elicits information about whether any discussion or feedback takes place in a writing class.

Question (1, b) asks about the stage in the process of writing at which such discussion takes place. Question (2) is planned for knowing the way a writing task is performed in a class and its frequency.

**Writing Process**

This section aims at getting some insights about the students' process of writing in class. It comprises three questions (1-3). The way the students are following when doing a writing task is investigated by question (1). Question (2) aims at retrieving data about the students' views on the self-relevance of what they write as well as its frequency.

Question (3) is subdivided into (a) and (b). Question (3,a) is formed to obtain information about whether the students are aware of the person they write to and the reason of writing a text when doing a writing task in class. Question (3, b), which is related to question (3,a), tries to enquire about the frequency of giving the audience when writing a task in class.

**Performing Different Types of Tasks**

This section asks about the types of tasks given in a writing class. The question in this section elicits the teacher's frequency in introducing outside writing tasks.

**Assessment**

This section is intended to know the type of errors students make in writing and its frequency as well as the students' and teachers' response to such errors from the point of view of students. This section, however, comprises three questions (1-3).
Question (1) requires the students to indicate the type of errors they and their teachers find after reading the written text and its frequency.

Question (2) is designed to know the students' reaction towards the error contained in their finished product, whereas question (3) tries to investigate the teachers' response towards the error found in the students' written text but from students' perspective. Therefore, alternatives of different responses are given to the students so as to show the teachers' responses and frequency.

**Writing Skills**

The last section in the students' questionnaire is specifically designed for investigating both the students' needs for developing their writing and the students' opinions on the intensity of importance towards the different elements in writing perspectives. Two questions are set out for such purposes (1-2).

Question (1) tries to examine the needs that are really needed by students to develop their writing from their viewpoints. This question displays different needs for selection. Moreover, the students are given a space for any other needs they may think necessary for their development in writing. Question (2) asks the students to indicate the intensity of importance of the three elements in writing perspectives.

**The Administration**

The students' questionnaire was administered to two hundred and fifty 2nd year level students of the B.Ed. (departments of English) in the three colleges of Aden University: Aden, Saber and Zingbar. Before distributing the questionnaire to the students, the researcher informed them about its aim and gave them a clear idea about the questions and the way they would answer them. Moreover, the researcher has told the students about the importance of the study as well as its purpose.
The questionnaires were personally administered and collected at the same time in the classrooms. Sufficient time was given to the students so as to complete the questionnaire. Out of two hundred and fifty questionnaires, two hundred and ten were selected for analysis. Incomplete questionnaires were not considered for analysis. The following table shows the number of students' questionnaires administered and excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Administration</th>
<th>Administered</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Analysed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (Aden)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (Saber)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (Zingbar)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that the validity and reliability of the students' questionnaire have to be tried out on a small scale of students in order to see if it is successful enough to apply it to a large scale. That is, the try-out of the questionnaire before administration has to be done to determine its suitability or effectiveness in yielding the required data and to determine the reactions of students to the questionnaire regarding its difficulty so that it can be cleared up later.

Therefore, the questionnaire had been piloted and validated by distributing a small number of it to a small sample of students from those participating in the study. Nevertheless, the results of the questionnaire received were compared with the second one later and no difference was found.

The Analysis of Students' Questionnaire

Medium of instruction

All the students had studied in the basic and secondary schools where Arabic is the medium of instruction. It is only when they joined the colleges of education
departments of English, the medium of instruction changed into or is supposed to change into English. It is worth noting that English in Yemen is taught to the students as a subject from the seventh class of the basic level at the age of around 13 or 14 years.

Even though the medium of instruction at the basic and secondary levels was Arabic, all the students had received minimum six years of exposure of English since English is a compulsory subject at the basic and secondary levels.

Thus this section aims at finding out the medium of instruction in an English class in the three levels of instruction: basic, secondary, and college. Therefore a question was put so as to know the medium of instruction in an English class at the three levels of instruction: Basic, Secondary, and College. The question asks the students to tick mark in the medium of instruction in an English class whether it is English, Arabic or Arabic and English. The question is presented in the form of table for the three different levels of instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of instruction</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Arabic &amp; English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic School</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (24): Medium of instruction in an English class in the three levels of instruction

It is clear from the students' responses that the majority (65%) of the students said that Arabic was the medium of instruction in an English class at the basic school. (33%) said that Arabic and English were used as a medium of instruction in an English class. The lowest percentage (2%) was given to the use of English as a medium of instruction in an English class at the basic school.

The above percentages show that the students did not practise or were not exposed to English in class since Arabic was much used in class. This, however,
indicated that students were suffering from lack of sufficient practice in or exposure to English.

Nevertheless, the percentage of using Arabic as a medium of instruction had decreased (10%) in the secondary school and the majority of the students (85%) said that Arabic and English were used as a medium of instruction in an English class. But English still had the lowest percentage (5%) as a medium of instruction in an English class.

It is observed from the percentages above that the use of or exposures to English had increased but still with the use of the mother tongue (Arabic). And this was the case at the college level. The percentage of using Arabic and English as a medium of instruction still had the highest percentage (69%) but with noticeable increase in using English (31%) as a medium of instruction in class. None of the students (0%) said that Arabic was used as a medium of instruction at the college level.

What is clear from the above responses is that Arabic was used in an English class along with English. This may resulted in less exposure to English and in losing track of comprehension of English language since the students were paying attention to two languages. This may contributed to undermining the process of acquiring English as students attended to the language they understood (i.e. Arabic) to help them grasp the information imparted.

Smith (1978) says “For as long as we pay attention to what is in short-term memory, on the other hand, we cannot attend to anything else” (p. 38). Thus, paying attention to two languages will overload or overwhelm the students’ short-term memory and may affect students’ comprehension of the target language.


**Use of English in Non-academic Settings**

This section aims at eliciting information about the students' use of English in non-academic setting. Various questions were used for such purpose.

Trying to know the students' use of English in non-academic setting was investigated in the following question: a) **Do you read English newspapers or magazines?** The response showed that the majority of students (67%) did not read English newspapers or magazines. Only (33%) read English newspapers or magazines. This indicates that students did not read English and therefore the lack of sufficient knowledge about the different types of genres, which have particular and distinctive characteristics. This knowledge can develop the students' awareness of what constitutes good writing.

Nevertheless, the number of the students who used English in a non-academic setting had increased when they responded to the question: b) **Do you watch English programmes like movies, TV serials, and news in English?** The majority of the students (70%) said that they watched English programmes such as films and TV serials. The highest percentage indicated that the students were keen to listen to English, whereas the other percentage for those who did not watch was (30%).

But one key point should be mentioned here is that the English programmes such as films and TV serials that are displayed in the channels by the Arabic satellite are displayed along with Arabic written translation of the utterances. Therefore, such act may attract or tempt the students to pay their attention to this translation especially if the utterances are not understood and this, however, may give away the opportunity of exposure to the target language.

The students' use of English in non-academic setting was also investigated in this question: c) **With whom do you talk in English?** Like the teachers'
questionnaire, quite a few questions in the students' questionnaire allow the respondents the possibility of choosing more than one option. They may also give an alternative which is not included in the given options. So, the total percentage of the obtained percentages will not be a hundred percent (100%). Nevertheless, the obtained percentage against each option represents its percentage out of the total sample of population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i.</th>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (25): Students' responses of English use in non-academic setting

The responses in table (25) above reveal the fact that using English in non-academic setting by the students was very low. The majority of the students (56%) said that they 'never' spoke in English. It was only with teachers (26%) they spoke much more than with friends (16%), which therefore showed the less use of English in non-academic setting. The lowest percentages of English use were given to family members (9%) and others (4%).

The less frequent use of English in non-academic setting was clearly more shown in the response to the question: d) Which language do you use when writing at home? (67%) of the students wrote in Arabic at home. (31%) of them wrote in both Arabic and English, whereas (2%) of the students wrote in English. Thus, the majority of the students did not write in English at home but what are the reasons of or the purposes for writing in English at home for those who wrote in English at home and how frequent did they write?
There were, however, certain purposes for which those students wrote in English at home. The information in table (26) below shows the percentages and frequency of the purposes the students wrote for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>For pleasure</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>To express your feelings / emotions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>For correspondence</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>To take part in some competitions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>To organise your work.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Any other (please specify)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (26): Purpose and frequency of non-academic writing

In response to question (e) about the purpose of non-academic writing at home: Please indicate the purpose for which you write in English and how often you write in English by tick marking in an appropriate column. (25%) of the students, as it is clear in the table above, wrote in English frequently at home for the purpose of correspondence. (7%) of the students wrote in English frequently to organise their work. (5%) of the students wrote in English frequently for pleasure. (4%) of the students wrote in English frequently to express their feelings or emotions. However, none of the students (0%) wrote in English to take part in some competitions or for other purposes.

The students primarily wrote in English in non academic setting for the purpose of correspondence, to organise their work. Pleasure and expression of emotions, which mainly associated with creative writing, were found less frequently in the students' non academic writing. Thus, writing in English in non-academic setting served as transactional function.
To investigate the types of written texts that the students may perform in non-academic setting, the following question was given: **Given below is a list of different types of written texts. Indicate how often you write each type of text in English by tick marking in an appropriate column for each type.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of written texts</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Letter</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dialogue</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Essay</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Report</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Note making</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Recipe</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Short story</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Any other (specify)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (27): Types of written texts and their frequency in non-academic setting

As illustrated in table (27) above, all the students indicated that they wrote the different text types mentioned above but with different frequencies. Nevertheless, the majority of the students (51%) indicated that they wrote the text type, 'letter'. (44%) of them indicated that they wrote the text type, 'Dialogue'. The other percentages (36%), (35%), (12%), (10%) and (3%) were given to the text types of 'Short story', 'Note making', 'Essay', 'Report' and 'Recipe' respectively. Moreover, none of the students (0%) indicated that they wrote other types more than those mentioned in the table above. Nonetheless, most of these writing were done in the classroom for academic purpose since the syllabus focuses on such genres. This suggests that writing in English was done in academic settings and it was only the academic purpose, which provided this minimum opportunity for the students to write at home.
According to the students’ responses above, another question was put to know how the students rate their writing in English: **What do you think of your writing in English?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (28): Students' rating of their writing

It is clear from table (28) above that the majority of the students (56%) rated their writing as average, whereas (17%) of the students rated themselves as poor writers. (15%) of them rated their writing in English as above average. (1%) and (11%) of the students rated themselves ‘very good’ and ‘good’ writers respectively. So why didn’t the students rate themselves as good writers? What are the reasons of such rating? Answers to these questions may be found in the section that follows.

**Attitudes towards the English Writing Course**

The purpose of this section is to get the students’ views on the writing course used.

Therefore a question was put to investigate the students’ attitudes towards the English writing course: (1) **Do you think this course is useful?** The result is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Attitude</th>
<th>81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (29) Students’ attitudes towards the English writing course

The findings in table (29) above reveal that the majority of the students (81%) had a positive attitude towards the writing course. (19%) of them had negative attitude towards it. But how useful the course is in practical terms?
Question (2) regarding the attitudes towards the English writing course was given to know its usefulness in practical terms: (2) How useful in practical terms do you think the course is?

Here is the result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (30): Students' attitudes towards the course usefulness in practical terms

It is observed from the students' responses in table (30) that the majority of the students (79%) agreed about the usefulness of the English writing course in practical terms but to some extent not to a great extent (1%). (20%) of the students stated that the course was not useful at all in practical terms.

This may suggest that the students felt that the above course was lacking some elements which may make the course useful in practical terms to a great extent. This was clearly noticed in the low percentage (1%) given to its usefulness to a great extent.

Another question was set out to investigate the students' attitudes regarding the improvement in their writing this course may make after its completion. Question (3): How far do you think that after completion the course your writing will improve? The result is shown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (31): Students' attitudes towards their writing improvement after course completion

It can be seen from table (31) that the majority of the students (82%) mentioned that after the completion of that course their writing would improve to
some extent. Only (7%) of them said that their writing would improve to a great extent, whereas (11%) stated that their writing would not improve at all after the course completion. Thus, the above percentages support the results of question (2) regarding the attitudes towards the usefulness of the course in practical terms, which clarified the idea that the students viewed the usefulness of the course to some extent not to a great extent.

Therefore, the implied meaning of such responses is that their expectations regarding improving their writing skills are not fulfilled by this course.

Teaching Method

The reason of establishing this section is to seek information about the teaching method used in the writing class. It consists of two questions (1-2).

Question (1): a) Does any type of discussion take place in your writing class? b) If yes, at what stage in the process of writing? investigated the teaching method in the students' writing class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (32): The students' responses regarding the discussion in the writing class

A look at table (32) above indicates that a negative response received from (69%) of the students regarding the discussion in the writing class. (31%) of the students stated that discussion did take place in the writing class. Therefore, the students responded that the role of discussion in the writing class was comparatively less.

Nevertheless, among (31%) of the students, (23%) of them indicated that the discussion took place in the classroom prior to writing. (2%) of them stated that the discussion occurred in the classroom after writing the rough draft. (6%) of them
mentioned that it was after rewriting the text discussion took place. Thus, discussion appeared frequently at the prewriting stage and less frequently after writing the rough draft and after rewriting the text.

The table below summarises the responses explained above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in the process of writing</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Prior to writing</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. After writing the rough draft</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. After rewriting is complete</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (33): Stages of discussion in the process of writing in the classroom

Although discussion before the prewriting stage is extremely useful to prepare a well-organised plan and take decisions about the purpose of the text, target audience, discussion prior to or at the rewriting stage is also useful for a coherent and cohesive text. It is important since it may confirm the decisions regarding the purpose of the text, target audience, language used, given information etc.

Information about the way the writing task is performed in the class was elicited by question (2): **How is the writing task usually performed / worked out in the class?** The findings are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Instruction</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Individually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) In pairs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In groups</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (34): The mode of instruction in the writing class and its frequency

Table (34) above shows that the majority of the students (98%) stated that the task in the writing class was organised individually very frequently, but they differed in frequency. (48%) of the students said that it was ‘always’ performed individually, whereas (30%), (12%) and (8%) of them said that it was ‘often’, ‘usually’, ‘sometimes’ performed individually in the writing classroom respectively. Only (2%)
of the students said that the writing task in the classrooms was 'never' performed individually.

Regarding the pair work, (23%) of the students mentioned that the organisation of the task in the classroom was performed in pairs. (1%), (4%), (5%) and (13%) of the students said that the writing task in the classroom was 'always', 'often', 'usually', 'sometimes' worked out in pairs respectively. But the majority of the students (77%) said that the writing task was 'never' performed in the classroom in pairs.

However it is apparent from table (34) that the group work had a higher percentage (26%) than the pair work. But it was comparatively less 'often' (3%), 'usually' (4%) performed than the pair work. It was only 'sometimes' (18%) performed in the writing class. (74%) of the students said that it was 'never' performed in class.

Accordingly, one can say that tasks in the classroom were organised in different ways but very frequently individually, and that the role of pair or group work in the writing class was comparatively less. And this mode of instruction (the individual work) has been observed in the classroom observation conducted by the researcher. But ELT experts emphasise the use of pair or group work – the collaborative work in the classroom since it has a positive effect on language learning.

As a matter of fact it is, however, a general classroom procedure done in the class by most of the teachers, if not by all, in the colleges of Aden University. It is a procedure in which the teacher reads the text loudly, explains the model text in simple English and sometimes in Arabic, asks questions, explains different words in simple English or sometimes in Arabic and asks the students to write or answer the writing tasks at home.
The key point that must be mentioned here regarding the teaching method is that teachers in the colleges of Aden University are developing among the students examination oriented writing and not exactly the practical use of writing and writing processes.

**Writing Process**

This section investigates the students’ writing process in class. To be aware of the writing process followed by the students in the writing class three questions (1-3) were asked. Question (1): what writing processes do you usually follow while writing in class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Process</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Imitate the written format explained by the teacher without any change.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Read the format given by the teacher and make some changes in it and write.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Discuss, with your classmates – write and rewrite.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Write individually by using your background knowledge.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Write points first – organise those points - develop the points.</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Write points first – develop the points and then organise the whole text.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Any other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (35): Students’ writing process in the writing class

In looking at table (35) above, the highest percentage (85%) was given to the first writing process i.e. ‘Imitate the written format explained by the teacher without any change’. However, different percentages were given to ‘Read the format given by the teacher and make some changes in it and write’ (6%), ‘Discuss with your classmates – write and rewrite’ (5%), ‘Write individually by using your background knowledge’ (3%) and ‘Write points first – organise those points – develop the points’ (1%). But none of the students showed that they wrote points first – develop the points and then organised the whole text’ (0%) or that they used other processes (0%).
The selection of the option (a) by the majority of the students identifies the indifference of the teachers as well as of the students towards originality in written texts. Although imitation of a model text in written form helps in understanding the general format of the written text, a frequent use of such process affects the students’ quality of originality and creativity.

It is obvious that students do not plan their written work in class, which therefore leads usually to disorganised and ineffective written text. For any well-organised written text, a plan is a prerequisite. The plan aids in defining the writer’s intentions of writing the text, potential audience of the text, suitable information and language used.

Question (2): *Do you generally feel that what you write conveys what you want to say?* is the other question related to the writing process. The result is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (36): Students’ views towards what they write

In their responses to question (2), (50%) of the students indicated that they ‘Very rarely’ felt that what they wrote conveyed what they wanted to say. Besides, (24%) of them said that they ‘Never’ felt that what they wrote conveyed what they wanted to say. However, they (26%) ‘Sometimes’ felt that what they wrote conveyed what they wanted to say but none of the students (0%) thought that what they wrote conveyed what they wanted to say most of the time.

This suggests a call for changes in the prescribed syllabus for the purposes of satisfying the communicative needs of the students in writing.
The third question of the writing process is: (3) a) Do you know who you are writing for and why, when you write or perform the writing task in class?  b) If yes, indicate the frequency. Here is the result:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (37): Students' responses for knowing the reader and the reason of writing

According to table (37) above, the students' responses indicate that (64%) of them did not know who they were writing 'for' and 'why' when they did writing tasks. (36%) of the students responded that they knew who they were writing for and why but they differed in frequency. They said that they 'always' (4%), 'often' (4%), 'usually' (6%), 'sometimes' (22%) knew who they were writing for and why. This is clearly illustrated in table (38) below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (38): Frequency of students' knowledge of the reader and reason of writing

The response to question (3) of the writing process shows that the context of writing was missing very frequently from the writing tasks. It is very important for the students to know why they are writing and who for? It is the audience that decides the appropriate content and style of the topic.

Performing different types of tasks

This section aims to know whether the teachers use activities from outside the prescribed textbook.

The following question: How often did your teacher introduce some tasks/activities outside the textbook in the writing class? investigated the performance and frequency of different types of tasks.
Table (39): Frequency of performing different types of tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in table (39), (59%) of the students mentioned that tasks outside the textbook were 'never' introduced in the classroom. (37%) of them stated that tasks outside the textbook were 'sometimes' introduced in the classroom. But it was only (4%) of the students who said that outside tasks were 'often' introduced in the classroom.

Since the writing textbooks were not based on the analysis of the Yemeni students' and teachers' needs, teachers should create lot of scope to organise the tasks outside the textbook in the classroom. But the results show that the frequency of organising outside textbook tasks in the writing class was low. It was clear that the teacher was more occupied with completion of the textbook units than preparing and organising new tasks.

Assessment

This section is aiming at assessing the type of errors students make in their writing and their reaction towards them. It is also aiming at eliciting information about the teachers' responses to such errors but from the students' perspective. It includes three questions (1-3).

Following is a question for assessing the students' classroom writing:

(1) Which type of errors does your teacher or you find after reading your written text? The results were analysed in percentage terms and frequency:
It can be noticed in table (40) above that the errors, which occurred frequently in the students' classroom writing were mainly grammatical (99%), sentence structure (93%), vocabulary (91%), organisation (90%), spelling (89%), punctuation (88%) and paragraph structure (83%) respectively.

Thus, the most frequently occurring errors in students' writing were the grammatical ones. They occurred more frequently than the other errors mentioned above in table (40). They had different frequencies of occurrence in the students' writing - 'very often' (27%), 'often' (52%), 'sometimes' (20%). Only (1%) of the students who said that such errors 'never' occurred in their writing.

Nevertheless, the sentence structure, vocabulary, and organisation were among the errors, which had higher frequency in occurrence in the students' writing respectively in comparison with spelling, punctuation and paragraph structure. This was because they 'very often', 'often' appeared in the students' writing as can be seen in the table above. However, it is also clear from the table above that spelling and punctuation constituted a difficulty for students as they appeared more frequently in their writing. The lowest percentage was given to the paragraph structure errors since such errors appeared less frequently in the students' writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Grammatical</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Spelling</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Punctuation</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Vocabulary</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Sentence structure</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Paragraph structure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Organisation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Any other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (40): Most frequent errors in students’ classroom writing
The other point in the assessment of students' writing is that what they do after finding such the mistakes mentioned in table (40) above. Students in the colleges of Aden University, however, usually write texts at home or in class for tests or exams and submit them to their teachers to be corrected and returned back. It is very rarely, and may never happen, to find students write, revise, edit and rewrite texts in class. Nonetheless, the key point is that what are the students' reactions towards the mistakes, if available, in their finished products?

Question (2): What do you generally do after finding the mistakes? finds out the students' reactions towards the mistakes in their finished texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) I do not try to read what I have written to discover the mistake I leave it to the teacher to discover it</th>
<th>69%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Correct the mistakes and rewrite the same text.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ignore the mistake.</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (41): Students' reaction to their mistakes

(69%) of the students, as tabulated in (41) above, did not try to read what they have written to discover the mistakes. They left it to the teacher to discover them. Ignoring the mistake and correcting the mistakes and rewriting the same text were undertaken by (25%) and (6%) of the students respectively.

The implied meaning of such response is that no major changes occurred in students' writing after the text was written completely. This means that students were not more involved in editing and revision processes, which should take place in class, and therefore the absence of revision of ideas, their presentation, organisation etc.

As a matter of fact, the students in the colleges of Aden University may pay attention to their errors corrected by teachers in times of tests or exams as some teachers may ask or give writing tasks that involve writing the same texts corrected. But how do the teachers respond to such errors in the students' writing?
The last question (3) in the process of assessment investigated the teachers’ response to the errors in students’ writing: **How does your teacher usually respond to the mistakes in your written text?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Explain personally where and why you are wrong</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Simply correct the mistakes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Discuss in the class without mentioning your name</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Simply underlines the mistakes</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Dictates the correct form.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Any other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (42): Teachers’ responses to errors in students’ writing

Table (42) above shows that the teachers most frequently responded to students’ errors by discussing them in class without mentioning names (93%), simply underlining them (89%), dictating the correct form (64%), correcting them (61%), and explaining personally where and why the students were wrong (6%) respectively. None of the students (0%) indicated ‘any other’ responses by teachers.

Generally, the students received a variety of responses from the teachers to the errors in their writing. Discussing the errors in class without mentioning names and Underlining the errors were the usual responses of the teachers. However, the students did not mention if there was any sort of feedback associated with underlining, which may involve students in the revising and editing of their own work. This is clearly suggested since none of the students (0%) gave ‘any other’ responses by teachers.

Teachers’ response to students’ writing is important as students expect feedback in their writing, which may become encouraging if it is presented effectively. But the point that should be probed here is that it is obvious from the
responses that teachers only responded to the students’ errors – weaknesses and nothing more than that. This can also be inferred from the table above since the students did not mentioned ‘any other’ (0%) responses by the teacher.

Teachers, however, should also respond positively to the students’ writing strengths as much as they respond to their errors. Responding positively to the strengths may build up confidence in the students, which may help in improving their writing.

**Writing Skills**

This section is aimed at investigating the students’ needs for improving their writing and the intensity of importance of the different elements of writing perspectives according to their views.

The following question: (1) What do you think you really need to develop your writing? investigated the students' needs to develop their writing. The need to develop the writing skill was desired by all informants but with different percentages regarding its components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas needed to be developed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Vocabulary</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Grammar rules</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Different sentence structures</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The organisation of information</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Paragraph writing</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Using cohesive devices</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Any other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (43): Students’ needs for developing their writing

In response to this subjective question above, the informants mentioned their interest in learning Grammar rules (96%), Vocabulary (94%), The organisation of information (89%), Different sentence structures (88%), Paragraph writing (87%), and
Using cohesive devices (81%). Surprisingly, (96%) and (94%), a large number of informants were interested in improving grammar and vocabulary.

The informants are preoccupied with the notion that effective writing in English means avoiding grammatical errors. Thus, the impact of grammar can be seen on the students. Learning English writing means learning grammar rules is deeply rooted in their minds. Or the other way round learning grammar rules is equated with learning writing skills by the students. Nevertheless, the grammatical element is important but it is not the only one needed to achieve effective writing.

The students are obsessed by the idea that good writing involves the knowledge of grammatical rules and vocabulary is supported by the students' response to the following: (2) Given below is a list of different elements in writing perspectives, indicate your opinion regarding the intensity of importance for each element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different elements in writing perspectives</th>
<th>Intensity of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Grammar (grammatical rules and vocabulary)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Context (the reader you write to and the reason for writing)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Processes (planning-organising - composing - revision - redrafting)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (44): Students' opinion regarding the intensity of importance and frequency of the different elements in writing perspectives

As can be noted in table (44) above, the students (19%) intensified the importance of Grammar as the most important element of all the three in writing. However, the other two elements – the Context and the Writing Processes received equal importance by the students i.e. (15%) as the most important elements in writing.
The majority of the students (78%) also considered the Grammar element very important and only (3%) of them found this element important but none of the students (0%) considered this element as less important.

However, (40%) of the students stated that the Context was very important but was not as very important as the Writing Processes element (54%). (36%) of the students considered the Context as important, whereas (22%) of them considered the Writing Processes element as important. The same percentage of students (9%) considered the Context and Writing Processes elements as less important.

Intensity of the importance, though the percentages were different, was given to the different elements of the writing perspectives by the students. Therefore, responsibility of the textbook as against teachers or textbook writers in developing the writing skill among the students needs to be re-examined.

The point to be noted here, after all, is that the students in the colleges of Aden University should understand that writing does not only mean grammar rules, vocabulary, organisation of information, different sentence structures, paragraph writing, and using cohesive devices but also a generation of ideas, i.e., to explore their ideas through, for example, various activities like prewriting activities either oral or written or both. More specifically, they should pay careful attention to the processes of planning, organising, composing, revising, editing, and redrafting, particularly through the group or pair work. This may suggest integrating genre-based approach knowledge and process-based approach knowledge while teaching writing. A lack of any of these two types of knowledge might result in poor performance and thereby this suggests the desire to create a balance between the two. The following lines, however, will present a summary of the findings of the students’ questionnaire.
A Summary of the Findings of Students' Questionnaire

Following is a summary of the findings of the students' questionnaire.

- Most of the students were from Arabic medium schools. Arabic was also used as a medium of instruction in an English class in schools and along with English in colleges. Therefore, the students had less exposure to English and that was one of the reasons of the low proficiency in English.

- Generally, English in Yemen is considered as a foreign language which is only taught as a school subject but which is not used as a medium of instruction in schools nor as a language of communication within a country.

- The majority of students did not read English newspapers or magazines and therefore the lack of sufficient knowledge about the different types of genres as well as lack of awareness of what constitutes good writing.

- The majority of the students watched English films and TV serials but with written Arabic translation.

- Teachers were the only source of exposure in using English communicatively for most of the students.

- Using English in non-academic setting by students was very low.

- Writing activity was undertaken by all students in non-academic setting for various purposes mainly correspondence and organising their work. Pleasure and expression of emotions, which mainly associated with creative writing, were found less frequently in the students' non-academic writing.

- The students 'sometimes', 'often' and 'very often' wrote letter, dialogue, note-taking, short story, essay and report in non-academic setting. But it was only the academic purpose which provided that minimum of opportunity for the students to write at home.
• The majority of students accepted the course as useful in practical terms but to some extent. Therefore, the current syllabus must be modified or changed to match the students' needs and help them become independent writers.

• In the writing class more focus was on an individual work with some discussion on the topics among the students in groups/pairs. The discussion sometimes, when taking place in class, appeared at the pre-writing stage and very rarely at the rewriting stage.

• The students in the writing class usually imitated a model given by the teacher instead of writing creatively and understanding different processes which go on during the process of writing. This supports the researcher's suggestion to include the process approach of writing in the curriculum of the departments of English in the colleges of Aden University.

• In the writing process, the context of writing was missing very frequently from the writing tasks. It is important for the students to know why they are writing and who for? It is the audience that decides the appropriate context and style of the topic. This suggests the modification of the writing tasks to include the context of writing and therefore this supports the researcher's suggestion to include the genre approach to the curriculum of the departments of English in the colleges of Aden University.

• The frequency of organising outside textbook tasks in the writing class was low. The teachers were more occupied with the completion of the textbook units than preparing and organising new tasks. Therefore, the tasks which are related to real life transactions did not receive appropriate importance in the writing class.

• The students' assessment of the errors declared that the majority of the errors in their writing were grammatical, sentence structure, vocabulary, organisation, spelling, punctuation and paragraph structure respectively. This suggests the inclusion of genre
approach in the curriculum of the departments of English in the colleges of Aden University since this approach does not only concentrate on the linguistic knowledge of language (the product approach) but also on the rhetorical structure of texts (i.e. organisation).

- The students did not tend to correct their errors. This means that the students were not involved in editing and revision processes and therefore the absence of revision of ideas, their presentations, organisation etc. This also supports the researcher’s suggestion to include the cognitive processes of writing (i.e. planning, organising, composing, revising, editing and redrafting in the writing class activities).

- According to the students, the teacher’s frequent response to their errors was discussing the errors in class without mentioning the students’ names and underlining them. This means that the teachers responded only to the students’ weaknesses but not to their strengths in writing.

- Many students needed to improve their grammar rules, vocabulary, organisation of information, different sentence structures, paragraph writing and using cohesive devices.

- The students gave importance to the different elements of writing perspectives; grammar, context and the cognitive processes. Thus, the current curriculum of writing in the departments of English in the colleges of Aden University must be modified or changed taking into account the researcher’s suggestion to shift the focus to a collective approach-the process-genre approach to improve the type of academic writing in the colleges of Aden University and therefore produce independent writers of English.
4.3 Teachers' Interview

The interview was conducted with ten teachers from the colleges of Education: Aden (6) and Saber (4), departments of English / Aden University. It aimed to get their views on the writing materials, syllabus, tasks, and methodology used for the writing skill. Therefore, the researcher designed (see Appendix 4) different questions based on the different categories: materials, syllabus, tasks and methodology.

Qualifications

Three of the interviewees had a B.Ed. degree and four of them had an M.A. degree. The other three interviewees are Ph.D. holders.

Work Experience

Two of the teachers had a teaching experience at unity, secondary and university levels (10, 5, 16 years), (4, 2, 4 years). One of the teachers had experience in teaching at the unity and university levels (5, 24 years). Five of them had a teaching experience at the secondary and university levels and such details can be illustrated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary School</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4 years</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2 years</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5 years</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5 years</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 7 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two of the teachers had a teaching experience at the university level (22 years), (11 years).

However, the teaching experience can be summed up and divided in the following scale:
It can clearly be understood that most of the teachers being interviewed were experienced in teaching at the unity, secondary, and university levels. This may reflect their much knowledge about the writing materials, syllabus, tasks, and methodology in their colleges.

The Analysis of Teachers’ Interview

The Materials

Raimes (1988) states that selecting “materials for a course” is confusing and that teachers face the problem of getting “the right materials” (p. 41). She clarifies that textbook is expected supply us with “secondary materials” (p. 45), “good advice on writing” (p. 45), unambiguous “explanations” of grammatical rules, “editing’ skills and a good set of texts for analysis” (p. 45). She recommends the focus on the texts in a writing class and calls for the use of “comprehensible” and “real” (p. 46) texts to be compatible with the recent “theories of second language acquisition” (p. 46).

We, however, as teachers, have to follow a prescribed textbook. These textbooks have just a collection of prose passages. Often these texts have long descriptive passages on different themes. Very often the subject matter tends to be uninteresting and in many cases those are not the subjects which relate to the students’ day-to-day lives. The students may not be motivated to study these passages.

Good teachers may see that one solution to this problem could be to use supplementary materials which are related to the topics/themes discussed in the text and which are interesting to the students or to make the activities on the passage
interesting. Therefore, this section aims at finding out information about the teachers' views on the materials that are used in the writing coursebooks used in the colleges of Aden University. It also aims at getting information about the teachers' views regarding the knowledge needed in the writing task to make it effective and therefore helps in improving the students' writing ability.

However, in response to the following questions under the 'materials' category:

1) **Do you prefer the use of model texts given in the prescribed book?**

2) **Do you use the model texts given in the prescribed book?**

3) **Do you think that grammatical and vocabulary knowledge are important in a writing class?** All the writing teachers (WT1 – WT12) expressed their preference and use of the model texts and the importance of knowledge of grammar and vocabulary in a writing class. WT3 added that he always used the model texts since there were no other coursebooks in the market. WT7 clarified that she used them especially those which were authentic and she also used others collected from other resources. WT10 also clarified that she used them but along with her own examples.

Interestingly, the responses were the same but some subject teachers naturally asked for authenticity of the texts used. Thus, the subject writing teachers gave importance to the use of model texts, grammar and vocabulary in a writing class—the importance called for by the product-oriented approach.

In response to the last question under the category of the 'materials': 4. **What do you think is also needed in a writing task? Or the other way around, what other knowledge do you think the students need along with the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary to help them write effectively?** The writing teachers
gave different responses regarding the knowledge needed on the part of the students—what they should know in a writing task. Or the other way round, what is the knowledge needed by the students when doing a writing task so that they can write effectively?

WT1 and WT9 agreed that students needed a good hand-writing. WT1 also added that they also needed the knowledge of constructing sentences, whereas WT 9 added that they also needed to know the order of the text and sentences and to have knowledge of punctuation. WT 2, WT 3, WT 7, and WT11 answered that students needed the discourse knowledge—the knowledge of discourse markers; how sentences, ideas, and paragraphs are linked to make the texts coherent or how to write above the sentence level. WT 7 clarified that the students needed to know the different types of texts and organisation. WT11 believed that the students needed to know about tenses and the agreement between the subject and its verb.

WT4, WT5, and WT8 responded that the students needed the knowledge of organising a piece of writing or as it was said by WT5 the schemata knowledge. WT4 explained that writing meant the style and that there was more to writing than just vocabulary and structures. WT8 said that the students also needed to know about punctuation and spelling.

WT6 and WT12 replied that students needed to read a lot. WT12 added that they also needed a good imagination. WT10 was different from all. She contended that students needed to write creatively. She clarified that they should be allowed to write freely to help them write creatively.

This discrepancy among the teachers was due to the different perceptions of the teachers regarding the other knowledge needed in a writing task to help the students write effectively. The writing teachers, thus, were not aware that those
students do not only need skills in organisation, linking ideas, sentences and paragraphs, punctuation, spelling, good handwriting, and reading so as to write effectively but they also need knowledge of the audience – the context of the writing task. They need to know the reader and why they are writing for, which therefore decide the content, style, and its organisation. Such knowledge would help them write effectively. The differences among the subject teachers, however, highlighted what they considered to be important in a writing task.

Thus, the responses of the subject teachers helped me in knowing the nature of writing to be seen in their eyes. And this helped me in being aware of the nature of academic writing that is required at the undergraduate level in the Colleges of Aden University.

**The Syllabus**

The writing textbooks that are taught in the B.Ed. programme at Aden University do not lead and reflect the teachers’ and students’ full need in teaching and learning writing. They were designed with different culture-based texts and therefore lose the contact with the culture of the country being used in. Moreover, every teacher is supposed to follow the syllabus that was previously determined. But, are all the teachers in the Colleges of Aden University satisfied with the writing syllabus used? Therefore, this section investigates whether the teachers are satisfied with the writing syllabus used at Aden University and the changes they like to see in the syllabus used.

In response to the question under the above category: 'The writing textbooks in the B.Ed. programme teach or practise the language functions. Do you like any change to be seen or brought about in the syllabus or totally convinced with it? All the subject writing teachers liked to see a change in the writing textbooks except WT5. WT5 saw that they were suitable since they helped the students organise
their information and wrote effectively. WT1, WT4, and WT10 rejoined that the texts used in those books should have gone with the Yemeni culture. WT1 retorted that the texts used should be related to the Yemeni environment; national holidays, great anniversaries—the revolution celebrations and historical events.

WT4 rejoined that she was not totally convinced with them since she believed they included lots of culture-based texts, which the students did not understand. She clarified that they would be beneficial if there was an addition or supplementation. WT10 suggested the design or use of texts taking into consideration the social features or settings of the country. She said that the students ignored a number of things used in the foreign or western countries. She clarified that writing a letter in Arabic differed from writing a letter in English and that that was only one thing.

WT2 contradicted WT3 regarding the forms of language used in these books. WT2 was satisfied with the way the functions of language was presented but not with the forms of language. He rejoined that they were not well developed; not contemporary, whereas WT3 saw that those text-books should be changed since they dealt with pure grammar. He said that pure grammar did not sometimes help students to catch something which was tangible or something in hand.

WT6 answered that those books taught simple styles of writing and extra styles of writing had to be added that could be more interesting to students. WT7 responded that something authentic should be added such as authentic post-cards and authentic texts from newspapers. WT8 and WT9 called for new model texts that go with what is recently available. WT8 replied that most of the topics were very important but some of them needed a change such as writing a telegram and telex. WT9 said that other texts or models needed to be presented which teach internet and email.
WT11 was only convinced with the first level syllabus but not with the other writing syllabuses, which, he said, were not enough for teaching good writing. WT12 responded that they required to be revised since many things appeared in the field of teaching writing.

**Tasks**

A task, for Richards, Platt and Weber (1986), is "an activity", which is done by the learners in the classroom rather than outside (p. 289). Long (1985) defines a task as "a piece of work" (p. 89) done by people in life. Long's definition implies some instances from the real world, which therefore do not use language. However, Breen's and Nunan's definitions of tasks refer to tasks as those done in the classroom. Breen (1987) defines a task as "any structured language learning endeavour" (p. 23) that has its "objectives, content, working procedures and outcomes" (p. 23), which helps in learning a language. For Nunan (1989), a task is mainly "a piece of work which involves learners in activities like comprehending, manipulating or interacting in the target language" (p. 10). The main focus for Nunan, thus, when defining a task, is on meaning rather than on form.

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the writing tasks in the coursebooks used at Aden University have their answers at the back of the coursebooks (i.e. key answers). The students usually recourse to these answers and therefore the absence of a true test of their writing ability. The question that should be raised, however, is that 'Do the teachers in the Colleges of Aden University give or use tasks from outside the books? Accordingly, this section is intended to elicit information about whether the teachers use writing tasks from outside the coursebook or they only perform all the given tasks given in the book.
In response to question one regarding ‘tasks’ category, ‘Do you give or use tasks/activities outside the textbook in the writing class? WTI said that he used outside tasks when it was necessary and when there was enough time. WT2, WT4, WT5, WT6, WT9, WT10, and WT12 responded that they sometimes gave their students tasks from outside the textbooks. WT9 added that he used additional tasks when there was a need. WT3 used tasks from outside but very rarely since he did not have enough time. WT7 rejoined that she used other materials from other resources when she taught some topics so as to achieve the aim. WT8 did the same thing but the reason was because the tasks in the coursebooks were not enough.

It is, therefore, clear that the subject teachers did use outside tasks to some extent but not to a great extent. But will they be able to perform the outside tasks along with the tasks given in the coursebook? Do they practise or teach students all the writing tasks given in the book? It is sometimes difficult to perform all the tasks given in the book in class along with other outside tasks since the units in these coursebooks contain so many tasks that cannot be completed in two or three classes. Therefore, we usually find some teachers, if not all, ask students to do some of the tasks as homework or leave them out since they were discussed earlier as claimed by teachers and that what was clearly observed in the classroom observation.

Notwithstanding, in response to the second question: 2. Do you perform or practise students all the writing tasks given in the book? WTI replied that he performed the most important tasks but not all of them so as not to waste the time. WT2, WT7, WT8, WT10, and WT11 answered that they practised their students all the writing tasks given in the book. WT3 said that he sometimes practised all of them in class. WT4 and WT5 responded that they performed most of the tasks given in the book. WT6 and WT12 acknowledged that they did not practise their students all the
writing tasks because the time given was limited. WT9 practised some of the tasks and left the others as homework.

Thus, all the subject teachers performed, if not all, the tasks given in the book. The key point here is that the materials selected for those tasks or the classroom activities do not, however, match those outside since they were not particularly designed for the speakers of Arabic in Yemen. Therefore, they were not relevant to language use outside the classroom. Littlewood (1992) says:

To spend all one's time pretending to book rooms in hotels that do not exist, reading menus for meals one will never eat and listening for the times of trains one will never take can be no less stultifying than the long dictations that one often had to write in the past. (p.102)

Moreover, the responses to such tasks may not be authentic in the sense of being rooted in the students' own personalities and growing out of the immediate interaction between participants in the real classroom situation. Therefore, relevance and authenticity should be kept in mind when selecting the materials for tasks in the classroom.

Methodology

The domain of teaching second and foreign languages writing is full of old and new orientations. First, there was a focus on the grammatical features of a text which involved controlled writing activities. Later, it was shifted to a focus on the discourse level which is represented in the functional approach. Then the emphasis was placed on the writer's composing processes, i.e., the process approach and finally on the genres in the academic discourse community.

In accordance with such changes in the orientations of teaching writing, this section is designed to search the mode of instructions followed by the writing teachers at Aden University. It will first elicit information about teachers' organisation of a
discussion in a writing class. It will then investigate the way the writing task is organised when performing a writing task.

The section will next find out about the way teachers deal with the grammatical rules in a writing class. It will finally enquire about whether the writing teachers teach their students the strategies of writing such as planning, organising, composing, revising, editing, and rewriting in a writing class.

Nevertheless, in response to the first question in the 'methodology' category:

1. Do you first start discussing or asking questions about the topic or you start directly discussing the writing tasks given? All the subject teachers (WT1 - WT12) answered that they did not start directly discussing the writing tasks given. They clarified that they first warmed up the topic in the form of giving some information—general ideas, questions or pre-writing activities.

   However, WT3 replied that he sometimes took the students back to something related to the topic but he mostly started directly discussing the tasks given in the book. WT4 explained that that depended on the tasks. She said that she sometimes went straight to the tasks since she believed those tasks would initiate the process of writing. She clarified that she did her own initiation when felt the tasks did not do.

   WT6 rejoined that the teachers should, before discussing the task, be aware of the objective of the task and make it clear to the students so that the students know what they are supposed to do and why they are supposed to do the task. Then, they, she continued to clarify, should think how to do it. Thus, it is clear that the subject teachers did usually warm up the topic or did what is so-called 'brainstorming', which is therefore one of processes followed by the process approach exponents. The process of brainstorming, however, could be initiated by the teacher through giving, for instance, certain prompt questions to the students to help them get started. He then
can ask them to start writing whether in pair or group to form the first draft of the intended text-type. But do all teachers ask their students to do such activities in a writing class?

In response to the second question: 2. Do you ask students to work in pairs/groups? All the subject teachers (WT1-WT12) responded that they asked their students to work in pairs or groups, but they differed in frequency. WT5 and WT7 replied that it depended on the task; whereas WT9 answered that it depended on the time given.

WT11 rejoined that he very rarely asked the students to do such activities since there were a large number of students in the class. WT12 also rejoined that it was difficult to ask students to do those activities because of the large number of students in the class. But he said that he sometimes did the activity of pair work. Therefore, the activity of pair/group work was motivated by all the teachers regardless of the difference in frequency.

With regard to the third question: 3. Do you explain the grammatical rule in a writing class? WT1, WT4, WT5, WT10, WT11, and WT12 responded that they explained the grammatical rules in a writing class where it was necessary. WT1 clarified that the grammatical rules were not necessary in a writing class since grammar was taught as a course in the college. But he also clarified that he explained them where it was necessary. WT10 did not explain them but she did so when she was asked to do.

WT2 replied that he explained the rules that were not understood by the students in detail. WT3 answered that he sometimes explained them but did not explain each rule contained in the intended unit. WT6 responded that she explained them but not always. She clarified that the grammatical rules confused the students.
and therefore suggested the communicative approach. She also clarified that the students should understand the meaning of a sentence without thinking about the rules and that that would help them later understand the rule of that sentence.

WT7 made it clear that he explained the grammatical rules in a writing class but not in detail. WT8 answered that he explained them, whereas WT9 replied that he explained them but after giving the examples that represented them.

In response to the last question under the category 'Methodology': 4. Famous writers or authors are believed to go through certain processes when they compose. They plan, organise, compose, revise, edit, and rewrite the final draft. Do you teach or practise your students how to plan, organise, compose, revise, edit, and rewrite the final draft? WT1 responded that he practised his students such processes in class. But his positive response contradicted what he did with students in class. He explained that he asked his students to write drafts and he, then, himself, not the students, looked at them and corrected them. And the same response was given by WT11 who followed the same procedure in class.

And this is usually the way writing is taught in the Colleges of Aden University by most of the teachers, if not by all. They ask the students to write about a topic and they give some time for that. And this act of writing is much done in tests and exams but very rarely in casual classes and this was clearly observed in the classroom observation. The teachers then take these drafts home to be corrected, graded, and later returned back. They usually comment on grammatical and vocabulary errors but not on meaning.

Nevertheless, some subject teachers thought that when they taught the rhetorical structure or the organisation of any piece of writing they believed that they taught the cognitive processes (i.e. the learning strategies) called for by the process
approaches. But what they did is that they only taught or practised their students the layout of genres that was called for by the genre approaches. WT2 answered that he taught those processes. He clarified that he taught his students the structure of paragraphs and the organisation of an essay. Moreover, he said that he himself checked the drafts not the students. But in the process approach classroom, the students, for instance, in a collaborative work, plan, organise, revise, edit, and rewrite the final draft. The role of teacher in such class is as a facilitator.

And this was the case with WT5 and WT10. WT5 said that she used those processes as a way out to help the students know how to start or introduce the topic, how to say something about the text (sic) itself, and how to summarise what is mentioned previously. WT5 was, thus, talking about the layout (i.e. organisation) of a written work – how to write the 'introduction' section, the 'problem' section and the 'conclusion' section. WT10 responded that she practised her students such processes but they were different. She said that she taught them organisation – the layout but not all the stages.

WT3 replied that he taught them those processes but it was difficult in practice. He said that those processes were taught in advanced books but the books used in the B.Ed. programme did not teach those processes. WT4 said that she personally followed some of those techniques but it depended on the tasks. She believed that second year students did not have to do all those processes. They, she clarified, would do one of two things – editing, rewriting, and revising but not planning – preparing points before writing if there was no essay to write. Unless, she continued, that was the task she did not follow those steps.

But the second level writing textbooks contain long tasks because there are tasks at the end of most of the units under the subheading 'Free Writing'. These tasks
require the students to write complete genres. Moreover, there is also a unit in the textbook, which teaches students how to write a composition (i.e. an essay); saying opinion, and asks the students at the end to write a complete and coherent text. Nonetheless, WT6 responded that she did not teach those processes since she taught writing at the level of sentences. She indicated that those processes should be taught at the advanced level and would be understood if the topics chosen were related to the students' life.

WT7 answered that she did them. She expounded that she first discussed the topic and the type of the text that students were going to write about. She clarified that she first wrote the outlines and organised out ideas on the board and asked the students to start writing, which was the first draft and that what she did in class. She, then, signed on the first draft the students wrote in class and asked the students to write the second draft at home. The students, later, she said, brought back their drafts the next class, where she could make sure they did those processes of writing. They, she clarified, revised on the first draft signed and rewrote on another paper at home.

It is apparent that WT7 did not use or understand the way these processes should properly be done. These processes, especially revision, should take place in class. Doing these processes at home misses the teacher’s feedback. The students' writing, however, would improve when they receive feedback. Teacher's feedback leads students to revise and therefore the importance of revision and of teacher feedback during the process of writing in class.

It is good that WT7 asked for multiple drafts but the process of writing lacks the teacher's feedback that helps students revise as they move through the stages of the writing process in class not at home. Moreover, the process of writing followed by
WT7 lacks the techniques that are used for initiating teacher’s feedback such as peer response, groups, and commentary.

WT9 responded that he asked his students to write drafts and did those processes. He clarified that the students wrote notes and points and organised them in some structures, and then they reviewed their drafts. WT12 said that he practised his students some of those processes but not all of them because of the time constraints.

However, one may conclude that three certain models in second or foreign languages pedagogy were preferable to be followed by the writing teachers at Aden University – the product, genre, and process approaches, although they seemed to have less knowledge about the process approach. The teachers really lacked knowledge about the processes and the ways these individual processes are carried out.

Nevertheless, the writing models or the writing approaches should not be looked upon as incompatible but should be looked upon as ones that can be combined or integrated. Therefore, the need here is of an eclectic model that subsumes the different models of language pedagogy. Thus, the teachers at Aden University should be trained in the teaching of the cognitive strategies and should be provided with enough time to implement them in the classroom as well as supplying them with knowledge of texts that is required in composing. However, the following section will provide a summary of the findings of teachers’ interview.

A Summary of the Findings of Teachers’ Interview

Following is a summary of the findings of the teachers’ interview:

The Materials

- All the teachers preferred the use of model texts, grammar knowledge and vocabulary in the writing classroom. But very few who used authentic texts.
- The teachers gave different responses regarding the other knowledge needed in a writing task along with the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary:
  - A good hand-writing.
  - The knowledge of constructing sentences.
  - The organisation of sentences and text, and knowledge of punctuation.
  - The knowledge of discourse markers – discourse knowledge; how to link between sentences, ideas and paragraphs to make the texts coherent or to write above the sentence level.
  - The knowledge of the different types of texts and organisation – the schemata knowledge.
  - The knowledge of tenses and the agreement between the subject and its verb.
  - The knowledge of style.
  - The knowledge of punctuation and spelling.
  - The knowledge of how to read and a good imagination.
  - The knowledge of how to write creatively.

The teachers should know that the students do not only need such knowledge in a writing task, though they are important, but they also need the knowledge of audience - the context of the writing task. The writing teacher should create a context for the students so that they should feel that they are writing for certain purposes and that what they write is intended for someone to read. Understanding the context may help the students write creatively and therefore the improvement of their writing. This also supports the researcher’s suggestion to include the genre approach that supports such act.
The syllabus

- All the teachers, except one, liked to see a change in the current writing textbooks. Therefore, changes in the official writing syllabus for the purpose of satisfying the communicative needs of the students and teachers should be mainly be done in the departments of English in the Colleges of Aden University.

The tasks

- All the teachers performed the textbook tasks. The tasks or the activities, which did not match those outside the classroom.

This result was supported by the data obtained from the students’ questionnaire regarding the performance of different types of tasks. This data showed that the frequency of organising outside textbook tasks in the writing class was low. This indicates that the teacher in a writing class was more occupied with completion of the textbook writing tasks than preparing and organising new tasks within the students’ experience.

Methodology

- Teachers did not use the activity of group / pair work in a writing class very frequently.
- Teachers tended to explain the grammatical rules in a writing class.
- Teachers lacked knowledge about the process approach of writing and the way the processes should be carried out. Therefore, this suggests including such an approach in the writing syllabus of Aden University along with the grammatical rules, which should not be definitely overstressed.
4.4 Students' Interview

Twelve of second level undergraduate students in the department of English at Aden University were interviewed. The interview in the field study is structured individual interview. At times the researcher had to reword the responses which were said in the mother tongue and those which were not clearly expressed either for better comprehension or analysis. This interview was tape-recorded and later transcribed by the researcher. However, the responses were not analysed in any statistical way.

The first four questions of the interview (see Appendix 5) were related to the students' personal details. To know the medium of instruction in their different stages of study in the three different educational institutions (basic school, secondary school, college), question 5 was framed. Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 were framed to know their level in the first language (L1) and the foreign Language (FL) writing and the reasons for that level as well as to know whether there is any difference in L1 and FL writing.

Questions 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, were developed to understand the students' writing process when writing and the difficulties they face when writing as well as to know the way they think and the way they can improve their writing. The students, however, have been given code numbers (S1-S12).

The Analysis of Students' Interview

Students' Response to L1 and FL/L2 writing

This section investigates the students' views towards L1 and L2 writing. It tries to enquire about the medium of instruction in the basic, secondary and college levels. It also tries to enquire about the students' opinions regarding their L1 and L2 writing and the reason of their rating.
It is apparent, however, in response to the question related to the medium of instruction in the three stages of study that Arabic Language was excessively used as a medium of instruction in comparison with English. This, however, would reduce the amount of language practice in an English class and outside the class either.

It is worth noting that the practice of English language in Yemen has no room outside an English classroom since English is dealt with as a foreign language. In Yemen, English language is taught as a school subject but which is not used as a medium of instruction in schools nor as a language of communication within a country, e.g. in government offices. It is very scarcely used outside class. Nevertheless, in the Colleges of Aden University, especially in the departments of English, though English is supposed to be used as a medium of instruction in the teaching of different skills of English language, the Arabic language is still used along with English. This was clearly indicated by students in their interview and sometimes was overstressed by some teachers, as the students rejoined.

In response to the question that is related to L1 writing: What do you think of your writing in the L1? The self-assessment of the students indicated that the majority of the students considered themselves to be not good in their L1 writing. Even though S6, S7, S9, and S10 rated their writing as relatively good but they still, as they explained, had language problems and made many mistakes and therefore their writing was not up to the mark.

S1, S2, and S12 assessed themselves as average writers in L1. S3, S5, and S8 considered themselves to be poor writers. S4 and S11 regarded themselves as above average, whereas S6 and S9 as good but not bad. S7 rated herself as quite good but S10 as rather good. And when the students were asked about the reasons of giving such assessment: Why do you think so? They reasoned such assessment to issues
such as the lack of knowledge about grammar, vocabulary, linking between ideas or sentences, punctuation, and spelling.

They replied that they made grammatical, vocabulary, mistakes and lacked knowledge about the use of the linking words. The students also clarified that they had problems with organisation - what to write in the beginning, middle and end.

They reasoned such rating to the lack of practice of such language aspects in class and the excessive use of dialect Arabic in class as well as the lack or absence of well qualified teachers.

The assessment of their writing in L1 was similar to their assessment to their assessment in FL/L2 writing since they lacked the same skill in both L1 and FL/L2 writing. For example, S1, S3, S4, S6, S7, S8, S9, and S11 responded that they had problems with the use of grammatical rules in both L1 and FL/L2 and therefore they made linguistic mistakes.

In response to the question related to their assessment in L2 writing: **What about English? What do you think of your writing in English?** S1 and S2 assessed themselves as little bit good. S3, S4, and S12 rated themselves as above average, whereas S5 and S11 as good writers but still they had some problems with grammar. S6, S7, and S8 considered themselves as poor writers but S9 and S10 as rather good.

However, when the students were asked about the reasons of that assessment: **Why do you think so?** They gave similar reasons to those given to their assessment in L1 writing. Thus, the students’ interviews showed that the students had problems with grammar, vocabulary, organisation, punctuation, and spelling.

The students clarified that such assessment was due to the lack of practice and the absence of well-qualified teachers. The students’ assessment of their writing in L1 was almost similar to their assessment in FL/L2 writing since they lacked the same
skills in both L1 and FL/L2 writing. For example, S1, S3, S4, S6, S7, S8, S9, S11, and S12 replied that they had problems with the use of grammatical rules in both L1 and FL/L2 and therefore they made linguistic mistakes.

Thus, the students' responses exhibited that the students lacked the same skills in writing in their L1 and in FL/L2. Even if there was a difference, it was only marginal. This difference appeared with S5 who had poor knowledge of grammar in L1 but rated herself as good in FL/L2 writing since she, as she said, learnt in an English medium school. However, she also responded that she had some problems with grammar, vocabulary, and linking ideas. This was clearly understood from her responses to questions (12) and (13).

Although the undergraduate students were proficient in L1, their writing skills in L1 were poor. The majority of students said that their L1 was used as the medium of instructions in the different stages of their learning, yet their writing in L1 was not good. This is because their cognitive/academic aspect of L1 proficiency was not developed. Their language proficiency, however, was not related to language skills required for academic purpose. Furthermore, research gives evidence that conversational skills are not strongly related to academic skills. Therefore, the undergraduate students possess good conversational skills in L1 but not academic skills.

Moreover, it has been suggested that L1 and L2 academic proficiencies are interdependent (Cummins, 1984), that is, manifestations of a common underlying proficiency. This "common underlying proficiency" makes possible the transfer of cognitive, academic or literacy related skills across languages. Hence, if the undergraduate students were skilled in L1 writing, then due to the "common underlying proficiency" those skills in L1 should have been transferred to FL/L2.
writing. But as they were skilled neither in L1 nor FL/L2 writing, we can conclude
that their high proficiency in L1 was only at the surface level. What is needed in such
situation is to develop the underlying cognitive proficiency of the undergraduate
students, so that they can improve their skills in both L1 and necessarily in FL/L2.

It is apparent from the interview that the undergraduate students were not
taught the cognitive skills in the process of FL/L2 writing in class. They used to go
directly to the process of writing without planning, organising, revising, editing, and
redrafting. S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, and S12 used to write directly
without planning their writing in class. However, S6, S8, S9, S11, and S12 did
planning at home as an attempt on their own and not in an organised and ordered way
but how can they get feedback about their process of writing?

S9, for example, explained that she tried to do planning at home but not in a
perfect way. She retorted that she did not practise those processes in class.
Furthermore, most of the students wrote their ideas in their mother tongue (Arabic)
and then translated them into English except S8 and S10 who thought out their ideas
in English and wrote them in English. But what is the use? What skills could be
transferred or used if they all lacked the cognitive proficiency and the composing
competence in both L1 and FL/L2. Krapels (1990) says that “A lack of competence in
writing in English results more from lack of composing competence than from lack of
linguistic competence” (p. 40).

Thus, from the students' interview, we can conclude that the undergraduate
students lacked writing skills in FL/L2 because their cognitive/academic proficiency
was not developed. Therefore, differences between L1 and FL/L2 writers relate to
composing proficiency in first languages.
Earlier studies provided evidence that the writing of the unskilled LI writers were similar to the unskilled L2 writers and vice versa. This suggests that the unskilled writers do not have good composing competence because of their lack of cognitive proficiency. Krapels stated that Zamel (1982) found that the writing processes of her L2 subjects were similar to those of the subjects described in LI studies. She observed that the unskilled L2 writers wrote like the unskilled LI writers.

Further, lack of composing competence in LI writing was reflected in students' L2 writing. Krapels (1990) observed that "Brooks' (1985) study indicated that writing competence was separate from oral proficiency and that lack of LI cognitive academic development, a somewhat broader concept than writing competence, affected L2 learners' composing skills" (p. 4). Krapels further pointed out that "the composing strategies of each individual writer were found to remain consistent across languages" (p. 56).

The lack of cognitive proficiency in FL/L2 could also cause a problem for the undergraduate students. This problem could appear when they try to think or write in LI and then translate into English. In response to the question: Do you think or write in your mother tongue and then translate into English later? S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, S11, and S12 answered that they thought or wrote in Arabic and then translated into English. But S8 differed from them since she replied that she thought in English and wrote in English. This may sound good but she lacked or had a poor cognitive proficiency in English and this would not help the matter.

However, Kroll (1990) pointed out that students should be asked to think in their LI and write in the same language and then translate into L2. If the students are asked to write in L2, without writing in L1 first, then we are putting a lot of strain on their short-term memory as they think in L1 and immediately translate it into L2 and
this, therefore, affects their speed and writing skills. Therefore, in the beginning and more probable in the basic and secondary schools they should write in the same language and then translate into L2. After they develop enough speed in translation, they can straightway think and write in L2.

What has been discussed above points out to the underdevelopment of certain cognitive skills among the undergraduate students. This is supported by the theory put forward by Cummins (1980a), namely, Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), on language proficiency and academic development. Nonetheless, since the undergraduate students at the college level in Yemen are not supposed to pursue an Arabic writing course in their colleges, the need here is to develop their cognitive writing skills in L2 and this, therefore, implies the inclusion and the practice of the writing processes suggested by the process approaches in the syllabuses of Aden University.

**Self-Diagnosis of the undergraduate students about causes for difficulties in FL/L2 Writing**

The difficulties of the undergraduate students while writing in FL/L2 should be examined to have an insight about their nature of writing so that their writing could be improved. Therefore, this section is designed to elicit information about the problems they have when constructing sentences and when linking ideas and organising them into paragraphs. It also tries to elicit information about the difficulties they face when they try to express themselves in writing.

In response to the following questions:

- **Do you have a problem in constructing sentences?**
- **What kind of problems do you face in linking ideas and organising them into paragraphs?**
• Do you have difficulties in expressing yourself in words?

• Why do you think you have these difficulties in writing English?

Most of the undergraduate students expressed that they had a linguistic difficulty. S1, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, and S11 responded that they had problems with grammar and vocabulary and therefore a problem in constructing sentences. S2 answered that he had no problem in constructing sentences but with how to link ideas using linking words. S12, however, had a problem with grammar but not with vocabulary.

In response to the question related to linking ideas and organising them into paragraphs, all undergraduate students except S9 revealed their inability to link the ideas and organising them into paragraphs as they had no knowledge of how to use linking words in linking the ideas into paragraphs. S9 clarified that she had no too much difficulty with linking the ideas. However, all undergraduate students contended that they had difficulties in expressing themselves in words. Moreover, S8 said that she had also a difficulty in organisation along with the expression difficulty.

In response to the question: Why do you think you have these difficulties in writing English? S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S9, S10, S11, and S12 reasoned the difficulties in writing English to the lack of practice in FL/L2 writing in classroom.

Further, S1, S2, S3, S5, S6, S7, and S12 also clarified that the other cause of difficulties was the teachers' way of teaching writing. S2 replied that teachers did not give them extra tasks. S3 retorted that the teachers did not help them with what they should do and how to write. However, the absence of tasks from outside the book was clarified by S7. She rejoined that teachers used to give them the tasks of the book that their answers were already known at the back of the book (i.e. key answers). S7 added that teachers should use tasks from outside the book to test their ability to write. S8
answered that the problem was with teachers who used to teach them using Arabic language as a medium of instruction.

S5 and S12 also stated that the difficulties resulted from the absence of well-qualified teachers. S3 and S12 said that their difficulties resulted from their poor background knowledge of English. S12 made it clear that they came from the basic and secondary schools with poor background knowledge of English. Thus, all undergraduate students agreed that language or the linguistic proficiency was not the only requirement for good writing skills since they were not even writing well in L1 though they were proficient in that language.

*Areas in FL/L2 writing in which the undergraduate students need improvement*

The undergraduate college students assessed the areas in which they needed improvement in writing FL/L2. This implies that they were aware of their difficulties and this, thereby, would help them identify or diagnose the ways of overcoming them. Therefore, this section aims to find out about what the students need from their point of view in order to improve their writing.

In response to the question: *How do you think you can improve your writing? Or what do you think you need to improve your writing?* All the undergraduate college students (S1-S12) responded that they needed practice in writing FL/L2. S1, S5, S6, S8, and S10 made it clear that they needed practice and more practice in writing different types of texts in class. S10 clarified that practice was the biggest problem in his college. He said that he did not have that chance to practice in class which, he believed, would help him improve his writing. S5, S6, and S10 added that they needed to read more along with practice.
S2, S3, S9, and S12 responded that they needed to read more and practise writing in class. S2 rejoined that the teacher should give them assignments and discuss them in class so that they can know their mistakes. The same requirement was needed by S3 and S9. S3 retorted that he needed someone to comment on his writing. S9 explained that teachers should give them extra hours and work hard in class. They should, she clarified, monitor what they write and comment on it.

S4 replied that she needed, along with practice, a good teacher and knowledge of organisation which she thought they were necessary. S7 and S11 needed knowledge of how to use linking words. Further, S7 said that she also needed knowledge in grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation.

Thus, this analysis points out to the underdevelopment of certain cognitive skills among the undergraduate students. The concept of language proficiency and academic development was put forward by Cummins (1984) which clarifies the following: if the cognitive skills in L2 were not developed then it can be assumed that perhaps even L1 cognitive skills were undeveloped. Therefore, the students in the Colleges of Aden University should be aware of the cognitive skills and should draw on when writing. They should be able to accommodate the knowledge of these skills in their writing task. Nevertheless, following is a summary of the findings of students’ interview.

A Summary of the Findings of Students’ Interview

- The students’ interview showed that the undergraduate college students did not have good writing skills either in L1 or in FL / L2. This was because the cognitive/academic proficiency required for good academic writing was not developed.
Thus, the undergraduate college students are in need of improving the writing cognitive skills and this supports the researcher’s suggestion to include the process approach to writing in the writing syllabus of Aden University. Shaughnessy’s (1977, cited in Hairston, 1982) saying about the process of writing gives insight to the teaching of writing:

We cannot teach students to write by looking only at what they have written. We must also understand how that product came into being, and why it assumed the form that it did. We have to try to understand what goes on during the internal act of writing and we have to intervene during the act of writing if we want to affect its outcome. We have to do the hard thing, examine the intangible process, rather than the easy thing, evaluate the tangible product. (p. 84)

- The undergraduate students did not have good composing competence since they were not skilled in L1 and FL/L2 writing. The interview showed that they were not aware of the writing processes as they were not trained in class with such processes. Therefore, they did not know that writing requires certain skills. As Sommers (1980, cited in Kraples, 1990) states, “the skilled writers clearly understand what writing entails, whereas the unskilled writers did not” (p.180). Krapels (1990) cites Jones (1982) also says that “the poor writers had never learnt to compose, and this general lack of competence in composing, rather than a specific lack in L2 linguistic competence, was the source of difficulty to the unskilled writer in L2 writing” (p. 41).

- But since the students lacked knowledge about certain skills — grammar, vocabulary, linking words, organisation, punctuation, and spelling, the researcher suggests the inclusion of the genre approach. This is because such approach does not only focus on the linguistic knowledge but also on the rhetorical structure of a written text.
4.5 Think-aloud Protocol

This section describes the writing process of the undergraduate students at Aden University. The principal objective was to examine the learning strategies involved in carrying out a writing task. Think-aloud procedure, which is most suited to tasks which may involve non-verbal processes, was chosen to elucidate these strategies brought to bear on the task. Eight undergraduate students (three males and five females) each completed one task essay.

The task required the students to read a given topic and to write about it. They were asked to think aloud as they worked on the essay topic, 'Drinking when driving a car'. Each student was tested separately and each was given time to acquaint them with the task and think-aloud procedure. The students were asked to generate verbal reports aloud and without supervision so as not to feel embarrassed or monitored. And when the students were clear about what was required, they were asked to proceed with the task. A free time was given to them so as to complete the task. The students have been already given an example about the think-aloud procedure by the researcher.

Data from the tapes were transcribed in full by the researcher (see Appendix 6) and their utterances were put between two square brackets, whereas their intended written words were not bracketed. The examination of the think-aloud protocol showed that the undergraduate students used a number of strategies while composing. It also showed that the use of cognitive processes involved in writing could contribute to an understanding of what it was that composition task demanded.

Research, however, has supported the effectiveness of using strategies to improve the writing skills. The most general finding is that the use of appropriate strategies yields improved proficiency or achievement overall or in certain areas.
O'Malley and Chamot (1990) indicate that the learners are mentally active during the learning process and that good language learners are conscious of this process. Flower and Hayes (1981) have observed in their theory of cognitive process that the students while writing used a number of strategies.

The Analysis of Think-aloud Protocol

It has been identified that the undergraduate students used a number of strategies while they were doing the writing task and here is the discussion and interpretation of some of the strategies identified from the think-aloud protocol of the students:

Planning Strategies

Planning was actually one of the strategies used by all the students. Here are some examples, which show that they planned, thought about what they wanted to say and they then started writing.

'... So the first thing of driving when drinking and driving a car... that causes many effects of the people who drink while driving they are they are careless people so is it? Will it be the opening sentence ok... first I will say that drinking when driving is something dangerous or very dangerous yes' (S1).

'... drinking when driving a car... ahh may be my point of view is very obvious about this ... I don’t like it ... many reasons ... it’s not allowed ... in our religion ... but some of us do so ... ok ... everyone ... may make this mistake so drinking when driving a car first of all drinking is very bad habit ... that’s my opinion is very bad habit like smoking because it’s dangerous for health so drinking is very bad habit... ahh... ‘(S2).

'... actually... when driving a car is the topic that I should talk about’ ‘... ahh... what should I write first ...’ (S3).
'... drinking ... ok drinking when driving a car ... ok... drinking here may be... drinking when driving a car yes they happen a lot in western western community yes drinking ...... when driving a car ... yes ......' (S4)

'a drinking alcohol driving a car...... I think it it seem ... it seem very important subject...... drinking alcohol when driving a car driving a car ... ahh what shall I start...... what shall I start which sentence can I start... drinking drinking alcohol drinking is a bad habit... drinking ...' (S5).

'it will lead you to make an accident an accident ahh... that ahh what can I do next? What can I write? ... what can I write next? ... Drinking ...' (S5).

'OK ... drinking when driving a car ... drinking ... when driving a car ... what can I say about ... drinking ... drinking ... drinking ... drinking ... '(S6).

'...... the first thing that I am going to write to do is ... try about driving in general ... ... so ...... ahh......' (S7)

'So now I will say ...... I go through details' (S7).

'Ok how should I start ok I am going to write some notes or some words as a notes ... ok ...

| For drinking bad habit it makes the person non awareness less | For driving a car driver should be alert / aware all the time. (S8).

Thus, the think-loud protocol revealed that the undergraduate students used the planning strategies through which they formed an internal representation of the knowledge that was used or which helped them in writing. Hedge (1988) makes it clear that planning strategy includes different things – a number of "points" (p. 22) put down to be contained in a piece of writing, "notes" and a brief "plan; or a mental"
plan "such as: 'I'll start by describing the problems, then I'll suggest two alternatives; I'll give the Nigerian example and discuss its advantages, then ...."." (p. 22).

Planning, however, as Flower and Hayes (1981) state, includes "a number of sub-processes" such as "generating ideas" which itself comprises "retrieving relevant information from long-term memory" (p. 372).

**Strategies for Generating Ideas**

Retrieving information from long term memory is one of the strategies for generating ideas and elaborating. The undergraduate students retrieved information from long-term memory (LTM) as well as from short-term memory (STM). And here are some examples:

'they may explore peoples' life into danger and they don't care of the consequences...... of the consequences ... ah ... Islam ah Islam ...... our Islam...... our religious our religious Islam forbid drinking alcohol not because of no reason but our God wants ah... want ... wants to us the good ....' (S1).

'I don't like it ... many reasons ... it's not allowed ... in our religion ... but some of us do so... ok ... everyone ... many make this mistake... ' (S2).

'OK... drinking when driving a car... actually I remember a story that my dad was driving a car and we were with him ... but ... suddenly he stopped ... stopped the engines of the car because there was ... someone walking not in a straight way in front of his car ... and he also was a drunk ....' (S3).

'drinking when driving a car yes they happen a lot in western western community' (S4).

'I saw stories that happens because of yes ok I saw I heard sorry I heard not saw I heard I heard some stories some stories ... yes ... about accidents' (S4).
'and drinking is a bad habit ... ah ... while while driving ...... while driving ... ah because ... it will leads because it will lead ... because it lead or it will lead?... it will lead you ... it will lead it will leads you or it will lead you ... it will lead you ... ahh it will lead you ... it will lead you to it will lead you ... to ... to to make an accident...' (S5).

'... the government should punish ... those who drinks especially while driving because they risks other peoples' ... they risk ... without's' ... they risk other peoples' ...' (S6).

However, S7 seemed to retrieve from STM, whereas S8 from LTM.

'like now I'm thinking about the drinking and ahh... its bad effect on driving ...' (S7).

'a driver should be alert all the time and drinking make and drinking make the person person ... unconscious' (S8).

Thus, retrieving information from STM and LTM helped the undergraduate students in generating ideas. Witte and Faigley (1981) state that the better writers seem to have invention skills. This helps them elaborate and extend the concepts they have formed.

Goal – Setting

All the undergraduate students had a clear idea of the purpose for which they were writing. Their purpose was to show the bad effects drinking have on both the drivers and the others. This helped the undergraduate students in goal setting. Goal setting is another strategy, which helps not only in organising but also in elaboration. Witte and Faigley (1981) clarify that setting the goals yields in elaborating the ideas that lead to other complex goals which in turn link “content with purpose” (p. 199). Goal setting, they also clarify, is a continuous process of composing.
Organisation

The undergraduate students were aware of organisation as they composed. They tried to generate ideas, explored the ideas, linked them properly and brought cohesion in their writing as possible as they could. They showed, for example, the grammatical and/or the lexical relationship between sentences or between different parts of a sentence. Here are examples showing the students’ awareness of organisation:

‘Drinking when driving a car is something very dangerous. It causes many effects that sometimes get a person to die’ (S1).

‘Drinking is very bad habit. Furthermore it is very dangerous because it may cause bad results...’ (S2).

‘Drinking when driving a car is something forbidden. Actually so many accidents could happen’ (S3).

‘OK I wrote how many five points I think it’s enough... ok that’s it’ (S4).

‘an accident an accident ah ... that ah what can I do next? What can I write? ... what can I write next?’ (S5).

‘Drinking is a bad habit. It affects both the family and the society/’ (S6).

‘So...it it... sometimes you have to stop and think more and more ... to get the link ... the suitable linker to linker two sentences like now...’ (S7).

‘Drinking is a bad habit. It causes many diseases. On other hand if a driver drinks alcohol while he is driving he may make... an accident ...’ (S8).

Thus, the above examples showed the importance those students gave to organisation which therefore helped them in generating ideas. Flower and Hayes (1981) contend that organisation of ideas in writing helps the writer thinks creatively
and therefore search and discover “superordinate ideas and subordinate ideas” (p. 372) that develop the target topic.

**Reviewing**

Revising and evaluating are two sub-processes of reviewing. The undergraduate students, however, revised their work as they wrote:

‘it sometime ah... effects that get a person to death... get a person to die...’

(S1).

‘Furthermore it is very dangerous because it may cause bad results such as drinking when driving car... I forgot the ‘a’ a car...’ (S2).

‘Actually so many accidents could happen ... ah ... could happen yah could happen infinitive could infinitive happen not happened yes amm ... a ... a new story...’ (S3).

‘ok ... I see a lot of accidents I saw stories that happens because of yes ok I saw I heart sorry I heard not saw I heard I heard some stories some stories ... yes ...... about accidents ...’ (S4).

‘it will leads you or it will lead you... it will lead you ... ahh it will lead you ...

(S5).

‘if you want to save their life... I think it doesn’t work if you want to save ...’

(S5).

‘and the government should punish... those who drinks especially while driving because they risks other people’s ... they risk ... without ‘s’ ... they risk ...’

(S6).

‘Driving is is not a good job. However some people think it’s... a mean job ...

so ... is ... sorry I found one mistake ...’ (S7).
'drinking itself is a bad and dangerous ... so it ... so imagine also now I found another mistake ...' (S7).

'a driver should not drink... or should not drive while he is drinking ...' (S8).

'drinking is a bad habit ... it causes many diseases ... to the person ... it causes many diseases to the person ... to the drinker no ... ok it causes many diseases ... it causes many diseases. (S8)

Further, all the students had been observed evaluating their work. They judged which ideas should be mentioned. This took place when they included their viewpoints in their writing, which were relevant to their purpose. Scardamalia and Bereiter (1986) clarify that writers, while composing, stop before they proceed with the text so as to alter or make new plans as the writing progresses. They observed that expert writers concentrate on the meaningfulness of their text as they composed. Gagne (1985) also explains that when the writer, in the translation stage, jots down the ideas, it is beneficial for the writer to have automatic writing skills of this sort so that attention can be freed for developing the cohesion and coherence and knowledge of audience which improve the quality of writing.

Recursiveness

Recursiveness was observed among the undergraduate students. They did not go straight forward in one direction from the beginning to the end. But they stopped before they continue moving back revising, editing, and generating new ideas. The following utterances are examples of Recursiveness:

'OK I will repeat again...' (S1).

'I will write it again?' (S6)

'... now I will reread I will read again my topic to check whether I miss some points that didn’t mention or something like that...' (S7).
‘So I am going to write the last draft …’ (S8).

Hairston (1977) explains that writing is “a recursive process” in which the cognitive processes of writing “overlap and intervene” but not “a linear process” (pp. 6-7). Murray (1985) also states that writing as a process does not go in one direction but it is “a recursive” in which writers “review” (p. 7) what they have written moving back and forth.

**Monitoring**

Monitoring was a strategy used by the undergraduate students as they composed. Editing and altering were done by them and were on-going processes.

**Reader-Awareness**

The undergraduate students gave importance to the reader, i.e. audience. They borne in mind the readers since they were concerned about showing them the disadvantages or the effects of drinking when driving a car. They really seemed to address the readers as they went on composing.

One can conclude that the students at Aden University used a number of strategies while they were writing, though they were not taught or helped to practise such strategies. Since most of the teachers and students lacked the knowledge of these strategies, English or writing teachers at Aden University should not only be aware and trained in the teaching of these writing strategies but also be able to implement these in their instructional classes to help their students be competent in using them when writing. However, the summary of the findings of the students’ think-aloud protocol will be outlined below.
A Summary of the Findings of Students' Think-aloud Protocol

It is observed from the analysis of the think-aloud protocol that the undergraduate college students used a variety of strategies during the process of writing. They applied appropriate strategies to the task requirement.

- They did planning.
- They did generate ideas through retrieving information from long-term and short-term memories.
- They did have a purpose for writing, which helped them in goal setting.
- They did organising through linking the ideas properly and bringing cohesion in their writing. They showed the grammatical and/or the lexical relationship between sentences or between the different parts of a sentence.
- They did revise, monitor or evaluate.
- They were conscious of the reader.
- They did recur when composing.

This supports the researcher's suggestion to include the process approach of writing in the syllabus of the departments of English in the Colleges of Aden University. Therefore, the undergraduate students should be trained to use a variety of strategies while composing so as to improve their writing skills and help them overcome their difficulties.

The undergraduate college students should first of all be made aware that there are strategies that help in developing good writing skills. Then, the strategies have to be used consciously while writing. Finally, after having some practice in using them, they could be used automatically. Oxford, Lavine, and Crookall (1989, p. 36) have stressed the importance of learner awareness of strategy use and teacher's role in strategy training.
4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has provided the aim of each research tool used in this study, the design, administration, and reliability and validity.

It has presented the analysis of the data collected through the tools of: (1) classroom observation; (2) teachers' questionnaire; (3) students' questionnaire; (4) teachers' interview; (5) students' interview; and (6) think-aloud protocol.

The analysis of the data gathered by each tool has been discussed in detail in accordance with the results obtained. The analysis and discussion of the data have been followed by the summary of the findings of the analysis of data.

Thus, the findings have shown that things were radically wrong with the way writing was taught in our colleges. They have also shown that teachers were doing things in the writing classrooms since they have never been shown a better way of teaching writing. And if they could undergo a reorientation programme as soon as possible, they would be able to guide their students in more beneficial ways.

It is evident from the findings that there is a contradiction between what teachers believed to be good in teaching writing and what actually do in the writing classroom. The classroom observation indicated that teachers did not apply what they believed to be good in teaching writing.

Some responses to certain questions in the teachers' questionnaire provided evidence which proves that teachers do not apply what they thought to be good in teaching good writing and thereby providing evidence of their ignorance of the principles they chose in their questionnaire. For example, the responses to question '4' in the 'syllabus' section, which asked the teachers' about the way they could best help students become independent writers, showed that the majority of teachers (87%) chose the option '(c) by teaching students not only to apply the grammatical rules of a
language in order to form correct sentences but also to get them know when, why, and how to write these correct, connected sentences and to whom.'

Also, the responses to question '4' in the 'Attitudes towards writing in English' section, which asked the teachers about the way teachers should deal with students' errors, showed that (73%) of teachers chose option '(c) respond positively and equally to the strengths in a student's writing as to correction of errors. He/She should tick in the margin and praise in the comments as equally as commenting on errors.' But all these responses are against the data collected by means of classroom observation.

Nevertheless, the next chapter will give a brief idea about the approach proposed in this thesis. It will also make an attempt to map this idea out. It will then provide some general and theoretical principles for application in a writing class to improve the academic writing at a college level. It will, next, present an analysis of the data collected by means of teachers' questionnaire. The questionnaire aims to collect teachers' views on the proposed writing tasks. The chapter will end with providing the proposed writing tasks and a suggestion for further research.