

Raising Teachers' Awareness about the Teaching of Writing through the Process Approach

Dr KESKES Saïd

University Ferhat Abbas of Setif, Algeria

Ms. BENABDALLAH Lina, Fulbright Scholar,
University of Springfield, Missouri, USA

Abstract:

There is a large body of research supporting the positive effects of teaching the writing skill through the process approach to small groups. Indeed, scholars like Hyland (2003) and Williams (2003) have highlighted the importance of usefulness of teaching the learners a step by step writing approach rather than emphasizing the final product. The primary aim of this study is to investigate real teaching contexts of writing sessions as they occur in second year classes, in order to be able to explore the problems that lie behind the learners' underachievement in written productions. For this to be possible; we have conducted a qualitative descriptive research using a multiple case study design and involving one observation session for each of the two teachers involved in the study. We have opted for video recording as an observational tool because it offers a unique access inside the target classroom's teaching reality. The findings point out that teachers do lack adequate training for classroom management and especially when it comes to coping with overcrowded groups. Accordingly, this study has resulted in raising teachers' awareness about solutions to the problem observed by providing ways of implementing the process approach to small groups, and by suggesting some recommendations based on their weaknesses revealed in the analysis.

Key words: Process, Writing, Collaborative Teaching, Teachers' Awareness, Classroom Observation, Classroom Management.

المخلص:

تتجه الكثير من البحوث حاليا نحو ما يسمى بتدريس المهارة الكتابية عبر المقاربة المسارية لأفواج الصغيرة، ويفسر هذا التوجه بانعكاسات الإيجابية العديدة على المردودية البيداغوجية في تطوير الكتابة. باحثون كهيلند وويليامس 2003 بلوروا أهمية وفائدة تدريس الكتابة بالخطوات - المقاربة المسارية - بدلا عن إعطاء الأهمية للمنتج الكتابي النهائي. الهدف الأساسي لهذا البحث يمكن في التحقيق في طريقة تدريس الكتابة كما يحدث في أقسامنا ليتسنى لنا الإطلاع على المشاكل التي تعيق تطوير المهارة الكتابية عند المتعلمين.

Introduction

When teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), teachers usually follow a certain order beginning with listening, speaking, reading, and then writing. This order may change depending on the needs of the learners, but usually the writing skill is placed at the end because it is claimed to be highly complex and difficult to master, as argued by Richards & Renandya (2002:303) "There is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill for L2 to master." Furthermore; in the Algerian context, writing in English, unlike speaking, listening and even reading, is not practised outside the classroom, so what the students learn inside the language class is only practised inside and has little chance to be improved elsewhere. This is why we believe that teachers are responsible for elaborating adequate teaching methods and techniques to facilitate this skill. Besides; mastering the writing skill is of tremendous importance for the students of the English Department because of its influence on the other modules, which need written productions to be tested and evaluated (Linguistics, Literature, and Civilization). This study identifies the following major writing problems faced at the university level and provides a literature review to contribute in raising teachers' awareness on the usefulness of the writing process approach and small group teaching.

1. Major Problems of Writing in Batna University

1.1 Teachers' Overemphasis on the Final Product

Data obtained from video recording reveal that teachers use a product approach to writing. They provide feedback after the piece of writing is finished, and when correcting it, they focus on form (grammar, spelling, and pronunciation) at the expense of content (ideas, meaning). Such an approach is claimed to be inappropriate (Harmer, 2002; Hedge, 1988; Parson, 1985) and criticized on the grounds that insisting on correct grammatical sentences and text swiftness shape most students' inability to write coherent paragraphs.

Although the product approach has declined many decades away (the seventies) in Europe, it is still widely adopted in countries where English is taught as a foreign language like in Korea, China, Japan, and

Taiwan (Kim & Kim, 2005). Consequently, writing curricula are based on a product approach and teachers lack training in processing teaching.

1.2 Lack of Appropriate Classroom Management Techniques

Video recording has allowed to picture classroom realities and given access to real teaching situations. Data related to classroom organization have revealed that the groups are overcrowded, up to 45 students per class. It has also displayed realities about the way teachers manage their classrooms to create a healthy environment for learning. In fact; classes were unorganized, uncontrolled, and were in majority taught in whole class setting. Data interpretation has revealed that practising writing in groups of 45 students with no management techniques impedes learners' written productions improvement. Thus; a second major obstacle to improving learners' written productions is teachers' awareness of classroom management techniques and lack of training in small group teaching.

2. Theoretical Background

Gatfield (1999) claims that small group teaching allows students to explore a diversity of opinions, better retain information and efficiently tackle projects too large to be handled by an individual, and writing tasks are no exception. Accordingly, we believe that examining the combination of the process approach with small group teaching techniques can contribute to raising teachers' awareness about how to teach the writing skill to small groups through the process approach.

2.1 Teaching the Writing Skill through the Process Approach

In the late 1970's, the reaction to the product approach made teachers feel that students were not set free to think and express what they wanted, as Leki (2002:62) puts it "With the arrival of process approaches to teaching writing and the emphasis on multiple drafting, it eventually became clear that merely giving L 2 writers model texts to imitate and making their errors did not produce better writers." Indeed; the process approach is concerned with teaching writing the way professional writers do, it is composed of several stages through which the students and the teacher should go to

achieve the final product. According to Curry (1996:1) "Tutors help clarify students' misconceptions about writing by explicitly teaching the stages of the writing process." The process approach teaches writing through practising, without giving much importance to form (spelling, grammar), it rather stresses the message included and advocates that the learners will gain control over the sub-skills concerned with the form spontaneously within the process. Besides; the writing process is based on equal participation of both learners and teachers. It makes learners feel more confident thanks to the fact that it is composed of many stages, and that learners start with simple and small blocks of writing. Brunch & Reynolds (2002:12) argue that "Rational to this approach to writing instruction has been that students will become less frustrated if they first learn the building blocks of writing and then later used them when asked to compose more complex pieces of writing".

The process approach has many other advantages which all aim at facilitating learning. Bedger & White (2000:165) argue that one of the most important advantages of the writing process is that every learner is responsible for his improvement and contributes to it actively: "[The writing process] allows students to understand the steps involved in writing, and it recognizes that what learners bring to the writing classroom contributes to the development of the writing skill." Grabe & Kaplan (1996) summarize the benefits of the approach in the following points:

- 1- Write on relevant topics they find interesting rather than on topics the teacher assigns.**
- 2- Plan their writing with a purpose in mind and a context to base the written text on rather than write freely without having anything to say.**
- 3- Be creative and imaginative using pre-writing activities, different drafts and feedback between these rather than immediately putting pen to paper without previous planning and revision.**
- 4- Get feedback from real audience either from peers, small groups, or the teacher through formative evaluation.**

- 5- **Focus on content and personal expression rather than the final copy, grammar and usage.**
- 6- **Look at writing as recursive rather than linear process since repetition of activities and steps are relevant and necessary.**
- 7- **Be aware of the writing process and the issues relevant to it, such as audience, planning, etc, rather than teach learners to write with no suitable method.**

Grabe & Kaplan (ibid.) claim that the process approach is considered as positive in that it helps teachers and learners interact more meaningfully and with a purpose in mind. Williams (2003:101) defines it as a top-down approach by saying that: "it is top-down, not bottom-up, which means that, the focus is on producing entire papers, not on grammar or parts of papers." His definition criticizes the controlled composition method that requires learners to combine paraphrase or rewrite sentences, by stressing the importance of producing entire papers. On the usefulness of the process approach, he (ibid.) says "Perhaps more important however, is that process instruction aims to modify students' behaviours to match those of good writers; it does not concentrate on form or rules or literature."

There are different models in the process theory. The early ones brought descriptions of general steps to be followed such as prewriting, writing, and rewriting (Raimes 1983, Hedge op.cit.), while most recent ones provided more detailed descriptions (Gardner & Johnson 1997, William op. cit.) These latter are different in form but carry common insights pertaining to the importance of teachers' roles and quality of feedback in teaching process writing which are going to be discussed subsequently. William (ibid.) proposes a model of eight stages giving a definition and a description to each stage as follows:

**Table 1: Williams' Writing Process Model
Stages of Writing**

Writing Process	Definition	Description
Prewritin	Generating ideas, strategies, and information for a given written task.	Prewriting activities take place before starting on the first draft of a paper. They include discussion, outlining, pre-writing, journals, talk-write, and metaphore.
Planning	Reflecting on the material produced during pre-writing to develop a plan to achieve the aim of the paper	Planning involves considering your rhetorical stance, rhetorical purpose, and the principal aim of the text, how they are connected to the information generated during pre-writing. Planning also involves selecting support for your claim and blocking out at least a rough organizational structure.
Drafting	Producing words on a computer or on paper that match (more or less) the initial plan for the work.	Drafting occurs over time. Successful writers seldom try to produce an entire text in one setting or even in one day.
Pausing	Moments when students are not writing but instead are reflecting on what you have produced and how well it matches your plan. Usually includes reading.	Pausing occurs among successful and unsuccessful writers, but they use it in different ways. Successful writers consider "global" factors: how well the texts match the plan, how well it is meeting audience'needs, and overall organization.

Reading	Moments during pausing when you read what you have written and compare it to your plan.	Reading and writing are interrelated activities. Good readers are good writers and vice-versa. The reading that takes place during writing is crucial to the reflection process during pausing.
Revising	Literally, “re-seeing” the text with the goal of making large-scale changes so that text and plan match.	Revising occurs after you have finished your first draft. It involves making changes that enhance the match between plan and text. Factors to consider usually are the same as those you considered during planning: rhetorical stance, purpose, etc.
Editing	Focussing on sentence-level concern such as punctuation, sentence length, and spelling, agreement of subjects and predicates, and style.	Editing occurs after revising. The goal is to give your paper a professional appearance.
Publishing	Sharing your finished text with its intended audience.	Publishing is not limited to getting a text printed. It includes turning a paper in to a teacher, boss, or an agency.

We believe that William’s model (ibid.) is the most appropriate description because it gives importance to several steps and provides enough details that facilitate its use. It includes discussions about techniques that should be used for an effective process approach such as peer editing and feedback, and stresses the importance of teachers’ roles and feedbacks.

2.1.1 Teacher's Role

It has previously been said that the writing process is an active process, which involves learners in an active learning model. The role of the teacher is of paramount importance; s/he is a facilitator of the writing process and should guide the learners through the different stages of the process without imposing his/her opinion in decision taking. Candlin & Hall (2002: 23) claim "Teachers are encouraged not to impose their view, give models, or suggest response to topics beforehand." They clearly argue that teachers should not be the center of the teaching / learning process; they should not suggest responses to the learners but give them enough time to look for answers themselves. They should teach implicitly through the "learning by doing" method.

William (op. cit: 106) claims that the best roles effective teachers should play in a writing lesson is "coaching". "Coaches intervene regularly in the learning process, immediately correcting those things students do wrong and appraising those things students do right, giving reinforcement." Accordingly, effective writing teachers should correct learners' mistakes immediately and praise their well doing. In fact; giving reinforcement is a very important aspect in the learning process in general, and to the writing process specifically "In most cases, students will adopt more effective behaviours when they are encouraged and corrected on the spot." (William, *ibid*, 105)

The process approach to writing is not a magic formula that can work by itself. Writing teachers have a great part of responsibility to play. They should be coaches providing immediate feedback when needed and reinforcement. Along these lines, Kroll (2003:115) approves claiming "Second language writers often benefit most and make most progress when teachers contribute to this goal through a variety of intervention strategies available in classroom settings." Among the intervention strategies that Kroll (*ibid*.) is speaking about, are feedback techniques, discussed below.

2.1.2 Importance of Feedback

Panaflorida (2002:346) defines feedback as "an internal feature of student writing in as much as it enables students to identify their own

strengths and weaknesses, which in the case of the latter; will the students know how to go about improving themselves and becoming more effective writers.” Furthermore; Grabe & Kaplan (op.cit, 378) define it as: “A final grade on a paper, often accompanied by much red ink throughout the essay.” Ferris (2003:28-29) explains that research has shown that feedback significantly improves the learners’ productions. Russikoff & Kogan’s (1996) findings also prove its positive effects on learners’ reading skill also, for it provides them with opportunities of reading either when commenting on their classmates’ texts, or when revising their own texts after the teachers’ feedback are provided. James (1998:13) concludes saying that “Process teaching thus assumes that students will develop their reading and writing abilities through acquisition, that is, through practice and supportive feedback rather than through learning in the traditional sense.”

There are two types of feedback that teachers can apply in classes: teacher feedback and peer feedback. Teacher feedback refers to comments or evaluation made by the teacher on students’ written works. They can either be content-based or form-based comments. In this respect, Grabe & Kaplan (op.cit.) note that teachers must be careful in order to avoid two extremes that often reached when providing feedback. One being that their comments are vague and non-directional that learners do not know what they practically have to do in order to improve themselves. Comments such as “rephrase” or “improve” are not clear enough and provide no effective guidance in the process. Comments may also be strict and detailed that the learners lose motivation to write. Grabe & Kaplan’s view is in perfect agreement with Ferris’ (2003:14-15) who talks about non-specific and inaccurate comments and inappropriate feedback. An alternative to teacher feedback is peer feedback; a student receives peer feedback when a fellow student provides it. It should complement teachers’ feedbacks. It fits well in a process approach to writing (Stassen, 2002) Peer feedback is recommended for the different advantages it offers. According to Topping (1998:262), “feedback appears capable of yielding outcomes at least as good teacher assessment and

sometimes better.” Nijenhuis (2005:13) argues, “Peers (...) provide encouragement, are less threatening, and can supply more feedback than what a teacher perhaps can give.” Jacobs et al. (1998) add that in the case of cooperative writing, peer feedback can serve to provide information about how to write as well as knowledge about what to write. However, Jacobs et al. (ibid.) maintain that there is a disadvantage with peer feedback when the writer receives too many opinions, not knowing which one is useful or correct, thus conflict might rise. Cho et al. (2006: 261) add that “Peers do not [always] take the task seriously, are not as qualified as the instructor in the subject matter, have had little training in writing or practice at making comments, and are simply not the reader assigning grades”. Hyland (2003:199) provides a clear summary, displayed below, of the potential advantages and disadvantages of peer feedback.

Table 2: Potential Pros and Cons of Peer Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Active learner participation- Authentic communicative context- Non judgmental environment- Alternative and authentic audience- Writers gain understanding of reader needs- Reduced apprehension about writing- Development of critical reading skills- Reduces teachers' workload	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Tendency to focus on surface forms- Potential for overly critical comments- Cultural reluctance to criticize and judge- Students unconvinced of comments' value- Weakness of readers's knowledge- Students may not use feedback in revisions- Students may prefer teacher feedback

In this respect, we assume that even if there are risks to take, peer feedback remains a very useful technique within the writing process.

After having discussed the process approach, which we have suggested as an alternative to the product approach, we move now to

discuss the second axe of this paper pertaining to classroom management techniques.

2.2 Small Group Teaching as a Classroom Management Technique

Small group work is a form of cooperation; it consists in organizing students in small units to better manage large classrooms. Small group teaching is an effective alternative to whole class teaching (Harmer, 2002; Mills, 2003) because it offers a considerable amount of advantages.

2.2.1 Psychological Advantages

Students' satisfaction with learning is enhanced when they are actively involved in activities encouraging their sense of responsibility of learning. Johnson & Johnson (1994) argue that cooperative learning, especially learning in small groups, generally leads to greater self-esteem than competitive or individualistic efforts. They explain that students gain greater self-esteem by achieving challenging goals, by gaining the respect of others, and through favourable comparisons with others. Slavin (1995) argues that self-esteem is the most important psychological outcome of cooperative learning methods and referring to a study by Maddan & Slavin (1983, cited in Slavin, op.cit.) where they found significantly greater general self-esteem in cooperative groups than in control whole class groups.

Another psychological advantage of small group teaching is its positive impact on students' anxiety. Indeed; the difference between teaching whole classes and small groups is that in the first one each student takes charge of a number of tasks and responsibility of receiving feedback or comment on it from the instructor. In this case, the focus is cast on one student, which puts him/her in a situation of high anxiety and confusion in case of mistakes. However; in cooperative settings, small groups are the units of the class, and thus, students share in groups what an individual in traditional classes is expected to do alone. When the end product is ready, the members of the group present the answer and no individual is subject to

criticism. This reduces anxiety to a very low level in the class, and leads students to produce and develop better.

2.2.2 Academic Advantages

Being a teaching technique, promotive active learning in small groups gets students involved in all what is going on in the class, and thus helps them improve their skills in many ways. Besides; group work is an enjoyable, lively, and interesting way of learning. Students keep interested in the tasks they handle together and are encouraged to be regularly present in th class. Avoiding absences increases learning. Johnson & Johnson (1990) have proved that there is a strong positive connection between class attendance and success in courses. Small group teaching also provides a chance for exchange of information among learners. In fact; a great amount of learning happens among group members. Brown (op.cit.) and Harmer (2003), cited in Ramirez (2004:2-4) develop some principles in which group work is grounded.

2.2.3 Teachers'Roles in Small Group Teaching

In order to gain a maximum profit from small group teaching, teachers should be aware of a number of things. Group work should be well planned and structured so that every one knows what to do. It is important to insist on the fact that small group teaching does not mean a "lazy teacher and a lost learner". Teachers need to pay attention to all the details to facilitate the work of their learners. Combining students of disparate abilities, gender, or ethnic background to form heterogeneous groups. As put by Farmer (1999:2) "Students' backgrounds, experiences, and skills can be reorganized and used to best advantage when groups are arranged to maximize diversity. At its most basic level; group membership can be comprised of varying ethnicities, genders and learning styles." Heterogeneous groups are the best formula in structuring small groups (Millis, op.cit.) Teachers' role is of utmost importance because if they do not give directions to manage groups, the technique cannot be successful, as put by Svinicki (2000:1-2) "In all small group designs, however, the key to success will be the instructor's directions to the group."

2.3 Teaching Writing as a Process to Small Groups

Several studies related to teaching the writing process using small groups have been conducted in different universities and colleges. In 2004, Ruuie & Honeycutt (cited in *TESL Journal* 2004) conducted, in the university of North Carolina (USA), a research to investigate the effectiveness of the use of the writing process approach. They examined a variety of works, such as that of Scannella (1992, cited in Ruuie & Honeycutt (ibid.), who conducted a year experimental study about the effects of the writing as a process model on 121 graduate students' writing performances. The students of the experimental group received instruction on the process approach, while those of the control one received instruction using standard methods of teaching composition (handouts, textbooks, teaching grammar in isolation..) Scannella (ibid.) found that students taught through the process model evidenced greater improvement in their expository writing than did those of the control group. Along the same lines, Singh & Sarkar (1994, cited in *TESL Journal*, 1995) conducted, in an Indian college, a study to examine the effects of the process approach on students written performances. They concluded proposing an Interaction Process Approach to solve writing problems observed among tertiary level students. O'Donnell & Dansereau (1994, cited in *TESL Journal*, 1995) reached the conclusion that teaching writing in small groups can improve the students' performances. So is the case also with Gocsik's experimental research (2005) to assess the efficacy of peer groups in the writing classrooms.

Teaching the writing skill through the process approach requires a well organized and managed classroom in terms of stages to be followed and group size to be formed. Because of these reasons, and the diverse advantages discussed above, we have hypothesized that many of our students' problems of writing may be due to our teachers' unawareness of the existence of a process approach as a writing teaching technique as well of the importance of organizing large classes into small groups to gain efficiency in their written productions. We hypothesize also that these problems may originate from the implementation of traditional methods of teaching writing.

3. Aim of the Study

This study seeks to provide teachers with some recommendations as to how to improve writing efficiency, in order to do away with some of the problems they and their students are facing when learning how to write. Answers to the following questions will help to some extent achieve this objective:

- 1- **To what extent are the teachers of the writing skill aware of the process approach?**
- 2- **To what extent are the teachers of the writing skill aware of the importance of managing overcrowded classes with small group size classroom organization ?**

4. Methodology

We believe that there is no best way for classifying research methods in the field of education. The choice of the research design is bound up with the problem situation and data type. Our study observes, describes, and analyzes real classroom contexts; it is descriptive, qualitative research that makes use of the case study design.

4.1 Research Instrument

It has been decided that the best way to collect reliable data is classroom observation, i.e. collecting data in real classroom situations. This allows the collection of concrete evidence on how a teacher teaches the writing skill and also about classroom management techniques used. To this end, video recording has been opted as an observational tool for the unique advantages it offers. Paterson (2003:5) summarizes the advantages of such a tool of research: video recording produces permanent, complete record of the traffic scene. The recording may be analyzed at any step, requiring small labor power. It is finally vital for researches wanting to make judgements on the behaviours of the participants. Along the same line; Koshy (2005:104) highlights other potentials in using video recording. He (ibid.) states that students' behaviours and attitudes can be captured with greater accuracy than by making observation notes. Video makes the sharing of data with colleagues and fellow researchers possible and easier to manage, which is

very useful at the time of dissemination through the provision of powerful images which are hard to match by other means of communication.

4.2 Corpus

The corpus includes all teachers' and learners' verbal and some non-verbal behaviours performed in two lessons with two different groups of teachers. Questionnaires have been administered.

4.3 Participants

The target population consists of teachers in charge of teaching the writing skill to second year students at the English Department in Batna University (Algeria). Doing one observation with one teacher has been thought to be non-representative. Therefore, two teachers have been selected to observe and analyze their ways of teaching before any recommendation can be suggested to them. Being part-time, the third teacher has not been included in the population. The learners involved are second year students distributed in two different groups with 45 individuals each displaying mixed abilities and age.

4.4 Lessons

The lessons transcribed are exercise sessions involving writing productions. Indeed; observing a teacher explaining theoretically an aspect of the writing skill may bring some significance but cannot be as revealing as when a written production is being practised. More precisely; it is the steps followed by the teachers that need to be observed, such as: amount of feedback, quality of feedback, amount of learners' engagements, and also whether small group teaching is implemented in class. Evidently, the analyses rely on the salient aspects about how to improve the writing skill discussed in the literature above. Namely, it is William's process (2003), which has been opted to analyse teachers' approaches, for it seems to be the most complete model.

4.5 Research Phases

At first, sessions of simulation have been organized with the teachers and learners. They are meant to get them both acquainted with video recording. Then, one session with each group has been recorded. After this,

Transcriptions of the recorded lessons have been carried out according to the Sinclair & Coulthard's model in terms of structural subdivision of the transcripts. A step that is essential before any work of analyses and interpretation can be activated.

5. Results and Discussions

For practical reasons to avoid lengthy descriptions and analyses, only some prominent rubrics related to the writing process and classroom management are discussed.

Rubric 1: Overview of Classroom Management

Table 3: Overview of Classroom Management

Classroom Organization	C1	%	C2	%
Individuals	20	55,60	23	57,50
Pairs	16	44,40	12	30,00
Small Groups	00	00,00	00	00,00
Groups > 4	00	00,00	05	12,50
Total	36	100,00	40	100,00

The above table shows that more than a half of class 1 is organized in individual learners (55,60%), pairs represent a high number of students (44,40%) while small groups and groups of four and more are inexistent. Also more than a half of class 2 prefer individual work (57,50%). Pairs in class 2 (30%) are less than in class 1 (44,44%) mainly because teacher one has limited the learners' choice to choose between individual and pair works, while in class 2, the learners have had more choice and thus have opted for groups involving more than four (12,50%). However, small groups are also inexistent in class 2 (00%) Rubric 2: Group Structure

Table 4: Group Structure

Group Structure	C1	%	C2	%
Teacher	06	16.67	00	00
Learners	30	83.33	40	100
Total	36	100	40	100

The table shows that teacher 1 is not much involved (16.67%) in group structure. Accordingly, it can be said that he does not seem to be aware of the role he should play to achieve cooperation, organization, and concentration. Data also reveal that all students (100%) are left free to organize themselves as they like and share tasks. Teacher 2 on the other hand seems to be unaware of the importance of his role to assign group structures, tasks, as well as checking students' participation.

Rubric 3: Teacher-student Interaction

Table 5: Teacher-student Interaction

Teacher-student Interaction	C1	%	C2	%
Teacher	10	71	45	61
Students	01	07	26	35
Collective	03	21	03	04
Total	34	100	74	100

Data reveal that teacher 1 dominates the class, being almost the only one who talked. It shows that only one student talked one time. Therefore, a classroom with 70% teacher's talk is far from being a learner-centred one. Moreover, in the three floors where some students answered collectively, in interaction took place because students only agreed with the teacher. Whereas in class 2, there more floors produced than in class 1. Besides, the learners' participation in class 2 is better in quantity as well as in quality. Indeed, in many of the teacher's floors, we notice invitation and encouragement for participation which proved to be rewarding for students participating frequently.

Rubric 4: Drafting Stage

This rubric and the following ones report to the teaching of the writing process. Only prominent ones have been selected for discussion, as follows:

Table 6: The Editing Stage

Editing Stage	C1	%	C2	%
Checked copies	00	00	04	13.80
Un-checked copies	28	100	25	86.20
Peer Editing	00	00	00	00.00
Total	28	100	29	100

Teacher 1 has not applied the editing stage; learners have not been asked to check content and form mistakes. In fact, the informal discussion reveals that such a stage has been planned to take place after the lesson. That is, three productions were to be chosen to be rewritten on the blackboard. Comment also was planned as well as mistakes' correction with learners' participation. Besides, more than half of the students received no teacher's help in checking and correcting. Teacher 2 seems to summarize this step in some reading without comments. Therefore, it can be said that he is unaware of the techniques related to editing.

Summary of the Results

The summary involves the outcomes of data interpretations concerned with the variables that the teachers' ought to be concerned with when teaching the writing skill. The variables concern features of the process approach applied on small groups.

Teacher 1

The first teacher has used a product and teacher-centred approach to deal with the writing skill and seems to lack training in implementing small group teaching. The following table reports interpretation of data related to him.

Table 8: Analyses of Teacher 1's Lesson

Variable	Outcome
Teacher's role in classroom organization	Teacher 1 is limited to suggesting peer work. Small groups are not present in class
Teachers's role in group structure	Teacher 1 does not intervene in selecting the pair members, except when changing the places of six students.

Teacher's role in assigning the tasks	Teacher 1 does not share the tasks among the students and leaves them free to do it.
Teachers' role in implementing positive interdependence	Teacher 1 seems to be unaware of this and does not check participation of all learners.
Teacher's role in promoting face-to-face interaction	Teacher 1 does not encourage students' participation and does not urge them to communicate with each other in English
Teacher-student interaction	The teacher speaks a lot more than the learners (71% vs.07%) He occupies the central place in the interaction.
Teacher's role in insuring and praising leadership as well as decision making	Teacher 1 has not displayed any interest about these aspects.
Pre-writing stage	Teacher 1 has not gone through this stage.
Drafting stage	Teacher 1 asks the learners to write a paragraph but gives no instruction to help them start it. He has not checked learners' first drafts.
Pausing stage	Teacher 1 has not initiated the learners to this stage
Editing stage	Neither form nor content mistakes have been taken care of. He has not also checked learners' papers nor asked other learners to peer edit them.
Publishing stage	No copy has been published.
Feedback	In absence of process approach steps, there has been a product-based feedback. Teacher 1 does not seem to be aware of the benefits that can be drawn from peer feedback.
Planning stage	Teacher 1 assumes that learners know how to plan thanks to the theoretical explanation he developed in class.
Reading stage	As it takes place withing the pausing stage, it has not taken place

Teacher 2

The second teacher may be said to have achieved a better performance in some of the stages of the process approach: teacher-student interaction, pre-writing, drafting and feedback. However, this performance lacks the needed consistency and does not seem to have been implemented with a principled strategy. This proves that Algerian teachers of writing may possess the potential to achieve process writing in class. They just need to be helped and made aware about it. In most of the other stages (11 out of 15), teacher 2 has used a clumsy and ineffective learner-centred approach, lacking training in the implementation of small group teaching. A more detailed report is displayed in the table below:

Table 9: Analyses of Teacher 1's Lesson

Variable	Outcome
Teacher's role in classroom organization	Teacher 2 does not intervene, leaving the students a total freedom for the choice of classroom organization.
Teachers's role in group structure	Teacher 2 does not intervene in group members.
Teacher's role in assigning the tasks	Teacher 2 does not share the tasks among the students and leaves them free to do it.
Teachers' role in implementing positive interdependence	Teacher 2 does not praise nor reinforce learners' participation.
Teacher's role in promoting face-to-face interaction	Teacher 2 does not encourage students' participation and does not urge them to communicate with each other in English
Teacher-student interaction	The teacher invites and encourages the learners to share ideas with him and express opinions.
Teacher's role in insuring and praising leadership as well as decision making	With 57.50% of individual learning and 00% of small group leadership, no student decision-making has taken place.
Pre-writing stage	Teacher 2 has really made learners generate ideas through effective brainstorming.

Drafting stage	Teacher 2 has constantly checked the works of 24% of the groups' copies, which is not rely enough.
Pausing stage	No pausing stage.
Editing stage	Teacher 2 does not seem to be aware of the editing stage by not asking learners to deal with style and peer editing.
Publishing stage	Only one copy has been published which is not enough to say such a stage has effectively been applied.
Feedback	Teacher 2 has provided a step by step content feedback by intervening several times while the texts are being produced. However feedback and peer feedback have been ignored.
Planning stage	Teacher 2 seems to be aware of the importance of outlining, however with no real implementation.
Reading stage	As it takes place withing the pausing stage, and no pausing stage occurred, it has therefore not happened.

6. Pedagogical Implications

As explained previously, this research seeks to check whether the teachers under observation are aware of the stages which are essential for the application of process writing. The observations reported in above tables prove that they are not, and if they they happen to apply some of the process writing stages, this is performed unconsciously. Definitely, both teacher need to be made aware of it through some recommendations reported below:

- Teachers should organize students in small groups of four to overcome the problem of crowded classes.
- Teachers should make their expectations explicite through clear rules and consistent procedures taught and reinforced.

During the first sessions, teachers should devote time to inform learners about the advantages of small group teaching.

- Teachers should mix up groups with learners of different abilities. They can do it by avoiding to organize them from the beginning of the year. They should take time to know the learners and then decide how to group them up.
- Teachers should also be responsible for assigning the tasks to the learners to avoid wasting time to assign fixed roles to the students or propose a rotation system to enable all the members to experience different missions: roles, monitor, recorder, reporter, checker, etc. Besides, they should check the participation of every learner through quizzes.
- Teachers should also assign a participation mark to motivate the students to cooperate and write the best productions. Praising individual contributions within group members is also appreciated.
- Leadership should also be praised as well as decision-making.

References

- Bедger, R & B, White (2000). A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing. ELT Journal, 54, 153-160.
- Brunch, P & T. J, Reynolds (2002). Curriculum and Affect: A Participator Development Writing Approach.
- Candlin, C & D; Hall (2002). Teaching and Researching Writing. London/ Longman.
- Cho, K & C. D, Schunn (2003). Validity and Reliability of Peer Assessments with a Missing Data Estimation Technique.
<http://ladybug.Irdc.pitt.edu/kcho/ref/ChoSchunn2@ED-MEDIA2003.pdf>
- Ferris, D (2003) Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gocsik, K (2005) Using Peer Groups in the Writing Classroom.
[http://www. Dartmouth.edu/-writing/materials/faculty/methods/peer groups.shtml](http://www.Dartmouth.edu/-writing/materials/faculty/methods/peer_groups.shtml)
- Grabe, W & B, Kaplan (1996) Theory and Practice of Writing. London and New York: Longman.
- Harmer, J (2001) The Practice of English Language Teaching. Second Language Writing. Cambridge University Press.
- Hedge, T (1988) Materials and Models in ELT: A Teacher's Guide. In Mc Donough Joe and Shaw Christopher, 1993, Blackwell Oxford, U.K and Cambridge, USA.
- Jackobs, G; Curties, A; Braine, A & G. Huang (1998) Feedback on Students' Writing: Taking the Middle Path Journal of Second Language Learning.
- Johnson, D.W & R.T. Johnson (1995) Positive Interdependence: Key to Effective Cooperation. In R.Hertz-Lazarovitz & N.,Miller (eds.) Interaction in Cooperative Groups. The Theoretical Anatomy of Group Learning. Cambridge University Press.
- Kroll, B (2003) Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing. Cambridge/ Cambridge University Press.

- Leki, I (2002) The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics: Second Language Writing. U.S.A Oxford University Press.
- Millis, B (2002) Speaking of Teaching. Winter, Vol,10.
- Nijenhuis, D (2005) Planning a Document and Feedback on Planning a Document. [http://www. Nada, kth.se/iplab/scribani/docs/Nijenhuis-KTH report 05, pdf](http://www.Nada.kth.se/iplab/scribani/docs/Nijenhuis-KTH-report-05.pdf).
- Penafloida, A. H (2002) Non Traditional forms of Assessment and Response to Student Writing: A Step Toward Learner Autonomy. In Richards, J.C & Renandya, W.A. (eds.)(2002)
- Slavin, R. E (1995) Cooperative Learning Theory, Research and Practice. 3rd London: Allyn & Bacon.
- Svinicki, M (2000) Using Small Groups to Promote [http//www. Utxas.edu/academic/cte/sourcebook/groups.pdf](http://www.Utexas.edu/academic/cte/sourcebook/groups.pdf). Learning.
- Williams, J.D (2003) Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory and Practice. 3rd ed. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.