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APPENDIX VIII.1: SCANNED COPY OF
A LOW-Achiever’S PRE-TEST (ESSAY)

1. The Introduction

Definition of the internet

(2 body)
1st paragraph is about the advantages of the internet
- and the domain with we use the internet.
2/ the disadvantages of the internet

Conclusion
The internet is one of the famous ways of communicating, learning and work in the world, especially in these last years. It has many or several advantages; now we can say that if some one don’t use the internet in his life, that he is a normal very older person among students, but the question here; how this way has changed our life, positive or negative?

First of all, students in their studies, need more the internet to help other people, because they need it for doing their topics, project, research or anything about their studies, and in addition to that, they can learn directly on the internet, just like a teacher, they can exchange the ideas between students and teachers in different countries, e.g., students from another part of the world, teachers in different countries. In other words, in the other countries, in our jobs, France students... etc. whereas in the other countries side, in our jobs, all the workers in any administration, schools, factories, or some... they should use the internet for gathering more experience from another; countries, for organize their job, for more facilitate, especially for exchange the experience and the knowledge, the products some times. But in the other, there are some people use the internet just for gathering more information, different cultures... etc.

Whereas, in the other side, there are a difficult, problem and disadvantages with the internet. Firstly, some people use the internet in a positive way, for example,
The internet is one of the famous and modern ways of communicating, learning, and working in the world, especially in these last years. It has many advantages and disadvantages. Now we can say that, if some one don’t or can’t use the internet in his life, that he is very older person, especially students. But the question here, how this modern way can change our life, in the two sides, negative or positive?

There are many advantages of the internet in different domains. First of all in studies, students need more the internet than the other people, because they are used it for doing their topics, projects, researches or many things about their studies. In addition to that, they can learn directly from the internet, they can exchange the information
between another students, teachers, scientists in different countries, U.S.A students, France... etc.

Whereas in the other side, (domain) like, the jobs: we can say that, all the workers in any domain of work, like administration, schools, factories, ... etc. they should use the internet for gathering more information about their jobs, for organize their job’s program and for more facilitation, especially for exchange the experience, the knowledge, and the product some times. Whereas, there are some people use the internet just for look to the cultures, see concerts or for playing, exposing... etc. like a children, or for gathering information.

"In the other side, we can’t forget the disadvantages of the internet, so we can gathering some false information, we can know some bad people, because there are some people use the internet in negative method. Some people use the internet for stolen books or something like that.... and there are some children use the internet all the time, they can forget the society, and the society can forget them.

Finally, the internet has two side, one good and the second it is bad. But we can’t never ever work without internet, because it is the just a way in the world, for facilitate and for help the persons for in their life."
APPENDIX VIII.2: SCANNED COPY OF
AN AVERAGE-ACHIEVER'S PRE-TEST (ESSAY)

As many people internet has totally changed my life, since
the day that my dad had bought us a computer and put internet conne-
tin it every, my lifestyle had changed, but many bad habits appeared
and all my manners changed. In this essay I'll try to show how inter-
did influence my whole life.

As a student at university internet changed my life but to a
positive one. I use it for my studies, everything that the teacher
says, I note it down from the first moment I open my laptop I go
directly to google and type what he said in the lecture, even
if I didn't note what the teacher said, I try to search for more
information. I don't limit my self for what he gave me in the
lecture, I use internet also for researches I download books from
it, I download also researches of other researchers, it's a way
to find more information.

For my life internet has not only changed my life, internet
has being a new one which was not mine, it really brings me to
my life internet has not only changed my life, internet

has bringing me to a new one which was not mine, it really brings me to

another world I've become addicted, I can't live my life alone for

another word, I've become addicted. I can't live my life alone for

one single moment because there is internet connection in it
one single moment because there is internet connection in it

the social network brings me new people, new friends

you can say virtual friends. I live in the same town

as me, they become a part of life, internet brings me also so many

bad habits like eating in front of laptop. I don't sleep early. I find
difficulties in sleeping, I can't live without internet, it's my

oxygen.

For my environment, I think that many people are like me
I'm not the only one who's addicted to it. I can say that all
my generation suffer from the same problem.

Finally I dare say that internet has a very bad effect on
person's life.
As many people internet has totally changed my life, since the day that my dad had bought us a computer and put internet connection in it, my lifestyle had changed, and many bad habits appeared and all my manners changed. In this essay I’ll try to show how internet did influence my whole life.

As a student at university internet changed my life but to a positive one. I use it for my studies, everything that the teacher says I note it and from the first moment I open my lap top I go directly to google and type what he said in the lecture, even if I didn’t note what the teacher said I try to search for more information. I don’t limit myself for what he gave me. I use internet also in researches. I download books from internet, or I download researches of other researchers, it’s a way to find more information.

In my personal life internet has not only changed my life. Internet has bring me a new me which was
not mine, it really brings me to another world that I've
become addicted. I can't live my phone for one single
moment because I have internet in it, the social
network brings me new people, new friends, it brings
me also bad habits, like eating and in front of laptop,
I don't sleep early, I find difficulties to sleep.
for my environment, I think that many people are
like me. I'm not the only one who's addicted, you can
say that all my generation suffer from it.
Finally, I dare say that internet has a very
bad effects on person's life.

I have chosen the second topic. I follow steps which
are: introduction, body: 3 paragraphs, conclusion.
I've chosen this topic because I've found it very
interesting. I started by making a plan for my essay
choosing ideas and the I've extend them I wrote an
introduction the the body which contains paragraphs and
my ideas are in those paragraphs. But the conclusion to
rename the ideas I self with.
Steps:
- Understanding keywords of the topic.
- How shall I develop my essay? By classification, exemplification, argumentation.
- Brainstorming.
- Finding a Gropper to start.
- Planning in the mind.
- Mathing a general shape/form.
- Finding examples, and quotes.
- Outlining, then writing the essay.
The importance of learning a new foreign language:

- It helps more in developing intelligence.
- Variety is the spice of life.
- Travels forms people.
- Be open-minded to the world outside.
- We can have knowledge from other nations.
- Translations and transliteration.
- Our age is social, so learning a foreign language makes it up to date and like of Greek from history.
- We can acquire knowledge from other nations.
- Making new connections, new societies, new people traditions.
- We can keep the threats of other nations by learning their lge.

Variety is the spice of life.

Learning a foreign lge has very important aspects. First, it...

Language is a window into the world.
Topic: "The importance of learning a foreign language"

Outline:
Introduction:
Topic sentence: There are many languages around the world.

Concluding sentence: People learn foreign languages.

Development:
Topic sentence: Learning a foreign language has very important aspects.

1. It helps people acquire new knowledge and recent technologies, e.g., the new earthquake alarm from Japan, its software is just in Japanese language.

2. It keeps the threats and menaces of the other nations, e.g. Experts and
engineers in these sensitive posts have to learn various languages in order to stand aware and alert to vigil from any danger.

3-D-3: learning a foreign language keeps the mother language up-to-date and make it a living phenomenon. e.g. Structuralists believe that language is a living phenomenon only if has borrowed from other language meaning, transliteration and translation.

3-D-4: Variety of languages in the human mind provides him with more intelligence and reflex. e.g. Neurologists believe that the huge number of the cells in the human's brain is due to using different languages.

3-D-5: learning a foreign language provides people with new connections, new societies, and new traditions. e.g. Ferdinand de Saussure says: "Language is social, general, idiosyncratic, and shared by all the members of the speech community."

Concluding sentence: people learn foreign languages for its huge importance in our life.

Conclusion: people use various languages and learn many foreign not as an end on itself but for many reasons.
The essay

Variety is the spice of life, no one can live the whole with the same things. Among these things language- this vital way of communication. There are many languages around the world, the nature of the human Being that makes human always in an inquiry and investigate in investigations. For this make, People learn foreign languages.

Learning a foreign language has many important aspects. Firstly, learning a foreign language makes people acquire new knowledge and recent technologies, for example, the new earthquake alarm its software is just in Japanese, so we have to learn that language. Besides, learning a foreign language keeps the threats and menace of other nations, for instance, experts and engineers in sensitive places have to learn various languages in order to stand aware and be vigilant from any foreign dangers. Moreover, learning a foreign language makes the mother language up to date and makes it a living phenomenon. Structuralists in language believe that language is a living phenomenon only if it has borrowed from other languages by using translation and transliteration.

Furthermore, variety of languages in the human’s mind provides him with more intelligence and reflex. Neurologists believe the huge number of the cells related to in the human’s mind is due to using different languages. Finally, learning a foreign language provides people with new connections, new societies, and new traditions as Ferdinand
De Samue says: "Language is social, general, idiosyncratic, and shared by all the members of the speech community. We can get a lot of things from different communities by knowing their languages. People learn foreign language for its huge importance in their life lives. People learn foreign languages and use them not as an end on itself but here many foreign languages are learnt to solve other purposes since everyone knows that language is communication, this is for this latter is life."
APPENDIX VIII.4: SCANNED COPY OF
A LOW-ACHIEVER’S POST-TEST (ESSAY)

Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for **two hours** after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You **cannot** use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write **clearly and neatly**.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You **cannot** use a dictionary.
- You **cannot** use your cellphone for any reason.
- You **cannot** talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer/rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.

**Your Topic:** The effects of the Internet on our civilization...
Internet is the most common technology in the world and in our society, especially it represents as a source of information and communication. But this important technology has several advantages as many disadvantages. It has two different faces.

First of all, the advantages of the internet are diverse and numerous. The first advantage or benefit is the whole information that it gives us because if we need to know or search about something, we can go to the internet and find all the information immediately (correct and correct) and correct, for example, immediately. When you want to search about specific books and their authors, you find it as it is and who wrote this book, when and where. In addition to that, the internet is like a book library on net, it is the most common source of communication for example, we find Facebook, Skype, emails, all these are called socialnet, this latter one is very important nowadays because very important many people use it, whether to make relations or to know something to exchange knowledge with other people from different countries and different cultures.
means of communication, it gives more help to people whether in educational domains or in other domains like economy and politics, or we can use it as a source of entertainment we find several games. As a result, internet in our society or in other societies is very important, as people in different domains or in different ages need it so much.

On the other hand, internet has other face, in other words, internet has many disadvantages. One is relate to the internet as a source of information, sometimes some information are fake and incorrect, and in this case people cannot depend on it all the time. Now internet as a means of communication, also people may find some problems when they are communicate with other people, may find some people give fake information about himself or may represent themselves as a famous people. For example they use artist's name and communicate with people and give people misleading information about his artist.

Finally, internet in general is the most common technology in the world without doubt, this technology has different advantages and disadvantages, but regardless to all these disadvantages, internet is
The Internet is the most common technology in the world, and in our society, because it represents a source of information, a tool, and a means of communication in the other side. But this important technology has several advantages and disadvantages. It has two different faces, and each face has specific effects.

First of all, the advantages of Internet are many and numerous. The first advantage when the Internet acts as a source of information, it gives a worthy information because if someone needs to know or to search on the net about something, he can find it easily, quickly and correctly. For example, if someone searches about specific books and authors, he can find it easily and where is the author who wrote his book and when. In addition, the Internet is like a library on the web. Also, it is as the most common of means of communication like Facebook, email, Skype, and others. Means of all those are called social net where people can communicate and exchange. It is very useful nowadays by many people in different places whether to make new relations (friendship) or just to exchange ideas and knowledge. Internet since it is as a source of information and means of communication, it gives more help to people whether in educational domains or in other domains like economy and politics. In addition to that, we can use Internet as a source of entertainment, may find video games.
As a result, the advantages of internet in our society and in other societies, internet in general are very very important for people in different domains and for different ages.

In the other hand, internet may have other faces, in other word, internet has many disadvantages that many people know it. The first one relates to the internet when it is a source of information, sometimes some information are wrong and incorrect, in this case, people cannot depend on it all the time. And internet as a means of communication, also people may find some problems when they communicate with other people, may some people give false information to other people, about themselves, or may represent themselves as a famous people, for example, they use... an artist's name and communicate to people and give them misleading information about this artist.

Finally, internet in general is the most powerful technology in the world, without doubt, this technology has two different faces, one is good and the second is bad, but regardless to all the disadvantages, we cannot avoid or neglect this big and large technology, all countries nowadays need internet.
Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cellphone for any reason.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer / rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.

Your Topic: Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization.
Since the beginning of human’s life, people were interested in how they can connect and communicate in an easy and fast way. There was a lot of discoveries such as phones, TVs, telegrams, and among these discoveries, it was the creation of internet, which is a huge net works where all the world is connecting using computers, people exchange ideas, share news, information at the same time. Internet has changed the view of people toward the world, it’s affected all the domains, education, science, and human daily life; it became an important tool in people’s life.

First of all, the use of internet has been increased time after time, people couldn’t work without it. For example, a huge number of factories and institutions work with internet where they communicate with other factories so as to exchange their products or their new information and with internet they make advertising in the net so many institutions depend on internet in these works.

Secondly, internet makes the world a small country, people use different blogs such as youtube or Yahoo! to communicate and share instead of showing their beliefs where the whole world see. Then, more and more a lot of people make these books and blogs and make it their work and they can win money through it.

Third, internet has opened a lot of doors to people as an example, for scientist and researchers to compare their researches besides and publish them in order to see the latest discoveries, books in the domain of education, and lots of changes happened where the school makes the internet an important tool to depend on it in their teaching and learning process.

In addition to that, and more important, internet has brought
an important changes in all the societies, the use of Facebook, Twitter, daily motion, myspace has made a lot of changes and revolutions in all over the world, where people revolt against their states, and we have the big example of the Tunisian revolution that emerged from Facebook.

To conclude with, internet make a lot of transformation in human's life, where it became a right for people to have it, and it bring people connect together at the same time even if they are far from each other.
Topic: The effects of the internet on your civilization

internet: listing:
1. It's a network where all the world is connecting, share ideas in the same time.
2. Internet has made the world as a small country, it's facilitate the connection between different places.
3. Internet has opened a lot of doors to whom they are interested in scientific research or any domain.
4. Internet in a lot of domains like education has brought in internet to use by teachers, because it helps them to find a lot of information.
5. Since the discovery of internet, people's life has changed, in any thing they search for, they find it in the net.
6. New generation of internet like blogs, wiki's, research engines content creation, has been created such as Facebook, Twitter, Wikipedia; they are used in posting new information that lead to a lot of changes such as wars, conflicts...

The essay:

Since the beginning of human's life, people were interested in how they can connect and communicate in a easy and fast way, there was a lot of discoveries such as phone, TV, telegram, among these discoveries it was the creation of internet which is a huge network where all the world is connecting by computers, people exchange ideas, share information at the same time.

Internet has changed the view of people toward the world, it's affect all the domain, in education, science, and human daily life, where any one could not live with out internet.
First of all, the use of internet has been increased time after time, people couldn’t work without it, for example a lot of factories and institutions work with internet; where they communicate with other factories so as to exchange goods or information, so here internet become an important tool, any institution can win or lose here place among other institutions.

Second, internet makes the world a small country, any one can communicate at the same time, people use different blogs to be heard in order to post their ideas or talents, a lot of hobbies emerge in internet where the whole world see them and through these blogs a lot of people gain much.

Third, internet has opened a lot of doors to people especially to scientists and researchers to compare their work, besides in education, a lot of changes happened where the schools are depending on using the net in their teaching.

In addition, and more important, that the internet brought a changes in human life, where all people use blogs such as facebook, where from this source the whole world is changing. For example these wars and changes that occurred happened like the Lebanese revolution.

To conclude with, the emergence of internet make a lot of transformation in human life, where it become as a right for each individual, and it bring him connect with the whole world at the same time even if the places are different.
APPENDIX VIII.6: SCANNED COPY OF
A HIGH-ACHIEVER’S PRE-TEST (ESSAY)

Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cellphone for any reason.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer/rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.

Your Topic: People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.
Brainstorming

People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school?

attended school = learning

The Reasons:
1. They want to study.
2. To be working later on in a good position.
3. To have prestige.
4. To know and to cultivate.

Planning:

Introduction:
- Introductory Sentences
  - Definition of learning.
  - Importance of learning.
  - Where to learn.
  - Thesis Statement:

Reasons behind attending school differ from one person to another. Some people learn because they are obliged, others to have prestige, others learn to know and others to be working later on.

Body:

Some people attend school because they are obliged.

Supporting details:
- Parents oblige them.
- Government obligation.

1. Some people are obliged to attend school.
2. Some people want to have prestige.
3. Some people consider the school as a bridge to the work field.
4. Some people learn and attend school to know
   more about the world and to cultivate.
concluding sentence:
Restatement.

82:

Topic sentence:
The reason behind learning for other people is to have prestige.

Supporting details:
- They think that knowledgeable people are more respected.
- Societies are known through their intellectual achievements.

concluding sentence:
Restatement.

83:

Topic sentence:
Other people learn just to know more and to cultivate.

Supporting details:
- Learning is good for thought.
- They are curious to know and learn everything.

concluding sentence:
Restatement.

84:

Topic sentence:
Some people look at school as the bridge to work.

Supporting details:
- Good work = good knowledge.
- Good work = high position.

concluding sentence:
Restatement.

Conclusion:
- Restatement.
- Point of view.
learning is the process of developing intellectual abilities, enhancing manual skills and refining social awareness. It is the process through which the mind develops. The effective setting of learning is school. The reasons behind going to school differ from one person to another; some people attend school because they are obliged, others might go to school for prestige, other people learn to know more about their world and to cultivate, and other people may see school as a bridge to the world of work.

To start with, some people attend school because they are obliged. There are some people who do not have the desire to attend school, they may have the attitude that it wastes time and work in the future. But, those people are obliged to learn because of their families. Moreover, the government obliges them to attend school. Or, because the country itself obliges them as learning is obligatory in the constitution. In Algeria, learning is obligatory and it is defined in the official constitution of the country. In short, some people may be attending school only because they are obliged to do so.

Furthermore, the reason behind attending school for other people might be to have prestige. Some people think that well-educated people are more respected than illiterate people in societies, so they opt for learning to be prestigious people. Also, they believe that societies are classified as having high culture according to their intellectual achievement and their averageness of educated people. In sum, behind attending school, there might be prestigious reasons.

Otherwise, another reason behind attending school might be just to know more about their world and to get more cultivated. These people are curious to know and to interpret the phenomena in their lives. They consider learning
Food for thought; they seem to feed their epistemic curiosity. In brief, learning may be "a food for thought" for some people.

In addition to that, some people look at school as a bridge to the world of work. They consider learning as a necessary condition to have a good work because without a grade one cannot find a good work. Then, they think that when they have a good work, they would have a high rank; for example, a doctor or an engineer is not the same as a simple worker. In brief, people may attend school to have a good work in future or...

In a nutshell, people are different and they do not attend school for different reasons. They may attend school because they are obliged to, to have prestige, to become more or to have a good position later on. As a matter of fact, becoming an attending school is very important and it is more pleasurable if it is the result of a noble reason.
Learning is the process of developing intellectual abilities, enhancing manual skills and refining social awareness. It is the process through which the mind develops. The effective setting of learning is school. The reasons behind attending school may differ from one person to another; some people may attend school because they are obliged, others may do so for prestige, other people may learn to know more about their world, and other people may see school as a bridge to the world of work.

To start with, some people attend school because they are obliged to. There are some people who do not have the desire to attend school, they may have an attitude that it is a waste of time and work is more profitable. But there are people who are obliged to learn because their families oblige them to attend school, or because learning is obligatory in the constitution, for instance, in Algeria learning is obligatory and is defined in the official constitution of the country. In short, some people may be attending school only because they are obliged to.

Furthermore, the reason behind attending school for other people might be to have prestige. Some people think that well-educated people are more respected than illiterate people within societies. So, they opt for learning to be prestigious. Also, they believe that societies are classified as having high culture according to their intellectual achievements and the scale of educated people. In sum, behind attending schools, there might be prestige reasons.

Moreover, other people may attend school just to know more about their world and feed their curiosity. These people are curious to know and to interpret the phenomena they see in their lives. They consider
Learning as good for thought; they learn to feed their epistemic curiosity. In few words, learning may be thought for some people.

In addition to that, some people see school as a bridge to the world of work. They consider learning as a necessary condition to have a good work; because without a grade one cannot find a good work. They think that when they have a good work, they would have a high rank, for example, a doctor or an engineer is not the same as a simple worker. In brief, people may attend school to have a good work later on.

In a nutshell, people learn or attend school for different reasons, they may attend school because they are obliged to, to have prestige, to know more or to have a good position of work later on. As a matter of fact, learning is an important factor. But beside it may be more beneficial and pleasurable if it is the result of a noble reason.
Final Draft

...dreaming...is...the...process...of...developing...intellectual...abilities,...enhancing
manual...skills...and...refining...social...awareness...It...is...the...process...through...which
the...mind...develops...The...effective...setting...of...learning...in...school...The...reasons...behind
attending...school...may...differ...from...one...person...to...another...;...some...people...may
attend...school...because...they...are...obliged...;...others...may...do...for...prestige...;...other
people...may...learn...to...know...more...about...their...world...and...other...people
...may...see...school...as...a...bridge...to...the...world...of...work...

...To...start...with,...some...people...attend...school...because...they...are...obliged...to...
Some...see...some...people...who...do...not...have...the...desire...to...attend...school...they...
may...have...the...attitude...that...school...wastes...time...and...work...is...more...profitable...
But...there...are...also...obliged...to...go...to...school...either...because...their...families
obliged...them...or...because...learning...is...obligatory...in...the...community...for...
...unions...in...Algeria...learning...is...obligatory...and...it...is...defined...in...the...
...official...constitutions...of...the...country...In...short...;...some...people...may...be...
attending...school...only...because...they...are...obliged...

Furthermore...the...reason...behind...attending...school...for...other...people...
might...be...to...have...prestige...;...some...people...think...that...well-educated...people...
are...more...respected...than...illiterate...people...within...society...so...they...opt...for
learning...to...be...prestigious...;...also...they...believe...that...education...is...classified...
as...having...high...value...according...to...their...intellectual...achievements...and...
the...rate...of...educated...people...To...sum...behind...attending...schools...these...
might...be...patriotic...reasons...

Therefore...other...people...may...attend...school...just...to...know...more...
about...their...world...and...feed...their...curiosity...Those...people...are...curious...to
learn...and...be...in...prestige...the...phenomena...they...encounter...in...their...lives...They...
consider...learning...as...food...for...thought...;...They...learn...to...feed...their...
epistemic...curiosity...The...few...words...learning...may...be...food...for...thought...
For some people, attending school is seen as a bridge to the world of work. They consider learning as a necessary condition to have a good work. They consider learning as a requirement because without a good work, one cannot find a good work. They think that without a good work, they would have a low rank, for example, a cleaner or an engineer is met to same as a simple worker. In a brief, people may attend school to have a good work later on.

In a nutshell, people...
NOTIFICATION

This thesis is an original work of the author’s PhD research. The thesis original title was as follows: “An Investigation of the Factors Accounting for Second-year English Students’ Writing Difficulties at Ferhat Abbas University of Setif”, which is the one that appears on the thesis cover page. However, during the progress/ course of her research, the author made some modifications on the title, but could not do it in an official way due to administrative considerations. Therefore, she invites the reader to consider reading this work based on the modified title, which was approved by the jury-as follows:

An Investigation of the Factors Accounting for Undergraduate English Students’ Writing Difficulties and the Effect of Strategy Training in Promoting their Writing Performance and Positive Affect

The Case of Second-year English Students at Setif 2 University
DEDICATION

To my parents,

Who were the reason for my existence and the inspiration of this work;
Who have been present in every step of my educational career;
Who have made me see challenges as valuable experiences for growth, progress, and success;
Who made me believe in everything, but failure and surrender; and
Who accepted, supported, and made my endless ambitions come true.

May Allah bestow them with His grace and paradise!

To my family, for their continuous support and patience;
To all those who contributed to this humble work, with concrete or emotional support;

May Allah endow you with success!
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise be to Allah for the completion of this humble work.

My sincere and deep gratitude go to my supervisor, Prof. Zahia MEBARKI, who gave me all kinds of support throughout my post-graduate career. She has been a supervisor, a teacher, a friend, and a sister. Her priceless time, constructive feedback, and valuable advice have given me the courage and motivation to accomplish this work.

I also owe gratitude to my colleague and close friend, Ms. Souhila Mekhoukh, for her continuous support and feedback, to my former student, Muhammed Akhrib, and to Omar Belkhiri, for their enormous help with the statistical analysis of the research results. I would, also, like to thank my former students who participated in the exploratory and the experimental phases of this work, and who showed great enthusiasm and productivity.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude and respect to Dr. Steve Graham, researcher, author, and writing instructor (USA), Dr. Muhammad Abdellatif (Egypt), Dr. Maria Zlateva, my former advisor at Boston University, and Dr. Zoltan Edward Wade (UK), for their valuable pieces of advice. I cannot forget to mention my former professors, colleagues, and friends from Setif, Bejaia, and Bordj Bou Arreridj Universities, as well as my colleagues and friends from different parts of the world (UK, USA, TU, FR, and UAE) for their encouragement.

Finally, my deep gratitude goes to the members of the jury, for their time, in reading this work and for their constructive feedback, upon which this work will be improved and polished.
ABSTRACT

This work reports the results of a study conducted at the Setif University English Department. The aim of the study was two-fold: to explore the factors accounting for undergraduate students’ writing difficulties and investigate the effect of strategy training on enhancing their writing performance and positive affect. To achieve this aim, it was hypothesised that students’ writing difficulties can be attributed to one or more factors: (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and/ or affective. It was also hypothesised that strategy training can have positive effects on these students’ writing performance and affect. The participants of the study were second-year English students, among whom a group of 24 participated in a training writing course as an experimental group, and a control group was used for comparison. To collect the data for this research, a combination of instruments was used. A pre-test and a pre-questionnaire were used to collect data on the participants’ writing background and affective factors. A post-test, a post-questionnaire, and a think-aloud procedure were employed to obtain information on the participants’ progress, if any, in their writing performance and affect level, as well as examine their processes and strategy use to confirm the post-study results, qualitatively. The data were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively, and a comparison was carried out to examine the differences between the experimental and control groups as well as between high-and low-achieving participants in terms of the degree of progress they made. The exploratory study findings demonstrated that the participants’ writing difficulties were attributed mainly to the (meta-) cognitive, followed by the linguistic and, to a lesser extent, the affective factors, mainly writing apprehension and self-efficacy levels. Moreover, a comparison of the pre- and post-test results of the experimental and control groups has shown that the participants in the former group have improved considerably and with varying levels in their writing performance, strategy use, and affect level, compared to the latter. These results have yielded to the conclusion that explicit writing strategy training contributes to the students’ writing development and progress if applied effectively and at a long-term level.

Key words: Affective factors, EFL learners, strategy training, writing difficulties, writing performance, writing process/ strategy (ies).
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1. **Rationale and Context of the Study**

Academic writing constitutes an important and integral part in any higher education program of many disciplines, whether at the undergraduate or the post-graduate levels. This is because academic writing is a primary medium of academic communication, whether for the purpose of writing regular assignments and exams or for higher academic purposes, such as writing research articles, dissertations or theses. In English as a foreign language (EFL) context, particularly at the undergraduate level, academic writing is among the major language skills that EFL learners are required to develop in order to reach the standards of university academic writing.

Yet, the situation for many EFL learners, particularly those who have fewer opportunities to practise and develop their writing skills, is that they find writing more complex and cognitively demanding (MacArthur, Graham, and Fitzgerald, 2006) than it is the case for native speakers of English. Many of them face various types of difficulties, including, but not limited to, meta-cognitive, cognitive, linguistic, communicative, and socio-affective constraints (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013). The latter can be attributed to the learners themselves or to other origins, such as, the instructional methods and the environment where learning takes place. As a matter of fact, research has shown that within EFL contexts, in general, writing has been taught in traditional methods, for many decades, focusing mainly on the learners’ finished products rather than the process of writing (e.g., Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al. 2006; Sasaki, 2000). In other words, the focus of writing instruction has been given to form and language (grammar) correctness rather than on what the students actually do while writing (i.e., during the pre-writing, drafting, and revision stages). Thus, despite the fact that the process approach was introduced in the early eighties (1980s), its application for instructional purposes was mainly in
the native language or in English as a second language (Alhaissoni, 2012; Leki, Cumming & Silva, 2008; MacArthur et al., 2006; Sasaki, 2000). In FFL contexts, however, the application process has been slow and gradual that little has been explored on EFL higher education instructional practices within the process approach framework (e.g., Kroll, 1990; Sasaki, 2000). In this respect, it has been reported that there is an unsatisfactory body of research that document the effects of implementing this approach on EFL learners’ writing development and performance (Abdellatif, 2007; Leki, Cumming & Silva, 2008; MacArthur et al., 2006). Some of the studies conducted in this field demonstrate that regardless of their language performance level, many EFL learners tend to have a limited level of awareness about the writing process and strategy use (e.g., Alhaissoni, 2012; Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham & Perin, 2007; Sasaki, 2000).

In more concrete terms, different studies show that, in general, learners from different background origins (i.e., those studying English as a second (ESL) or foreign (EFL) language) often skip the pre-writing processes and start composing immediately (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013; Sasaki, 2000). They also ignore the importance of revision and the strategies of improving the quality of their writing (e.g., Alhaissoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005). These results show clear evidence that learners from different backgrounds appear to have a limited level of meta-cognitive awareness about their writing processes and strategies and, based on their writing performance, many of them seem to have a limited knowledge about academic topics and academic language use. In addition, research (e.g., Abdellatif, 2007; Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013; MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006; Sasaki, 2000) shows that little is known about EFL learners’ writing progress, which is, most probably, due to the effect of using summative assessment, a traditional method which has
been used for decades as a result of some, among other, reasons such as, teaching large classes, insufficient time for practice and regular feedback, the use of traditional instruction methods, and the absence of teacher training. Understanding and tracking the learners’ progress can only be possible under favourable conditions where learners can engage in writing processes and receive guidance on strategy use, which would allow them to get various opportunities to share and exchange ideas, communicate through writing, use the language for various purposes, and develop their critical, analytical and communicative skills, as well as enhance their motivation and self-efficacy. However, if these practices and opportunities are unavailable in a writing classroom, these learners will not overcome their fears towards writing in English as a foreign language and will not be able to face their difficulties, which can become more complex as a result of failure and negative feedback; the latter can, in turn, be direct or indirect sources of negative affect in the sense that they may hinder the learners’ motivation to write and their writing abilities (Brown, 2004).

With respect to these background conditions that characterize many EFL writing classrooms, particularly in the Algerian university context, and with reference to the literature pertaining to EFL and ESL writing research, which has brought changes in writing pedagogy, it is worth emphasizing the importance of the process-oriented writing instruction, the goal of which is to ensure students’ progress in writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). These changes in writing pedagogy emphasize on adopting formative assessment, where the focus of evaluation is on the process of forming writing with a goal of developing the students’ progress, rather than summative assessment, which evaluates writing as a finished product (Nitko & Brookhart, 2007). To achieve this aim, it is argued that engaging the learners in the writing process will enable them to have more opportunities to use effective writing strategies (Brown & Rodgers, 2002).
The latter have an important role in facilitating the complex cognitive processes required in academic writing and enhancing their writing development and positive affect (Brown, 2004; Topping, 2003).

Based on the above summarized results, pertaining to EFL and ESL writing research, the present study is a contribution to the body of the existing research on EFL writing, with an aim to provide a larger and clearer picture on important aspects that have not been well documented, at the national and international levels, mainly with reference to the higher education context. In other words, this study is both exploratory and experimental, attempting to complete some of the missing gaps that have not been empirically investigated in EFL writing contexts.

In more concrete terms, although a large body of research pertaining to EFL writing exists, little work has been investigated on the factors accounting for EFL learners’ difficulties in writing, mainly in university settings. Most of the existing data are related to the learners’ difficulties in writing, focusing, generally, on the micro-level aspects of writing, such as difficulties related to specific language units or use (e.g., sentence structure, grammar, or vocabulary use), aspects of writing quality (the product of writing), and other aspects related to a particular stage, step, or strategy of writing (e.g., mind-mapping, planning, composing, or revising) (Abdellatif, 2007; Cohen & Macaro, 2009; Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013; Leki, Cumming & Silva, 2007; MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006; Sasaki, 2000). However, little is known about the learners’ writing difficulties at the macro-level (e.g., learners’ essay writing development, writing progress, writing processes, strategy use, and aspects related to their writing quality) and the factors (origins) to which these difficulties are related. On the other hand, most of the studies that have been investigated in this field have, generally, been
exploratory, most of which are related to ESL contexts, mainly those conducted on young learners (K-12) (e.g., Leki, Cumming & Silva, 2007; MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006).

The present study is both exploratory and experimental, using a triangulation of methods to cover various dimensions and aspects, both quantitatively and qualitatively. It is, on the one hand, an attempt to explore the major factors that are, particularly, learner-driven, with a focus on three different categories: (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and affective factors. The other aspects that may be considered as sources of the learners’ writing difficulties (e.g., the instructional method(s) and the instructional environment, such as the large class size/amount of writing practice and time) are not treated in the exploratory phase, but are taken into consideration in the design of the experimental phase of the study, with an aim to create a favourable environment for strategy training. Hence, they are not treated as variables in this study. On the other hand, the present study seeks to investigate, through experimentation, the effect(s) of writing strategy training on enhancing the learners’ writing performance and their positive affect, with particular emphasis on promoting their self-efficacy and decreasing their apprehension levels in writing in the target language (English as a foreign language). This implies that the learners’ (study participants) existing difficulties, whether they are major or minor, can be alleviated through strategy training in different ways.

In brief, the ultimate aim of this research is to gain evidence, through a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods, about the possible sources (factors) that may be the cause(s) of EFL learners’ writing difficulties, which can be multi-faceted, and to address them through an explicit writing strategy training program in order to enhance their writing performance (process and product) and affect levels. By promoting their performance and affect levels, these learners will be able to acquire a higher level of autonomy in writing, which would,
at the long-term level, enable them to address new and more complex academic writing situations.

2. Statement of the Problem

In Algerian universities, writing is taught as a core component of the curriculum to undergraduate students for two years. In the first year, the writing syllabus focuses on the sentence level, and in the second year, paragraph and essay writing are introduced in their various forms and genres. At the university setting, students are required to produce a variety of writing assignments that have to conform to the standards of academic writing, compared to what they were expected to produce at the pre-university level. Yet, many undergraduate students face varying kinds and levels of writing difficulties, the origins of which may be multi-faceted.

Writing is a complex skill in English as a foreign language acquisition and is even more challenging for students with writing difficulties. Some of the problematic areas for them may include, but are not limited to, the development and organization of ideas, lack of or a limited knowledge about the writing processes and the ineffective use of the writing strategies and conventions. These difficulties may be attributed to different factors, among which three may be considered to be important and are particularly learner-driven: (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and affective. The (meta-) cognitive factors refer to the students’ insufficient knowledge about the academic writing skills and conventions and a lack of awareness and/ or an inadequate use of the writing processes and strategies. The linguistic factors can be related to the students’ (low) proficiency level in the target language; and the affective factors can be related to the students’ negative affect towards writing, including, but not limited to, their negative beliefs about their
abilities (low self-efficacy) and their fear from approaching writing tasks (high writing apprehension).

3. Aims of the study

The aims of the present study are two-fold: exploratory and experimental. The former consists of exploring the major factors that may be related to the students’ writing difficulties. These factors can be multi-faceted and may include, among others, (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and affective factors. The (meta-) cognitive factors can be related to the students’ limited knowledge and awareness about the academic writing conventions, processes, and strategies or the ineffective use of the latter; the linguistic factors refer to the students’ proficiency level in the target language, mainly in relation to writing; and the affective factors include, among others, the students’ writing self-efficacy level, i.e., their beliefs about their writing abilities, and their writing apprehension level, i.e., fear from approaching writing situations.

The second main aim is to investigate the effect (s) of strategy training, through an experimental course of study, in improving the students’ writing performance, both at the process and product levels, and promoting their positive affect; i.e., increasing their writing self-efficacy and decreasing their writing apprehension levels.

4. Research Questions and Hypotheses

Based on the afore-mentioned research aims, which address the exploratory and the experimental phases of the study, two main questions can be posed; each of which generates further questions. The first main question seeks to explore the major factors that can be attributed to the students’ writing difficulties, and it can be posed as follows:

1. What are the major factors that are related to the students’ writing difficulties?
Because the writing difficulties can be attributed to more than one factor, it is possible to generate three further questions from the above question (1), as it is shown below:

i. Are the students’ writing difficulties related to (meta-) cognitive factors?
ii. Are the students’ writing difficulties related to linguistic factors?
iii. Are the students’ writing difficulties related to affective factors?

The second main question addresses the experimental phase of the research, and it attempts to investigate the effect(s) of strategy training on the students’ writing performance and affect level; it can be formulated as follows:

2. What is (are) the effect(s) of (writing) strategy training on students’ writing performance and their affect level?

Three further questions can be generated from the above question (2) as it involves three variables (strategy training/ or trained strategy use, writing performance, and affect (level)).

i. What is the relationship between students’ writing performance and trained strategy use? Or, in other words,
   - Do students with trained strategy use perform better that those with no trained strategy use?

ii. What is the relationship between students’ writing performance and their affect level? In other terms,
   - Do students with positive affect perform better than those with negative affect?

Because ‘affect’ involves two affective factors (i.e., English writing apprehension and English writing self-efficacy) that can be treated as two separate variables, the above question (ii) can generate two sub-questions as in the following:
- Do students with low writing apprehension level perform better (in essay writing) than those with high writing apprehension level?

- Do students with high writing self-efficacy level perform better (in essay writing) than those with low self-efficacy level?

iii. What is the relationship between students’ affect level and their writing strategy use? Or, in other words:

- Do high-achieving students use the writing strategies more effectively than their low-achieving peers?

The above questions can be expressed through the following sets of hypotheses, which cover both the exploratory and the experimental phases of the research, respectively. The first set aims at providing evidence through exploring the factors that may be related to the participants’ writing difficulties. The second set of hypotheses has as its main aim testing, through experimentation, the effect (s) of writing strategy training on enhancing the students’ writing performance and their affect level. The following are the two sets of hypotheses, followed by their null counterparts.

The first set of hypotheses includes hypotheses one (H₁), two (H₂), and three (H₃); each of which investigates whether the students’ writing difficulties are attributed to cognitive, linguistic, or affective factors, respectively. These hypotheses are stated separately in the following.

*Hypothesis one (H₁):* Students’ writing difficulties are related to (meta-) cognitive factors.

*Null hypothesis (NH₁):* There is no relationship between the students’ writing difficulties and (meta-) cognitive factors.

*Hypothesis two (H₂):* Students’ writing difficulties are related to linguistic factors.
**Null hypothesis (NH₃):** There is no relationship between the students’ writing difficulties and linguistic factors.

**Hypothesis three (H₃):** Students’ writing difficulties are related to affective factors.

**Null Hypothesis (NH₃):** There is no relationship between the students’ writing difficulties and affective factors.

The second set of hypotheses consists of hypotheses four (H₄), five (H₅), and six (H₆), and they measure the effect of writing strategy training on enhancing the students’ writing performance and their affect level.

**Hypothesis four (H₄):** Students with trained strategy use perform better than those with no trained strategy use.

**Null hypothesis (NH₄):** There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with trained strategy use and those with no trained strategy use.

**Hypothesis five (H₅):** Students with positive affect (HWA and LWSE) perform better than those with negative affect.

**Null hypothesis (NH₅):** There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with positive affect and those with negative affect.

Because this research investigates two affective factors (students’ English writing apprehension and their English writing self-efficacy levels), this hypothesis can be divided into two sub-hypotheses: H₅ (a) and H₅ (b).

H₅ (a): Students with low writing apprehension level perform better than those with high writing apprehension level.

NH₅ (a): There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with low and those with high writing apprehension levels.
H₃ (b): Students with high writing self-efficacy level perform better than those with low writing self-efficacy level.

NH₃ (b): There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with high and those with low writing self-efficacy levels.

Hypothesis six (H₆): High-achieving students use the writing strategies more effectively compared to low-achieving ones.

Null hypothesis (NH₆): There is no difference between high-achieving and low-achieving writers in as far as their use of the writing strategies is concerned.

5. Scope of the Study

In order to provide a clear picture about the main aspects that are emphasized in this research, it is worth clarifying the scope of the study, which determines the variables of interest, the population and sample, as well as some methodological aspects (e.g., the research topic and the focus of the exploratory and experimental phases of the research).

The variables of the study include two sets, the choice of which was based on the nature and aims of the study. Each set comprises two categories: dependent and independent variables. The first set addresses the exploratory phase of the study and the second covers the experimental one. In more concrete terms, the former set of variables include a dependent variable, which consists of the (students’) writing difficulties (in academic essay writing), and an independent variable, which covers a number of factors that may be the origin of the students’ writing difficulties in the study. This variable includes three categories of factors: cognitive (including the meta-cognitive), linguistic, and affective. The (meta-) cognitive factors refer to aspects like: the students’ knowledge (and awareness) and their use of the writing conventions, the writing processes and strategies. The linguistic factors involve aspects of language use (e.g., grammar
correctness, vocabulary use/choice, and syntactic structures). The affective factors consist mainly of the students’ level of writing apprehension and their writing self-efficacy.

The latter set of variables, which covers the experimental phase of the study, includes three main variables: an independent variable, consisting of (writing) strategy training (also referred to as trained strategy use), and two dependent variables, including (the students’) writing performance and (their) affect level. Strategy training refers mainly to an explicit teaching/instruction of the writing strategies throughout the writing process; the students’ writing performance covers both the process and the product of writing and can change (improve) as a result of strategy training. The students’ affect level refers to whether they demonstrate a positive or negative affect towards writing in English as a foreign language. It is worth noting, here, that only two affective factors are considered in this study, namely (the students’) English writing apprehension (level) and (their) English writing self-efficacy (level). Other affective factors such as ‘motivation’ and ‘attitudes’ towards writing, are mentioned in relation to the afore-mentioned factors, but are not considered as variables, in this study. Like ‘writing performance’, ‘affect’ can also be promoted through strategy training, according to this study. Each of the above-mentioned variables is further explained in the literature review chapter (I) of this work.

As mentioned earlier in this introduction, the exploratory phase of the present research focuses mainly on the learner-driven factors, which may be the origin of their difficulties in writing. Based on this choice, the population of this study was selected. It consists of university undergraduate students of English as a foreign language, who, during the study period, were enrolled in a four-year full-time study program, at the Setif University English Department, to obtain their Bachelor’s degree in English. The sample involves second-year students, who are
male and female, aged between 18 and 22, and whose writing performance level ranges between low- and high-intermediate. The *gender* and *age* factors are not considered in this study. For more details about the population and sample categories, a detailed description is provided in the *methodology chapter* (II) of this work.

In addition to the research variables and the population and sample, it is worth clarifying that the method selected to conduct the experimental phase of this research consists of an explicit *training* (also referred to, in this study, as ‘teaching’ or ‘instruction’) of the writing strategies, to the selected sample, throughout the various stages of the writing process: planning, drafting, and revising. Teaching the writing strategies is more appropriate and effective through the process approach as it has been recommended and implemented by a number of researchers and writing experts (e.g., Abdellatif, 2007; Alhaissoni, 2012; Graham and Harris, 2005; Harmer, 2004, 2007; Kroll, 1990; MacArthur, Graham, and Fitzgerald, 2006; Sasaki, 2000). Therefore, the researcher, in this study, has, partly, adopted the writing instruction model introduced by Graham and Harris (2005), the focus of which is on an explicit teaching of the writing strategies, through the process approach. This method has proven to be effective for students of different backgrounds and with varying writing difficulties.

In more concrete terms, the emphasis of training is, in addition to introducing the conventions of academic essay writing, mainly given to teaching the strategies involved in the major stages of the writing process (planning, composing, and revising). The aim behind this choice is related to the importance of this skill (academic writing) to EFL university students, especially that it is considered as one of the major and basic skills for them to complete most of their required assignments, research papers, and exams. Many students often struggle to meet the standards of university academic writing and are in need to develop their skills, mainly of the
argumentative and the expository types (also referred to as ‘genres’ (Murray, 2012)). The latter is selected for training for the reason that it responds to most of the students’ needs.

Finally, it is important to clarify the fact that the activities selected and designed for the training sessions (of the experimental phase) focus particularly on training the participants on an effective use of the writing strategies throughout the major stages of the writing process, and that any external variables/ effects (such as, reading or online materials that could be used to elaborate on students’ ideas/ topics) are not included. Thus, if the participants are allowed to elaborate on their ideas through reading other documents, the latter (i.e., reading) should be considered as an external variable that would, probably, affect their writing performance, at the process (generation and development of ideas) and the product (i.e., writing quality and depth of ideas) levels. Therefore, and in order to avoid any bias in the internal validity of the study post-test results, external variables (effects) are excluded from the training.

6. Research Instruments

The study consists of two phases, exploratory and experimental, for which two sets of research tools were used. The latter consisted of pre- and post-tests (written essays), pre- and post-questionnaires, and think-aloud protocols.

The pre-test and the pre-questionnaire aimed at gathering data on the factors that may be involved in the participants' writing difficulties. The post-test and the post-questionnaire were mainly intended to collect data on the effect (s) of strategy training (the experimental phase) on the participants’ writing performance and their affect level, respectively. Finally, a think-aloud procedure, an introspective technique, was used to obtain data on the participants’ actual writing processes as they planned, composed, and revised expository essays and the strategies they
employed to achieve this aim. This procedure was used with a limited sample that participated in the experimental group, sub-categorized as high-, average-, and low-achieving student writers, so as to gain proof of their progress at the end of training as well as test their improvement at the level of strategy use while writing.

7. Definition of Terms

*Writing difficulties*: They refer to the difficulties student writers encounter in developing and organizing their ideas when writing. In this study, the difficulties are related to cognitive, linguistic and affective factors.

*Writing performance*: It refers to the students’ level (high or low) in writing, or, in other words, their writing processes and finished products.

*Writing progress*: It has to do with the writer’s improvement throughout the writing process. The writing progress can lead to a high level of achievement, and it is related to the students’ use of strategies and their affect.

*Writing Process*: Writing is an ongoing activity which requires different stages and strategies. The stages of this process include: pre-writing, drafting, revising and editing, and for each of these stages, different strategies can be used to accomplish it.

*Writing Strategy*: The term strategy refers to the student’s skill (s) in undertaking a given task or a problem-solving situation. For example, brainstorming is one of the pre-writing strategies which students use to generate ideas about a given topic.

*Writing Affect/ affective factors*: Affect refers to aspects of learner’s emotion, feeling, mood, or attitude, which condition behaviour (Arnold, 1999, p. 1). It is considered as an important
contributing factor to success in learning. In FL learning, aspects like ‘attitude’ and ‘motivation’ are the best predictor of FL achievement. Language apprehension/anxiety is, on the other hand, considered to be an inhibitor for FL achievement. In relation to writing, affect has to do with the ‘writer’s perceptions and beliefs’ and the ‘writer’s personal knowledge’ (Abdellatif, 2007). Aspects like ‘writing apprehension’ and ‘writing self-efficacy’ refer to the first category, i.e., writer’s perceptions and beliefs, and have a tight relationship with students’ success or failure in FL writing.

Writing Apprehension: Writing apprehension is used interchangeably with writing anxiety. It refers to the learner’s “tendency to avoid or approach writing situations” (Daly & Shamo, 1978, p. 120). In other words, writing apprehension is the learner’s “pre-disposition which determines how s/he responds to the situation in or through which s/he may be involved in performing writing tasks or in which her/his writing may be evaluated” (Abdellatif, 2007, p. 59).

Writing Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy refers to the learner’s beliefs about her/his learning capacities which in turn can “determine what s/he does with the knowledge and skills s/he has” (Bandura, 1997; in Abdellatif, 2007, p. 59). It helps learners control their goals about future writing achievements, the amount of effort to be devoted to perform the task (s), “the perseverance” they will need to surmount possible difficulties, and their “thought patterns and emotional responses” (Pajares & Johnson, 1994, p. 314).

8. Structure of the Thesis

The thesis comprises two parts: a theoretical account that consists of ‘chapter one’ and a practical part that consists of the research methodology design (chapter two) and the study
findings, analysis and discussion (chapter three and four). The last chapter (five) is devoted to
the research implications, limitations, and recommendations for further research.

The first chapter is divided into three sections. Section one provides an overview of the
nature of academic writing, with particular focus on the expository type and its characteristics. It
also summarizes some of the findings brought about EFL learners’ processes and strategies.
Section two reviews the studies that investigated the writing difficulties encountered by second
and foreign language learners, and the factors that may be related to their difficulties. Section
three explains some of the modern practices of writing instruction, mainly those related to
strategy training within the process approach framework, and its effect (s) on enhancing learners’
writing performance and positive affect.

Chapter two discusses the research methodology design, population and sampling
procedures, as well as a description of the instruments used to collect the data for this study. It
also explains the aim behind the selection of each instrument, its contribution to the study, as
well as the way it was employed. In addition, the chapter provides a clear explanation of the
procedures used to treat the data and the ethical issues that were considered to conduct it.

Chapter three and four are devoted to the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the
results obtained from the pre- and post-tests and the pre- and post-questionnaires. The results are
statistically displayed, using descriptive statistics and percent analysis, followed by qualitative
analysis. Moreover, a qualitative analysis of the think-aloud protocols is conducted to uncover
the writing processes and strategies used by high-, average-, and low-achieving participants.
Each of these chapters ends with a discussion of the results in light of the hypotheses set for this
research. Finally, chapter five consists of an account of the major pedagogical implications for
EFL writing instruction. It also highlights some potential limitations in the study as well as some recommendations for further research.
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Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the literature review that covers the major aspects of the present research. It is divided into three main parts, each of which discusses a number of aspects that are related to each other. The first part discusses the nature of academic writing, including the various definitions given by researchers from different perspectives, and a detailed account of the different features of expository writing, as an academic genre. In addition, it explains the writing processes and strategies, in some detail, as well as the ways in which the latter are used by skilled and unskilled writers.

The second part of this chapter reviews the major difficulties encountered by foreign language students in essay writing. A detailed account is also given to the description of some, among other, factors that are thought to be related to foreign language learners’ writing difficulties. These factors are particularly related to the nature of writing, the instructional writing methods, and learner-driven factors, which is the focus of the exploratory part of this research.

The third part, and the last one, is devoted to a description of the process approach to writing instruction, and the effect of strategy training in promoting students’ writing performance, both at the level of the process and product, and their affect level.

1.1. The Nature of Academic Writing: Definition, Features, Process and Strategies

1.1.1. Definition of Academic Writing

Writing is considered as one of the essential skills of any language. This entails that writing requires the knowledge and skills of the target language that learners acquire and apply
by using descriptive logical structure, organization and language to clearly convey a message. In this respect, Brooks and Penn (1970, p.3) state:

Writing things out is simply a more rigorous way of talking things out. It is a way of training the mind in logical thought. For one thing, in writing, we must understand the structure of the language, what the parts of speech do, how the words relate to one another, what individual words mean, the rules of grammar and punctuation.

This definition implies that compared to speaking, writing in a given language is a more organized logical act that is structured, and that calls for all the elements of a language, in combination, to convey meaning. That is to say, writing requires linguistic abilities, among language learners; these include vocabulary knowledge and the correct use of grammatical, syntactic, and semantic rules. Similarly, Flower and Hayes (1980) claim that writing is a mental process through which writers make choices related to the language elements and their use, and that these choices are made selectively to convey meaning. This suggests that there is a goal to achieve from the act of writing, and that the procedure of selection entails steps, a mental process that has a cognitive nature. These researchers were among the pioneers of the process approach to writing, and their “Cognitive Process Theory of Writing” considers the cognitive processes to be distinctive among different writers because the latter process their thoughts and organize them in different ways. They state that writing is “best understood as a set of distinctive thinking processes which writers orchestrate or organise during the act of composing”; “these processes have a hierarchical... organization”, and are “goal-directed” (p. 366). The hierarchical organization of the cognitive processes makes of writing a demanding complex task, involving the generation of ideas, organizing, and composing them into a coherent text.
Berlin (1988), on the other hand, views writing as a combination of the mind, with its cognitive processes and linguistic units, and the audience. The latter gives writing a social dimension that interacts, in harmony, with the abstract mind. In more concrete terms:

For cognitive rhetoric, the structures of the mind are in perfect harmony with the structures of the material world, the minds of the audience, and the units of the language.” (Berlin, 1988, p. 480).

To put it otherwise, there is a close connection between the writer and the reader. Thus, in addition to the considerable amount of cognitive energy a writer has to devote to the act of writing, by simultaneously managing various types of information related to the topic, purpose, and the rules and conventions of writing (Weigle, 2002), s/ he has to consider audience needs and expectations. That is to say, writing has a communicative value and it is a tool to share ideas with others, or in Graham, MacArthur, and Fitzgerald (2013, p. 289)’s words, “writing is a social activity because [writers] can share [their] writing with others and discuss and comment on it, as well as use it to communicate”.

This social constructivist view emphasizes the social dimension of writing, which consists of purpose and audience, among other elements. In other words, writing to communicate involves meaning and sharing with others; i.e., there is a sense of reciprocity between the writer (i.e., the producer) and the reader (i.e., the receiver). This social interaction also calls for a psychological, or affective, dimension that cannot be dissociated from the social one (Graham et al., 2013). That is to say, the act of writing is goal-directed, and the latter is triggered by the writer’s will or motivation to write. Without the latter, the act of writing may not take place or may not be well performed to reach the reader’s expectations. Writing is, hence, a socio-affective act.
To sum up, writing is considered to have cognitive, linguistic, and socio-affective dimensions. The cognitive and linguistic dimensions have a mental and behavioural nature, in that writers process their cognitive and linguistic abilities and use them in the act of composing. The socio-affective dimension is communicative and it entails a social and affective influence between the student writers and their readers.

1.1.2. Features and Conventions of Academic Writing

Writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) is a demanding mental activity that requires skills and strategies as well as a good command of the language specific to a given purpose and genre. At the university setting, students are more likely required to produce the academic type of writing in completing assignments like essays, research papers and written exams (Boardman, 2009; Boardman & Frydenberg, 2008).

Academic writing tends to be more challenging to undergraduate EFL students than it is to native speakers of English (Murray, 2012). The demands of this type of writing involve not only language proficiency and the writing conventions, but also a good understanding and manipulation of the complex organizational patterns pertaining to a given academic topic and purpose of writing. It also requires good analytical and rhetorical skills as well as a considerable repertoire and an appropriate use of academic register relevant to a given topic and genre (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013).

In more concrete terms, academic writing refers to the type of writing in which the student writer informs, analyses, describes, or explains to the reader information or data by providing evidence from reliable sources. It requires an academic style that is objective and formal, and a specific register (vocabulary) that is related to a specific topic and purpose. In addition, academic
writing has various types, including: descriptive, narrative, persuasive and expository writing. The latter can, for example, be organized through different patterns, such as: classification, process analysis, cause-effect, problem-solution, or comparison-contrast. Some of the above-mentioned patterns can be combined together in one essay, but generally one pattern dominates an essay, and each has specific rules that govern it (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). These types will be explained, below, under the sub-heading ‘Types of Academic Writing’.

Academic writing is characterized by an objective style, formal language, and clear, coherent and organised ideas. It embraces different types, purposes, and organizational patterns. Moreover, academic writing has a concept of audience (Leki, 1998) that student writers need to be aware of. These aspects and others are explained, in some detail, below.

**Writing Purpose and Audience**

Purpose and audience are very important aspects of academic writing. It is through identifying them that a student writer can make decisions as to what to write in terms of content, how to write it to convince the reader, and what type of language, register, or style to use. Therefore, understanding the purpose and audience of one’s writing is one of the primary things a student should consider.

The purpose of writing denotes that the student writer has a given message to convey to the reader (Murray, 2012). It answers questions like: Why is the piece being written? What is it for? Or what does it convey? In academic writing, a writer may be interested in informing, explaining and analysing, arguing, or describing. Each of these purposes depends on the topic. Once the topic and the purpose are known, the student has to think of who will read the piece of
writing, i.e., the audience. The concepts of purpose and audience are, hence, closely connected to each other.

According to Leki (1998), “the concept of audience is extremely helpful” for student writers in the sense that knowing who the readers are will facilitate for them “to make assumptions about what they know, what they do not know, and what they want to know”. Accordingly, the writer will “make decisions about all aspects of [his/ her writing]” (pp. 39-40). These aspects may include the following:

- The level of formality and objectivity (of the language and style),
- The type of register (specific to the topic, audience, and genre),
- The pattern of organisation (topic- and genre-specific), and
- The level of literacy (of the target audience).

**Style and Language**

As mentioned above, audience is also related to the style and language a student writer uses in writing academic essays or papers. Thus, in academic writing, language and style have to be formal and objective (Murray, 2012). Formality refers to the use of formal expressions, vocabulary, and grammatical forms, while objectivity has to do with the use of an academic, as opposed to personal, style that is free of any personal opinions, feelings, or emotive language. An example about formal language consists of grammatical forms, which have to be written in full as opposed to their contracted forms. Thus, expressions like ‘cannot’ and ‘they will’ are academically acceptable unlike their respective contracted forms ‘can’t’ and ‘they’ll’.

Similarly, the use of impersonal, or as Murray (2012) labels it ‘gender-free’, style is an aspect of objectivity that is required in academic writing, mainly if the writer is addressing an
academic audience. Using an impersonal style denotes that the writer’s voice is objective and not present explicitly through the use of personal pronouns ‘I’ or ‘we’. One way to avoid using the personal pronouns ‘I’ or ‘we’ is by using a third person singular point of view (he or she) or a plural form (they). Another way is the use of the passive voice, which is considered more appropriate in academic writing (Murray, 2012). The following example illustrates the point in more clear terms.

**Personal (subjective) style**

- In this study, I am interested in exploring the factors that are related to undergraduate students’ writing difficulties.

**Impersonal (objective) style (active voice)**

- In this study, the researcher is interested in exploring the factors that are related to undergraduate students’ writing difficulties.

**Alternative/ objective way (passive voice)**

- The factors that are related to undergraduate students’ writing difficulties are explored in this study.

**Academic Vocabulary (Register)**

Like language and style, the use of vocabulary, or register, in academic writing has its characteristics. The student writer has to use an academic register that is formal and objective. In other words, s/he has to avoid using informal, colloquial or slang words and expressions as well as emotive language that expresses feelings and personal opinions. The choice of register is related to the audience, topic and the purpose of writing. It is also genre-specific in the sense that each genre requires a specific register. For example, the expository type (or genre) of writing
requires an academic register that is different from those used in argumentative or descriptive writing (Murray, 2012).

**Organization and Clarity**

Organization in a piece of writing is one of the most important aspects that student writers have to consider in academic writing (Hogue, 2003). It is sometimes crucial, particularly for inexperienced students, because it is multi-faceted. That is to say, the organization of a piece of writing does not concern only the surface structure; rather, it involves the internal aspects of essay, paragraph, and sentence structure. In addition, organization depends on the writers’ personal goals, the various types of paragraph and essay organizational patterns, and on the different genres of writing (Leki, 1998; Oshima & Hogue, 2006). For example, the organization of a comparison-contrast paragraph or essay appears to be different from the one adopted in a process-analysis essay. On the other hand, an essay developed by a cause-effect relationship may have different organizational patterns, as it is mentioned below, in figure 1 and figure 2 that illustrate the organizational patterns of a cause-effect essay.

In addition to structure and organizational patterns related to different genres, organization involves meaning (Murray, 2012), in the sense that when the ideas, in a piece of writing, are organized, meaning is achieved. In contrast, if there is a lack of organization at the level of sentences, paragraphs or a whole essay, meaning is distorted, unclear, and confusing to the reader. What guides students to achieve organization, in addition to the logical order of ideas, is the use of cohesive devices and transitions. If the latter are used appropriately, the student writers can achieve an organized, coherent, and clear piece of writing.
In order for students to achieve the desired goals of organization in writing, it is recommended that they plan extensively before writing. Planning guides writers through tentative and detailed plans to organize their ideas with respect to their personal goals and the requirements of specific genres and essay types (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006).

**Unity, Cohesion, and Coherence**

Unity, cohesion and coherence are essential in writing in that they guide the reader smoothly throughout the written text (Hogue, 2003). These aspects make the piece of writing clear and easy to understand because the ideas flow in a logical way. Thus, a unified piece of writing denotes that there is connection between the ideas in the sense that all the ideas discuss the same topic. Cohesion refers to the connection between the ideas, sentences, and the different paragraphs in a piece of writing. To achieve this connection, student writers can make use of cohesive devices and transitions; the latter are of different types and their use depends on the topic, the purpose, the genre as well as the different organizational patterns of writing. Coherence depends on cohesion, unity, and the flow of ideas. Thus, when cohesive devices are used appropriately and the ideas are logically connected, the flow from one idea into another and from one paragraph into the next one becomes easier and smoother (Hogue, 2003; Murray, 2012).

**Other Features: Explicitness, Concision, and Precision**

In addition to the above mentioned features, explicitness, concision, and precision are important in academic writing. Academic language has to be explicit, as opposed to the implicit way of writing. This means that the writer has to make each idea or key word clear and accessible to the readers. In addition, s/he has to write concisely whereby s/he avoids redundancy and repetition. Precision refers to the direct way of expressing ideas; that is, a writer has to go to
the point so as to avoid confusion and misinterpretation among readers. These characteristics are interrelated and they contribute to a clear, succinct, and explicit language that a writer has to be aware of in producing academic papers and essays (Murray, 2012).

**Punctuation and Spelling (Mechanics)**

Although spelling and punctuation are considered among the mechanical aspects of writing that are given a lesser degree of importance in the writing performance, these two aspects contribute to clarity and meaning in writing (Hogue, 2003). In academic writing, words should be spelled correctly and sentences have to be punctuated appropriately so as to achieve clarity in meaning. When a piece of writing is not punctuated or is inappropriately punctuated, it may result in a lack of comprehension and confusion among readers. In addition, a student writer has to avoid the use of abbreviated forms of words or expressions, unless they are used in their appropriate academic forms (Murray, 2012). The above-mentioned aspects contribute to a certain degree in achieving clear and meaningful writing.

**1.1.3. Types of Academic Writing**

Academic writing embraces different types, also referred to as ‘genres’ (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013), and various organizational patterns. The major types that are often used in academic contexts include, among others: descriptive, persuasive, and expository writing. Although these types share similar features of academic writing, each of them has its own purpose (s).

Descriptive writing, as its name suggests, aims at describing a person, place, event, or an object. It can be achieved through vivid language, examples, comparing and/or contrasting the elements or the characteristics attributed to the described subject, or illustrating through
examples or displaying graphs and/ or statistics. An effective description should contain sufficient details and varied elaboration in order to communicate the desired goal, i.e. the intended description (Murray, 2012; Oshima & Hogue, 2006). Persuasive, or argumentative, writing is used to persuade the reader about an idea, belief, or point of view. In doing so, a student writer uses arguments, examples, and concrete evidence to convince the reader about her/ his point of view, or in other words, support her/ his position. In academic writing, unlike personal viewpoints, the arguments have to have a certain degree of objectivity. They also have to be expressed in a clear, convincing manner to reach the reader’s expectations (Leki, 1998).

Expository writing is intended to inform the reader, explain, illustrate, or analyse an idea, information, facts, or events. Like any type/ genre of academic writing, the expository type requires objectivity and formality, as it is explained below. It also involves different other types, such as, process analysis, problem-solving, and comparison-contrast relationships (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). What follows is a more detailed description of expository writing, as a common type/ genre of academic writing.

Expository writing is considered as one common type or genre of academic writing. It also embraces a number of organizational patterns through which an essay can be developed; these include: description, process analysis, classification, cause-effect, comparison-contrast, and problem-solution relationships, to name a few. Each of these types has a specific purpose, organizational pattern that governs it, and requires a specific register and language devices (Murray, 2012). For example, a comparison-contrast relationship has as a main purpose comparing and contrasting between two or more objects or people to identify the points of similarity and difference between them. It has specific language devices to express the comparison-contrast relationship and link between the ideas and paragraphs. It can also be
developed through different methods, such as, the block and the point by point pattern of organization (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). Likewise, the cause-effect type has its particular characteristics, although it has some points of similarity with the other types. The following is a description of the cause-effect type of expository writing, with its main features.

1.1.3.1. Description of a Sample Expository Essay: The Cause-effect Relationship

Cause and effect, as its name suggests, refers to the type of expository writing where a student writer is required to establish a relationship between the causes of a particular event, phenomenon, or problem and its direct, or indirect effects. Writing about this type of essay entails a discussion of:

- The reasons why something happened, how certain circumstances might have been avoided, the reasons for [making certain] decisions, the implications of particular actions,
- potential problems associated with a certain view or course of action; [or] the significance and/ or implications of taking a particular stance on something … theoretical or practical (Murray, 2012, p.56).

Understanding and analysing the causes of a particular event or phenomenon and its effects becomes less complex once the relationship between them is established. The latter is an important and complex cognitive process that learners have to consider carefully. In this regard, Leki (1998) argues that the “ability to determine accurately the causes of a given situation or the effects of another is an important intellectual ability to develop [among learners]” (p. 275).

In more concrete terms, the complexity of the cause-effect relationship lies in the pattern (s) in which ideas have to be organized into a coherent, logical, and meaningful essay. These patterns differ in structure and focus. Thus, a writer may prefer to focus more on the causes rather than the effects, or s/he may wish to give them equal importance, or, again, discuss only...
the causes or the effects. In any of these cases, the writer can choose one of the organizational patterns that fits the cause-effect relationship. The patterns consist of: the *block* and the *chain* methods. The *block* method is the simplest in structure, hence, the easiest for students, mainly beginners. The *chain* method is the most commonly used and is most appropriate to develop the cause-effect relationship (Leki, 1998; Oshima & Hogue, 2006). The selection of one of these patterns depends on the purpose and the topic, and the student may decide which one to use accordingly.

In more concrete terms, in *block organization*, a writer may focus on the causes or the effects, depending on the purpose and the topic of writing. In doing so, s/he can discuss a number of causes in a few paragraphs, then, create a transitional paragraph and, finally, move to analyse the effects. The student writer does not have to include a transitional paragraph; however, the latter helps in concluding a previous block (causes) and introducing the following one (effects), especially when the topic is complex (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). Figure 1, below, illustrates two different patterns of the block method of organization in a cause-effect essay. Other patterns may also be possible, in which a student may discuss either the causes or the effects.

![Figure 1](image-url)

**Figure 1.** Cause/Effect Essay: Block Organization (Oshima & Hogue, 2006, p. 95)
The *chain organization* is considered to be more appropriate for the cause-effect essay (Hogue, 2003; Oshima & Hogue, 2006), mainly when the causes and effects occur as a reaction to each other, and, thus, form a chain. In other words, a chain is created if a given cause or event leads to a given effect, and the latter (effect) leads, in turn, to another cause (event), and this event causes another effect, as it is shown in Figure 2., below.

![Figure 2. Cause/ Effect Essay: Chain Organization (Oshima & Hogue, 2006, p. 99)](image)

1.1.4. The Language of the Cause-effect Relationship

The language of a cause-effect essay is characterized by the use of specific transition signals that are particular to this type of writing. The ideas are related to each other by means of cohesive devices and transitions that express the purpose of the essay (cause-effect relationship). Examples of connectors that express cause and effect are given in the following table (adapted from Hogue, 2003, p. 306 and Murray, 2012, pp. 56-57).
Table 1

*Cause and Effect Relationships (Connecting Clauses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Connectors</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressing cause (reasons)</td>
<td><em>Because, as, since... due to...</em></td>
<td>The water produced by the rapidly melting ice <em>resulted in/ led to/ caused / contributed to</em> a rise in sea level of several inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>To result from, to be the result of</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>As a consequence of, as a result of, the effect of...</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing effect (results)</td>
<td><em>Consequently, as a consequence</em></td>
<td>A rise in sea level was the <em>consequence/ the result / the effect of</em> the water produced by the rapidly melting ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>As a result, to result in...</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The reason for... the cause of...</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>To affect...</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.5. Structure of an Academic Essay

Understanding the structure of an essay is one of the most important aspects a student writer has to consider. Respecting the structure in writing is a characteristic of good writing (Hogue, 2003; Murray, 2012). Structure is an aspect of organization and it helps guide the reader throughout the different parts of an essay and follow the flow of ideas. Good structure contributes to achieving coherence and clear meaning in writing.

A good essay should contain an introduction, with a good attention grabber and a clear thesis statement that states the purpose of writing, three or more body paragraphs that reflect the thesis statement and discuss the main ideas thoroughly and coherently, and a conclusion that summarizes the main ideas. Moreover, a logical organization of an essay is required in order to guide the reader. This can be achieved by following a particular pattern of organization to discuss the major ideas of the topic, which depends on the nature of the topic and the purpose of writing (Murray, 2012). The following is a brief description of the main parts of an essay.
**Introductory paragraph**

In an introduction, a writer introduces the topic and tries to attract the attention of the reader. In doing so, s/he uses general statements and attention grabbers that create interest and curiosity in the reader’s mind. S/he will, then, state the purpose of the essay in a clear way, and hint, implicitly or explicitly, to the main ideas of the essay. This is called the thesis statement, and it is generally the last sentence in the introduction (Boardman & Frydenberg, 2008). In a thesis statement, the writer may also refer to the pattern in which the main ideas will be organized in the body; this will guide the reader to follow the flow of ideas. The thesis statement should be considered carefully because it may take various shapes and may appear to be interesting, but may not be clear or may not state the purpose clearly. Some statements are simply facts and are not acceptable for development and analysis.

The following example illustrates the difference between an appropriate and an inappropriate thesis statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate thesis</th>
<th>Inappropriate thesis</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are three major effects of school dropout: economic, social, and psychological.</td>
<td>School dropout is a serious social phenomenon.</td>
<td>The second thesis does not state the purpose clearly. It is not clear whether the writer will discuss the effects of school dropout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Body paragraphs**

The body is the second main part of an essay and is the most important as it discusses the details, support examples, and explanations that the reader needs to know (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). The body is divided into several paragraphs. Each paragraph discusses one main idea of the topic and includes a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence. The
organization of ideas in the body depends on the nature of the topic, its purpose and genre. To achieve a logical relationship between the ideas, a writer has to use devices and handy language that is appropriate to the selected topic/genre, purpose and pattern of organization. The length of the body paragraphs is important in that each main idea should be discussed deeply and thoroughly; however, there is no specific limit for that.

**Concluding paragraph**

A concluding paragraph in an essay summarizes the main points that have been discussed in the body paragraphs or it restates the thesis (statement). It does not add any further details or explain what has already been said. A conclusion is as important as is the introduction because it

---

**Figure 3.** Essay Structure (Oshima & Hogue, 2006, p. 57)
leads the reader towards the end of the essay in a logical manner that it leaves an impact on him/her (Oshima & Hogue, 2006).

Figure 3., above, provides a clear picture of the different parts of an essay, with a detailed structure of each part (paragraph). It is easy for a student writer to establish a relationship between the structure of a paragraph and that of an essay in the sense that the former is simply one main unit of the latter.

1.1.6. Writing Process and Strategies

1.1.6.1. Writing Process: Defined

Writing is a dynamic recursive process that involves various stages: planning, drafting, and revising. The recursive nature of the writing process allows the student writer to use different strategies while planning, writing, and revising, and move back and forth at their convenience. While processing their writing, students use strategies to facilitate the mental multitasks that are required to produce a clear, organized, and meaningful piece of writing.

The process of writing consists of different stages that are related to each other, sequentially and recursively; i.e., each stage leads to and completes the other in a way that writers may go back and forth while processing their writing. They may plan their ideas, formulate them into a written essay, and, then, go back and plan again and, finally, rewrite their ideas. They may also evaluate their ideas and, then, consult their plans again to make possible revisions to achieve a better organization. The main stages of writing are displayed in Figure 4., below, which is based on the Flower and Hayes’ (1980) process model of writing. The figure shows that there are various elements that operate in coordination with each other during the process of writing: task environment, the writer’s long term memory, and the writing process.
Task environment refers to the writing assignment and the text produced, that is, the finished product of writing. In more concrete terms, the writing process starts with the choice of the ‘writing assignment’ or task; the arrow moves in the direction of planning, which is the first stage of the process. In the early stage of the planning process, writers have to consider (think about) the topic, audience, and the motivating cues, which would guide them achieve their goals. Once they have decided about the assignment, they start to generate ideas for their text, by making use of their long term memory. The latter includes three types of knowledge: knowledge about the topic, knowledge of audience, and the stored writing plans.

The second planning sub-process consists of organizing ideas and goal setting. Because planning is a recursive process, writers may set new goals and reorganize their ideas along the
whole process of planning. Goal setting and organization are monitored through the use of strategies, which may depend on the topic, the purpose, the genre and organizational patterns of the intended text.

The following stage, after planning, is translating, or drafting. During this stage, writers expand their ideas, by elaborating on those they generated during the previous stage. Drafting also involves organizing ideas into a clear form of a text (e.g., an essay); respecting a given pattern of organization, such as, establishing a cause-effect relationship; and connecting ideas in a logical and coherent way, by using cohesive devices and transitions. These sub-processes are also goal-oriented and are monitored through composing strategies. Writers may also consider consulting their plans again, make modifications, and decide on alternative organizational patterns or forms, which explains the recursive nature of the composing processes.

After the first draft (text produced so far) is completed, the writers may decide to review their text. Reviewing includes reading and editing, according to Hayes and Flower (1980)’s model. Other researchers (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006; Murray, 2012) refer to reviewing as revising and editing. Revision includes the major aspects of writing, that is, revision for content, organization, and style, while editing concerns the minor aspects of a written text, including grammar and mechanics. Student writers may revise recursively while planning, drafting, or revising. Revision may go through different sub-processes, during which students may use various revision and editing strategies. Once they finish revising and editing, they may rewrite their pieces and submit them.

A more detailed account about the different stages of the writing process and the common processes and strategies used in each stage are provided, below.
1.1.6.2. Writing Strategies: Defined

In general terms, a strategy refers to the actions a learner takes in performing a specific language act or problem-solving situation. Cohen (1998) relates strategies to specific behaviours or processes that second (SL) or foreign language (FL) learners select in purposeful and conscious ways. These processes may affect positively on the learning and/or use of the target language by storing, memorizing, and applying the information related to a given language. Similarly, Alhaissoni (2012) defines a strategy as a "series of actions, methods, steps and techniques employed by a learner behaviourally or mentally, and more or less consciously, to facilitate their processing, retrieving, and [use] of information" (p.145).

A writing strategy can be considered as a conscious behaviour that is intended to solve a problem or reach a certain goal in a writing activity (Graham & Harris, 2005). Kieft, Rijlaarsdam, & Den Berg (2006) view a writing strategy from the perspective of organizing cognitive activities that writers go through during the process of planning, drafting, and revising writing.

Likewise, Alexander, Graham, and Harris (1998) describe a writing strategy as a “set of operations or actions that a [learner] consciously undertakes in order to accomplish a desired goal” (in Graham & Harris, 2005, p. 8). According to them, a strategy “involves purposeful behavior” and the “how to” or “procedural knowledge needed to accomplish the desired goal” (pp. 8-9). In order to reach the desired goal, a writer needs to have and make use of a “strategic know-how” that can be in the form of a “step-by-step” procedure (p. 9). The latter involves both the knowledge about writing and the actions a writer makes to achieve the desired goal.
Graham and Harris (2005) consider that strategies have a facilitating effect on the learners’ writing processes at the various phases of the process: planning, writing, and reviewing. For this effect to take place, strategies have to be “deliberately activated” because they are “purposeful, procedural, willful, and effortful” (p. 9). This means that writers have to be committed and motivated to use specific strategies for a specific purpose or a particular writing task.

It is, therefore, important for student writers to recognize the writing strategies and their importance in facilitating the demands of the writing processes (Cohen & Macaro, 2007). Recognizing and understanding their importance would develop the writers’ meta-cognitive awareness of the writing strategies, hence, they would learn to use them more effectively to improve their writing.

1.1.6.3. Writing Processes and Strategies Per Stage

There is no clear-cut difference between the writing processes, sub-processes, and strategies. They are sometimes used interchangeably by some researchers (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006). Thus, processes involve sub-processes and strategies, and, in various cases, sub-processes are referred to as strategies. For example, brainstorming is a strategy used by student writers to generate ideas during the pre-writing stage of the writing process. It is also considered as a sub-process or process, involving other brainstorming strategies, such as, free writing and mind-mapping. Likewise, peer-reviewing is a revision strategy used by student writers. It is also referred to as a process that involves several sub-processes and/ or strategies, such as, reading the produced text, evaluating it, and discussing with a peer (s) (Graham, et al., 2013; MacArthur et al., 2006). What
follows is a description of the writing processes and strategies, per stage, that is, planning, drafting (or composing), and revision (including editing).

In this work, a *process*, often used as ‘the writing process’, refers to the stages of writing that students go through while they are writing; that is, from the pre-writing stage till the end of revision. When the term *process* is used in the plural form, as in *students’ writing processes, planning processes, or cognitive processes*, this involves the processes and/ or sub-processes that student writers go through while, for example, thinking, brainstorming, planning, writing, or revising. Each of these is in itself a process or sub-process that is part of a whole process of writing. They are, therefore, used in the plural form, particularly when the process involves other sub-processes. As for strategies, they are used within the process or sub-processes, but in some contexts a strategy is itself a process or sub-process, as in the examples mentioned in the previous paragraph.

1.1.6.3.1. Planning Processes and Strategies

Recent studies (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013; Graham & Harris, 2005; Murray, 2012) on writing instruction emphasize the importance of teaching planning strategies as a fundamental phase of the process of writing. Planning strategies prepare the platform for an organized, coherent and meaningful piece of writing that allows the reader to go through the different parts of an essay in a smooth way, without confusion of meaning.

Planning can be defined as a set of cognitive processes that require a significant mental effort. It involves processes like: generating, outlining, and organizing ideas. To facilitate these processes, writers can use a number of strategies to guide them through various steps that are purposeful and self-regulated to build an organized, meaningful and coherent piece. Examples of
the planning strategies include: setting a goal for writing, analysing a topic, evaluating information, and considering audience.

Researchers (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001; Deane, Odendahl, Quinlan, Fowles, Welsh, & Bivens-Taum, 2008; Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013) identified different approaches to the planning processes; the two major ones consist of: the top-down and the bottom-up. The top-down approach, or what Graham et al. (2013) call “advanced planning”, refers to what writers do in the pre-writing phase, including “concept [mapping] and outlining”. In the bottom-up approach, however, the writers “[discover]” thoughts as they write freely and, then, proceed to recursive revision and organization (Graham et al., 2013, p. 193).

These researchers claim that advanced planning is more effective for writers who encounter more difficulties in tackling various cognitive processes simultaneously. Thus, they recommend that students be taught the advanced planning strategies explicitly as they have considerable effects on the organization of their writing. This can be the case with students with varying levels of writing ability, including the skilled ones, as Deane et al. (2008, p. 36) put it: “even skilled writers can be limited by working-memory capacity so that they cannot handle all the aspects of the writing task simultaneously”.

The bottom-up approach is recursive in nature. In other words, writers can proceed through the process of generating ideas while considering decisions as to which ideas they will keep and which ones to delete. In doing so, some writers reflect on their ideas by revising their original plans, while others change their written thoughts, “visualize, and re-envision the structure and content” of their writing (Graham et al., 2013, p. 200).
The top-down and bottom-up approaches to planning processes can both be effective for student writers, but the former can be easier for struggling writers, who have problems processing several cognitive activities at a time. Skilful writers, on the other hand, may use both approaches successfully as they are more strategic and are able to handle complex activities simultaneously. They can, for example, generate ideas while reflecting on them, evaluating them, and making decisions related to content, structure, and organization of ideas.

In comparing unskilled and skilled students in as far as strategy use is concerned, MacArthur, Graham, and Fitzgerald (2006) report that the formers tend to pay little or no importance to planning their writing, thinking that the latter takes a considerable amount of effort and time; hence, they consider that a plan is unnecessary since they already have an idea in mind about what they are going to write (Rosa and Roca de Larios, 2007). Because they ignore the importance of planning (Graham et al., 2013) in easing the composing processes, these writers usually start writing by making minimal concept maps or some free writing in order to save time and avoid making extra mental efforts.

Skilled writers, on the other hand, consider planning seriously by devoting sufficient time and effort. In doing so, they set a goal for their writing, and accordingly, plan purposefully and strategically. According to MacArthur et al. (2006), these writers tend to spend a considerable mental effort before and during writing. Thus, before they start writing, they often plan their writing, by trying free writing or by creating a “graphic organizer”, “a semantic map (for expository text), or an outline” (p. 200). The common planning strategies that are generally used by skilled writers are displayed in table 2, below, with a brief corresponding definition for each.
Table 2

Common Planning Strategies and their Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing/ analysing vocabulary, content, or strategy</td>
<td>Judging one’s writing either positively or negatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General planning</td>
<td>Organizing thoughts and deciding how to proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/ decision making based on purpose/ genre or topic</td>
<td>Making decisions related to the purpose/ genre, or the topic of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating (or brainstorming) ideas</td>
<td>Generating new ideas/ elaborating on previous ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local planning/ goal setting</td>
<td>Deciding what to write next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning about content/ structure/ other aspects of writing</td>
<td>Asking questions related to content/ structure/ or other aspects of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/ rereading/ repetition</td>
<td>Reading/ rereading/ Repeating (a generated) word/ or part/complete sentence(s) while writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to audience, purpose/ genre, or topic</td>
<td>Relating audience, purpose, or genre/ topic to the activity of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to cohesion/ coherence</td>
<td>Establishing a link between sentences/ paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to strategy use</td>
<td>Mentioning the strategy used/ its importance (e.g., brainstorming, listing, mind-mapping, outlining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Adding or deleting a word/ expression/ or an idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem recognition or identification</td>
<td>Recognizing or identifying a problem while thinking or writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem assessment</td>
<td>Examining and solving the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to organizational pattern/ structure of an essay</td>
<td>Decision making related to essay organization/ structure in accordance with a particular pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>Selecting vocabulary words or expressions that fit into a given context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other classifications of the planning strategies may exist, but the list provided, here, is adapted from the works conducted by: Akyel & Kamisli (1996), Graham & Harris (2005),
Mahfoudi (2003), Perl (1979), Raimes (1985), and Wong (2005). Because writing is a recursive process, some strategies can be used throughout the three stages of the writing process, i.e., planning, drafting, and revising. For example, goal setting, word choice, generating ideas, and editing are strategies that may be used at any writing stage, because writers may revise or edit while planning or composing, as they can generate more ideas at the revision stage of writing, that is, after they finish drafting.

1.1.6.3.2. Composing Processes and Strategies

Composing or drafting (Graham et al., 2013; Hamlaoui, 2007), as its name suggests, refers to the stage of writing where writers start to put down their ideas into form, by respecting a specific form (paragraph or essay), and construct meaning. The piece of writing may not have a perfect shape; rather, drafting indicates that writers may produce several drafts before achieving a polished piece of writing. In more concrete terms, after planning their ideas, writers need to connect these ideas so that they give them a more coherent shape and meaning. They may generate more content and details by elaborating on their previously generated ideas, and they may modify or delete ideas and change their plans as they wish.

Like planning, drafting processes also require strategies to facilitate the composing demands of writing (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006). These composing demands include, but are not limited to, goal setting, word choice, content generation, knowledge about the topic and genre, sentence combining, organizational patterns (e.g., cause-effect and comparison-contrast relationships, argumentation, description), cohesive ties, coherence, meaning, audience and purpose consideration, in addition to language use (grammar accuracy and fluency, vocabulary use, genre-based language cues) and writing conventions (spelling, punctuation, and formatting). In order to ease these processing demands, writers can make use of
composing strategies (Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013; Hamlaoui, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2006). Examples about the composing strategies used by skilled writers include: generating ideas through brainstorming or free writing; setting goals based on audience, topic, and genre; selecting vocabulary words and expressions and assessing them; sentence combining, using various types of compound and subordinate clauses and connecting them by means of cohesive devices, the choice of which depends on the topic, genre, and organizational pattern; and using organizational patterns that are genre specific, such as establishing a cause-effect relationship (Hogue, 2003; Murray, 2012).

In comparing the composing processes and strategies used by skilled and unskilled students, Graham and Harris (2005) and MacArthur et al. (2006) report that the latter tend to focus more on solving language problems and surface-level aspects of composing rather than meaning and content. In addition, they often generate less content compared to skilled writers, whose main focus is on developing their ideas in a lesser amount of time and with deep focus on meaning, purpose, and audience expectations. They pay less importance to language matters, particularly, grammar and spelling. Their main concern is to solve the cognitive problems that arise during the composing processes, such as, the knowledge related to the topic and genre of writing, the internal and external aspects of organization, meaning construction and responding to audience needs.

In this respect, MacArthur et al. (2006) and Graham et al. (2013) suggest that an effective use of the composing processes and strategies facilitates text generation and organizational processes that are the main focus of the composing stage of writing. They also recommend that when students make an effective use of the planning strategies, particularly, advance planning, they tend to have a lesser load of tasks during the composing stage of the writing process.
Table 3  
*Common Drafting/ Composing Strategies and their Definitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General planning</td>
<td>Organizing ideas and deciding how to proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas</td>
<td>Generating content/ elaborating on previous ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing preference (of word/ expression/ idea, structure, or strategy)</td>
<td>Selecting/ evaluating vocabulary, ideas, sentence structure, or strategy used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to cohesion/ coherence</td>
<td>Establishing a link between sentences/ paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to grammar</td>
<td>Expressing concern/ choice of grammatical form/ use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to structure/ pattern of organization</td>
<td>Mentioning sentence/ paragraph/ essay structure or pattern of organization (e.g., cause-effect/ point by point method)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>Making decisions related to the purpose or topic of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing/ interpreting a word or idea</td>
<td>Explaining the meaning, choice, use of a word or idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/ rereading</td>
<td>Reading/ rereading generated word(s) or sentence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing content (what has been written) or a strategy</td>
<td>Judging (positively or negatively) on one’s ideas, writing, or a strategy used, in terms of its importance or use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning about an idea, sentence structure, word choice, etc.</td>
<td>Asking questions about an idea, word meaning, structure or other aspects of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to audience, purpose, or topic</td>
<td>Relating audience, purpose, topic to the activity of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to cohesion/ coherence/ unity</td>
<td>Establishing a logical relationship (or meaning) within/ between sentences/ paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to strategy use</td>
<td>Mentioning the strategy used/ its importance (e.g., brainstorming, outlining, goal setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and revising ideas/ structure</td>
<td>Writing &amp; making major changes (content/ organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/ composing and editing</td>
<td>Making changes at the level of grammar and mechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This implies that the writing processes are recursively connected throughout the different phases of writing and the strategies used have a facilitating effect on the immediate as well as on the following writing processes. Table 3, above, describes briefly the common composing strategies used by skilled writers. The list of strategies is adapted from Akyel and Kamisli (1996), Graham & Harris (2005), Hamlaoui (2007), Mahfoudi (2003), Perl (1979), Raimes (1985), and Wong (2005).

1.1.6.3.3. Revision Processes and Strategies

Revision and editing are the final stages of the writing process. As in planning and drafting, there are strategies that are specific to revision and editing, which, when used effectively, would contribute to improved writing regardless of the writer’s performance level (Graham and Harris, 2005; Sasaki, 2000; Sze, 2002). Flower and Hayes (1981a) divided revision into two sub-processes: evaluating and revising. Later, they divided them into further sub-processes as mentioned below. The latter define clearly what revision activities involve and how they are generated (Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver & Stratman, 1986).

In the process of evaluating and revising, a writer has to make choices as to which strategies to use as s/he “defines the task”, “evaluates the text and defines the encountered problem”, “selects a strategy involving either going back to the preceding processes or going on to modify the text”, and, finally, “modifies the text ... by revising it or rewriting it” (Alhaissoni, 2012, p. 145). These sub-processes are considered in a hierarchical way and each of which is dependent on the preceding one. However, a writer may choose to revise recursively by going back and forth flexibly (Flower et al., 1986; Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013).
The main goal of revision is evaluating and improving the product of writing. Before they start their revision, student writers should identify their goals, decide on which levels (deep/surface level) they will make revision, and the strategies they will use to achieve the goals set. The deep-level revision refers to the major aspects of revision, which include, but not limited to, revising for content, in terms of variety and amount of ideas; organization, including external (essay and paragraph structure/outline) and internal (connection between ideas and sentences/cohesion, organizational patterns, and the logical order of ideas/coherence) aspects of organization; and language accuracy and fluency, which involve grammar usage, vocabulary choice, syntactic structures, and sentence fluency. The surface-level revision, on the other hand, consists of superficial aspects of revision, often referred to as editing, such as, grammatical forms, mechanics (spelling, punctuation, and capitalization), and format (spacing, indentation, and margins). The latter are considered to have a lesser or no effect on altering meaning in writing.

In comparing skilled and unskilled writers in as far as their revision processes and strategies are concerned, studies (e.g., Alhaisoni, 2012; Flower et al., 1986; Graham & Harris, 2005; Li, 1999) show that these two categories of writers generally demonstrate differences at various levels when they revise. In other words, skilled writers tend to focus on the written text as a whole, while their unskilled peers give tribute to the sentence level and ignore the macro-level revision. In addition, skilled writers possess a higher level of meta-cognitive awareness and the knowledge needed to set the required goals, such as: “[checking] for correct meaning, text length, and text type” and “… the number, density, and complexity of the problems and errors in the to-be improved text” (Flower et al. 1986; in Alhaisoni, 2012, p. 145).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface-level Revision/ Editing</strong></td>
<td>Making superficial changes (editing), like, grammar forms and mechanics (punctuation and spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting/ decision making</td>
<td>deciding what to revise/ do next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition/ or substituting</td>
<td>Adding or substituting grammatical markers or connecting words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Deleting grammatical markers or words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Indicating concern for a grammatical rule or form (e.g., changing verb form or tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Adding, deleting or considering the use of punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Considering or changing spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Changing the sentence structure through embedding coordination or subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word form</td>
<td>Indicating concern for appropriate vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep-level Revision/ Making changes affecting meaning and organization</strong></td>
<td>Making changes (revision) based on content and organization (sentence, paragraph, essay/ pattern of organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition and/ or modification</td>
<td>Adding and/or modifying content (words, phrases, sentences or clauses, full ideas/ paragraphs), modifying sentence/ paragraph/ essay organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion and/ or modification</td>
<td>Deleting content (words, phrases, or sentences), modifying sentence/ paragraph/ essay structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>substituting words, ideas, sentences or clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>expressing concern/ making decisions about word choice/ appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Self-questioning about a word/ sentence, structure, or other aspects of writing while revising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading the whole paragraph/ draft</td>
<td>Reading what has been written so far (for the sake of/ or prior to revising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescanning</td>
<td>Reading a sentence or part of a sentence with focus (for the purpose of revising it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to cohesion/ coherence/ unity</td>
<td>Making revision/ setting goal (s) based on sentence, paragraph, or essay unity, cohesion, or coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to audience, purpose/ genre, or topic</td>
<td>Making revision/ setting goal (s) based on audience needs, purpose, genre, or topic of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to strategy (used)</td>
<td>Mentioning the strategy used/ or to be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewriting without revision</td>
<td>Rewriting what has been written (whole paragraph/ draft) without making any revision or editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing/ analysing content, strategy or vocabulary</td>
<td>Judging positively or negatively on one’s writing, ideas, strategy, or structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, compared to unskilled writers, their skilled counterparts tend to use a variety of revision strategies to ease the demanding tasks of their revision processes. Thus, in revising for content, for example, they set goals for which ideas to keep and which ones to delete or modify. They often read their previous draft(s), evaluate it (them), and decide on whether to add, delete or elaborate on their previous ideas. They also assess the vocabulary used and make decisions on whether to make any changes. They are aware about their audience’s expectations, upon which they set (new) goals to improve the quality of vocabulary specific to a given topic, genre and purpose. In revising for organization, skilled writers often consider overall as well as internal organization and they set goals on which organization patterns to adopt for a given topic of discussion and genre. They are flexible at selecting appropriate patterns and forms and they know well how to adopt changes to their previously composed texts. They consider revision recursively, by going back to their previous drafts and plans and then decide how to proceed throughout revision processes.

Table 4, above, describes the most common revision and editing strategies used by skilled writers. They include some of the strategies that are mentioned, above, in the planning and composing strategies because they are overlapping and may be used in different stages of the writing process. The list provided in Table 4 is adapted from a number of researchers, some of whom were mentioned earlier in this section (Akyel & Kamisli, 1996; Alhaissoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur et al., 2006; Mahfoudi, 2003; Perl, 1979; Wong, 2005).

1.2. EFL Learners’ Writing Difficulties: Nature and Related Factors

1.2.1. The Nature of EFL Learners’ Writing Difficulties

Learning to write in one’s first language (L1) is a complex skill, compared to the other language skills. Learning to write in a second (L2) or foreign (FL) language can be more
challenging for learners in general and struggling ones in particular, because writing is a complex process that involves not only a mastery of the target language, but also a number of skills, strategies, and conventions that require a considerable effort and practice.

Studies (e.g., Graham et al., 2013; Kroll, 1990; Sasaki, 2000) found that L2 writers generally face particular difficulties in academic writing. Their writing tends to lack in grammatical correctness, complexity of ideas, and organization, compared to native speakers’. Thus, based on their writing performance, these writers have difficulties at different levels: linguistic (grammar), cognitive (organization) and knowledge about the topic (content).

Similarly, MacArthur, Graham, and Fitzgerald (2006) observed that in addition to their linguistic constraints (or difficulties), L2 writers, particularly inexperienced ones, tend to face difficulties at different levels of their writing processes: planning, content generation, text transcription and revising. The difficulties consist, to a greater extent, of the cognitive demands, followed by linguistic and, then, mechanical demands, to a lesser extent (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013). In other words, because these writers struggle much with the mechanical, low-order, problems of writing, like spelling, handwriting, and surface structure, they pay less attention to the high-order concerns of writing, such as, content generation, composing processes, goal-setting, audience awareness and meaning construction.

In describing the major difficulties that second/ foreign language writers, mainly struggling ones, encounter in writing, Graham et al., (2013) refer to various overlapping constraints that generally define the learners’ distinctive features and needs. These constraints are relatively documented in the literature targeting second/ foreign language writing instruction
and research, and they include, among many, cognitive, linguistic, communicative, contextual, textual, and affective constraints. Thus, to quote Graham et al. (p. 382):

When composing, all students face the challenge of simultaneously juggling a number of demands that call for their attention. For inexperienced writers, juggling too many constraints can cause “cognitive” or “emotional” overload (Flower & Hayes, 1980, p. 32) … The challenges are magnified for [English as second / foreign language learners] … they face … cognitive, linguistic, communicative, contextual, textual, and affective constraints”.

What follows is a description of the main constraints, mentioned above, among which the three first ones, i.e., cognitive, linguistic, and affective constraints, are the focus of the present study.

1.2.1. Cognitive Difficulties

Because of the academic writing standards expected from undergraduate and graduate students, English as a second or foreign language learners have a cognitive overload, compared to native English speakers (MacArthur et al., 2006). This means that in order for student writers to handle the cognitive multi-tasks of planning and composing, they are required to use their working memory to generate content and translate it coherently into an organized written text (Flower and Hayes, 1980). The cognitive processes require a great deal of effort from writers, in general (El-Mortaji, 2001); but the challenge is even greater for inexperienced writers, who do not only struggle with processing their thoughts into a written text, but also find it difficult to use an appropriate language for academic purposes and achieve coherence in their written products.
Thus, the act of writing is not only cognitively difficult but it calls for a number of other demands that often cause serious difficulties for inexperienced and unskilled writers.

The following is a description of the major difficulties that appear to have a cognitive nature. They include, according to MacArthur et al. (2006): planning, content generation, and revising difficulties. Other difficulties may have a meta-cognitive dimension.

**Difficulties related to planning**

Planning is considered to have positive effects on both the process and quality of writing. However, it is important to highlight the fact that the amount of time spent in planning and the planning behaviours may be challenging for writers in general, and for inexperienced ones in particular (Abdellatif, 2009, Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1980). The demands of planning can be explained through the mental multi-tasks a writer has to manage simultaneously, which comprise three sub-processes (Flower & Hayes, 1980; in MacArthur et al., 2006, p. 325):

- Formulating, prioritizing, and modifying both abstract and highly delineated goals and sub-goals to address task and genre demands, and to perceive audience needs;
- Generating ideas; and
- Selecting and organizing valuable ideas for accomplishing established goals.

In this respect, studies (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1980) found that experienced writers tend to plan and write simultaneously, instead of planning ahead, which makes them pause longer during the early stages of composing. Thus, despite its considerable benefits in helping writers stay focused when composing (Hayes & Flower, 1980), advance planning can limit their further exploration of ideas and organization that may come up during the composing process. This can,
however, be avoided by writers who plan more strategically and know well what ideas to include in their pieces.

Moreover, it is argued that compared to struggling writers whose plans tend to take the form of a first draft, which may limit further exploration of ideas, more experienced writers go through extensive, recursive planning that allows them achieve a deeper level of reflection, development and organization in order to meet the specific requirements of audience, topic, purpose, and other rhetorical aspects (Akyel, 1994; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). Struggling writers plan superficially, whether prior to or during writing (MacArthur & Graham, 1987). They often generate ideas in a linear way (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Hayes & Flower, 1980; MacArthur et al., 2006). In other words, inexperienced writers tend to skip planning and, instead, they begin writing as soon as they are given a task, because they have difficulty managing the demanding load of composing. Consequently, they devote little or no consideration to purpose, audience, structure, and other rhetorical aspects of writing (Graham, 1990; Graham & Harris, 1997).

Thus, students may overcome writing difficulties if they are taught explicitly, through effective planning strategies in order to help them improve their writing in terms of organization, length, and quality. In doing so, writing instructors may provide intensive strategy training of goal setting for planning, brainstorming, generating and organizing ideas in an outline form, before composing (MacArthur et al., 2006).

**Difficulties related to content generation**

Content generation is another challenge for many struggling writers. The difficulty can be related to the writers’ limited knowledge of the topic, genre, or the composing processes and
strategies (Beare, 2000). In other words, these multi-faceted constraints make the writing processes more challenging for this category of writers because they lack the necessary knowledge about academic topics and registers specific to particular genres. In addition, they have a limited awareness about the composing strategies, their benefits, and adequate use. In contrast, skilled writers possess more knowledge about composing strategies, and are able to manipulate them successfully and purposefully. They often set personal goals for the writing task, topic, genre requirements, and audience needs, and are strategic in achieving specific goals of text generation (Graham et al., 2013; MacArthur et al., 2006).

Moreover, in explaining the challenges of text generation among inexperienced writers, MacArthur et al., (2013) argue that these writers tend to generate less content, compared to their experienced peers, and their text quality is generally poor and unclear. Their main problems are related to their (1) limited ability to use their memory in order to seek information about the topic, (2) their insufficient knowledge about the topic (Graham & Harris, 2005), or (3) their limited knowledge about genre patterns and organizational skills (MacArthur et al., 2006).

**Difficulties related to revision**

Revising consists of mental processes that writers go through while reviewing and polishing their written texts. It is considered of great importance in the writing process as it has considerable benefits in improving the learners’ writing performance. Many struggling writers consider revision and editing to be synonymous, thinking that revision includes only the surface-level aspects of writing, such as editing for grammar and mechanics (Brown & Hoods, 1989; MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006). They tend to revise superficially and skip the deep level aspects of writing. Skilled writers, on the other hand, understand and are aware that content
and organization are of paramount importance and should be the focus of revision. They set goals for the revision process and they revise at the deep as well as the surface levels to improve their products (Graham et al., 2013; MacArthur et al., 2006).

Revising for content is a complex process that entails the use of meta-cognitive and cognitive awareness of genre-specific knowledge and the academic register related to a specific genre (MacArthur et al., 2006). Revision at this level may call for more elaboration, deletion, and rewriting of some ideas, as well as rearranging ideas and adopting more appropriate organizational forms or patterns. In this respect, many inexperienced writers ignore these aspects of revision because they lack the necessary knowledge about effective revision strategies and are not aware enough about the importance of revision. They also have limited knowledge about academic topics and organizational forms and patterns; hence, they do not have sufficient information to elaborate on their ideas and organize them appropriately, respecting the genre requirements (Graham & Harris, 2005).

Other important aspects of revision consist of purpose and audience (Hogue, 2003; Murray, 2012), although these elements are often considered during the early stages of planning. Yet, re-envisioning these concerns reassures learners that their piece of writing has a clear purpose and responds to their audience needs. The latter is not only related to the information displayed and the way it is delivered, but it is also connected to the style of writing and the choice of vocabulary (register), which is, in turn, related to the genre and purpose of writing (Murray, 2012). The difficulty encountered by many struggling writers in revision is that they do not only struggle with the mechanics and conventions, but they tend to be confused about the audience needs and they neglect the importance of expressing a clear purpose for their writing, because they do not set goals for these issues at earlier stages of writing (El-Aswad, 2002). In
contrast, experienced writers are more aware about their purpose and they have a sense of audience, which allow them to reconsider these aspects while revising their writing (MacArthur et al., 2006).

In addition to purpose and audience, writers have to consider revision at the sentence level, by checking meaning, structure, cohesion, as well as stylistic elements of writing. All these aspects contribute to the construction of a clear, coherent, and meaningful text. Other revision considerations are related to editing for grammar forms and mechanics, which contribute to a polished error-free piece of writing. Although these are considered as minor aspects, as they do not affect the overall organization and meaning of the text produced, many struggling writers devote little effort and time for revision because they lack the required knowledge about effective editing strategies to improve their writing (Graham & Harris, 2005).

**Difficulties related to meta-cognition among unskilled student writers**

Metacognition refers to the learners’ knowledge about their cognitive abilities and skills and the way (s) in which they are used in the target writing activity. MacArthur et al. (2006) argue that metacognitive awareness is as important for student writers as their cognitive abilities in undertaking any writing task. This awareness is a key factor for them to effective writing. However, many ESL/ EFL writers, particularly unskilled ones, lack or have insufficient metacognitive awareness. Thus, not only do they struggle with the cognitive demands of writing, discussed earlier, but they have difficulties understanding the benefits of the writing strategies and using them adequately (Graham et al., 2013).

In addition, inexperienced learners lack the required knowledge of academic writing genres, topics, and registers (Sasaki, 2000). They are less acquainted with the variety of topics
they face at the university level, which are required to meet the standards of academic writing. They also have a limited knowledge about genre requirements, such as adopting appropriate organizational patterns to develop their ideas, and using appropriate registers that correspond to genre and audience needs (Elbow, 1981b).

1.2.1.2. Linguistic Difficulties

While cognitive demands of writing are challenging for writers, in general, and English as a second/foreign (ESL/EFL) language writers, in particular, linguistic demands are particularly more difficult for the latter. In academic settings, language proficiency is considered one of the important factors to academic success. More precisely, the mastery of academic language is a key predictor of proficiency in academic writing (Murray, 2012).

In this respect, it is argued that many ESL/EFL writers do not possess the required standards of language proficiency specific to academic writing, although they may possess a good proficiency in oral communication (Graham et al., 2013). Thus, unlike skilled writers, inexperienced ones lack in the knowledge of academic language, or, in other words, the “set of linguistic registers associated with academic disciplines” (Graham et al., 2013, p. 324). Their main challenge is particularly related to the understanding of these academic registers as well as their appropriate use, which depend on audience needs, topic, genre, and the writer’s personal goals.

In the process of writing, writers often make use of their long term memory and metalinguistic awareness in order to use language appropriately and meaningfully. In doing so, they call for their metalinguistic awareness to solve problems such as: spelling words, using punctuation marks, selecting vocabulary and grammatical class of words, and organizing ideas
into sentences (Graham et al., 2013). In this respect, skilled writers can activate their metalinguistic knowledge and have control over language use while engaged in simultaneous multi tasks. In contrast, unskilled writers put all their focus on trying to solve surface language problems, such as spelling and grammatical forms, which may impact negatively on achieving meaning and personal goals set for the writing task. They have difficulty managing various linguistic and cognitive tasks at the same time, because they have limited metalinguistic awareness necessary to achieve the linguistic needs of the intended writing activity.

In order to alleviate the linguistic difficulties for these student writers and help them improve their writing performance, it is recommended that writing instructors teach effective strategies to their students so that they control the use of academic language across different writing genres.

1.2.1.3. Affective Difficulties

According to Graham and Harris (2005) and Graham et al. (2013), effective writing requires effort and motivation or will. Without these, the goal set for writing may not be achieved or it may result in poor performance. Recent research suggests that motivation is associated with writing achievement (Graham et al. 2013; MacArthur et al., 2006). This implies that high motivation and positive attitudes can encourage writers to learn, while negative attitudes and low motivation may affect negatively on the learning outcomes.

On the other hand, anxiety may hinder a writer’s ability to write well. Writing anxiety is used interchangeably with writing apprehension. It refers to the learner’s avoidance of writing situations (Abdellatif, 2007). In other words, writing apprehension is the learner’s “pre-disposition which determines how s/he responds to the situation in or through which s/he may be
involved in performing writing tasks or in which her/his writing may be evaluated” (p. 59). This implies that apprehension can be facilitating or debilitating in the sense that it may affect positively or negatively on the students’ writing processes, and overall performance. Studies show that many apprehensive students perform low because they struggle not only with the cognitive and linguistic demands of writing, but they also suffer from debilitating anxiety that hinders their writing abilities and predisposition to write.

Low writing self-efficacy may also impede students’ ability to write. When students have a low self-efficacy level, they tend to devote a lesser effort and time to the writing task, compared to their peers who possess a high level of confidence. Writing self-efficacy can reveal what learners do with the knowledge and skills they possess (Abdellatif, 2007). It helps learners control their goals about future writing achievements, the amount of effort to be devoted to perform the task (s), “the perseverance” they will need to surmount possible difficulties, and their “thought patterns and emotional responses” (Pajares & Johnson, 1994, p. 314).

1.2.1.4. Communicative Difficulties

The basic goal of writing is to communicate. In other terms, a writer is required to have a purpose, which entails the consideration of a specific audience. These imply that a writer has to consider aspects like language and vocabulary choice to suit the needs of their audience; i.e., in an academic context, these aspects have to be objective and formal. In this respect, skilled writers are more able, than their unskilled peers, in developing more convincing and coherent thoughts and, hence, are able to reach the needs of their audiences (Graham et al., 2013). In doing so, the ability to construct strong and meaningful writing usually reflects the writers’ effective use of the writing processes. Unskilled writers, on the other hand, do not possess the ability to communicate effectively through writing. They struggle to express a clear and
convincing point of view to the target audience (Murray, 2012). The difficulties struggling writers have do not originate only from their inability to communicate effectively through writing, they also stem from a number of other factors, mentioned previously, namely, linguistic and cognitive.

1.2.1.5. Contextual Difficulties

Contextual constraints refer to the elements and the circumstances that affect the writing process. Thus, the latter can be influenced by the writing task, the topic and the audience to whom students write. In other words, the context where students write is important in the sense that it allows them to make decisions on what information to convey to the reader, how to organize ideas and create meaning, and what specific register to use so as to achieve their personal goals and audience needs (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013).

The challenges inexperienced writers may encounter can be related not only to the demands of text composing, but also to whether or not they are familiar with the topics they write about, especially if the latter are not based on their personal choice. These writers often struggle in developing academic topics (El-Sayed, A. (1992) because they have limited knowledge of certain academic registers. In addition, struggling writers are often exposed to situations where they are limited in time; hence, they are given little or no opportunities to collaborate and interact with their instructor and peers. The latter may, in better circumstances, be a source of help for them and can contribute with supportive feedback. In some other situations, the students may be confused about the notion of audience and may not be aware enough to respond to the audience needs. In academic contexts, writing is particularly challenging for students who fail to achieve the standards that respond to the expectations of an academic audience (Graham et al., 2013).
To overcome these constraints, it is important for student writers, mainly inexperienced ones, to develop an awareness of a variety of academic topics, within and across genres, academic registers, and audience needs. To achieve this, writing instructors can use various ways to help their students understand and manipulate writing activities for academic purposes.

1.2.1.6. Textual Difficulties

In addition to contextual constraints that students face when writing, textual constraints can exert an influence on their composing processes (Arndt, 1987). Textual constraints refer to the difficulties student writers face in producing content and form of their texts. In their long term memory, writers often store the writing experiences and bring them to their new writing situations. The memory retrieving process influences to a great extent their new writing prompts and shape their produced texts, be it content or form.

Compared to their inexperienced peers, skilled writers possess a considerable knowledge about their prior written texts. Thus, when they are in the process of retrieving this organized knowledge to produce a new text, these writers appear to have the ability to recognize common information patterns, which seem to ease the mental loads of their working memory (Graham et al., 2013). Inexperienced writers, on the other hand, have a limited or no “domain-specific knowledge” or “working memory” to activate the knowledge of their prior written texts (Graham et al., 2013, p. 324). As a result, they face, in addition to other constraints, multi-faceted challenges of content generation and organizational patterns of different academic genres of writing.

In order to alleviate the textual constraints among student writers, with particular emphasis on struggling ones, writing instructors may engage these students in various writing
activities, of different academic genres, using effective strategies to enhance their knowledge and awareness of different writing genres as well as their organizational patterns and structures.

1.2.2. The Factors Related to EFL Learners’ Writing Difficulties

Writing difficulties among ESL/EFL learners are of different types, as discussed in the previous section, and may originate from different sources. The latter can be related to various factors including, but may not limited to: the nature of the writing skills and processes, which tend to be complex with its varying constraints; the student writers, with their varying characteristics and needs; and the quality of instruction, as well as the environment where writing taught and its characteristics.

These factors are described, in some detail, below, with more emphasis on the learner-driven factor(s) as it is the main focus of the present study.

1.2.2.1. Learner-related Factors

Studies report that second/ foreign (L2) language learners’ writing difficulties can be related to different variables or factors (Leki, et al., 2008; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur et al., 2006; Sasaki, 2000). The latter include, but may not be limited to, the writer’s second or foreign (L2) proficiency level, their L1 (first language) and/ or L2 writing ability, and/ or factors that are inherent to the learner’s affect, such as confidence, motivation, attitude, apprehension, and fear of negative feedback, and their individual differences. In other words, the learner-driven factors that may account for their writing difficulties can be categorized as: cognitive and meta-cognitive, linguistic, and affective factors. Individual differences also involve, among others, some of the above-mentioned factors. The latter explain the differences between skilled and unskilled writers, and define their characteristics and needs.
1.2.2.1.1. Cognitive and Meta-cognitive Factors

Many ESL/EFL writers struggle with their composing processes because they lack the knowledge, skills, and strategies required to manage the multiple mental tasks of writing. Writing in one’s first language is viewed as difficult for the above-mentioned reasons; writing in a second or foreign language is even more challenging, particularly for inexperienced writers, who do not only struggle with the cognitive and meta-cognitive demands of writing, but they also face difficulties in using the linguistic features for academic purposes (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006). In more concrete terms, Schoonen et al. (2003) explain the demanding tasks of L1 and L2 writing in relation to language abilities, stating that:

Writing in one’s mother tongue is a demanding task that calls upon several language abilities, as well as upon more general (meta-) cognitive abilities. These constituent abilities are in a constant interplay. Writing in a second language is even more demanding, because several of these constituent abilities may be less well developed than in one’s first language. For example, linguistic knowledge of the L2 may be limited, and the accessibility of this knowledge may be less rapid or automatic (p. 166).

In comparing skilled and unskilled writers in as far as their composing processes are concerned, Sasaki (2000) argues that the latter tend to have concerns with strategy use at the various stages of the writing process. In other words, many struggling writers do not possess the knowledge about the writing processes and strategies to handle the cognitive demands of planning, organizing, composing and revising their writing. As a result, they are at a loss finding what strategies fit into a specific goal and how to use them adequately. Studies on ESL/EFL writing show that less skilled or reluctant writers tend to have difficulties achieving their writing goals. They are unable to use effective strategies that fit into a given task, stage, or goal. They do
not know how to manipulate their knowledge and employ it as required (Graham, Moran, & Saddler, 2004). Skilled writers, on the other hand, are more aware of the demands of academic writing and are able to employ their knowledge of the topic and language by self-monitoring the strategies in a way that will guide them to complete a given task. They are aware of the expectations of a specific audience, purpose and genre of writing, and they know well how to direct their knowledge of the topic to achieve their goals (MacArthur et al., 2006).

In addition, learners with writing difficulties often have a lack of knowledge about academic topics and genres. Thus, their concern is related not only to their composing processes and the organizational patterns pertinent to the writing genres, but also to content generation. The latter is due to a lack of or insufficient knowledge about academic registers and topics. Their writing products are often short, poorly elaborated, and they lack academic knowledge of registers. In contrast, skilled writers know well what to include in their pieces and they find composing to be a flexible process, despite the complex nature and requirements of the task (Sasaki, 2000).

1.2.2.1.2. Linguistic Factors

Learners’ L2 proficiency level plays an important role in their writing performance. The ability to write well in a second or foreign language requires a set of linguistic skills to undertake the demanding writing tasks in the target language. In this respect, it’s argued that writers with a higher level of proficiency were diagnosed/ found to have a higher L2 writing ability and a greater fluency, and who demonstrated a lower use of their L1 in writing. However, writers with a lower level of L2 proficiency were found to have more difficulty in L2 writing and a lesser transfer between L1 and L2, despite their higher level of their L1 writing ability (Leki et al., 2008; Leonisa, 2010). In other words, L2 proficiency level contributes to a certain degree in L2
writing ability. Other studies claimed that although L2 proficiency level is not a sufficient condition for L2 writing, it is required/ found to account L2 composing ability and strategy use (Sasaki, 2000). Likewise, Graham, et al. (2013) argue that linguistic constraints contributed to a considerable extent in the composing/ has hindered struggling learners’/ writers’ composing abilities to a considerable extent and resulted in poor writing performance, especially at the level of grammar and academic vocabulary use.

1.2.2.1.3. Affective Factors

In addition to the linguistic and (meta-) cognitive factors, discussed above, learners’ affect can be considered as a key factor that may inhibit their writing abilities or be a source of their writing difficulties (Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2006).

Research pertaining to affect in writing has shown that ESL/ EFL learners’ writing difficulties may originate from their negative affect, in the sense that the latter may hinder their writing abilities (e.g., Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al. 2006). Thus, many students who demonstrated low writing performance were found to have low self-efficacy beliefs and were apprehensive when they approached writing tasks, mainly in exam situations and academic writing assignments (Abdellatif, 2007). In other words, “self-efficacy has to do with learners’ opinions about their ability to carry out a task” (Arnold, 1999, p. 16).

In order to enhance self-efficacy beliefs among learners, Oxford and Shearin (1994) recommend that teachers “[provide] meaningful tasks at which students can succeed and over which [they] can have a feeling of control”. Teachers can also [give] students a degree of choice in classroom activities…” (p. 21), so that they feel more interested in the target activity and learn in a stress-free environment (Moussaoui, 2012).
Apprehension and self-efficacy beliefs are closely related in different learning situations, with particular focus on writing. Thus, when students are apprehensive about a writing task, they tend to develop low self-efficacy beliefs about their writing ability, which often influences negatively on their writing performance. Likewise, students with low self-efficacy beliefs tend to be apprehensive, although this claim is relative in some research studies (Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2006). However, sometimes apprehensive students perform higher than their non-apprehensive peers because they manage to use apprehension positively. For example, in a timed-situation, students tend to make more effort and manage their anxiety positively to accomplish a given task in a timely manner. These students often score higher and have high confidence levels. In this respect, Oxford and Shearin (1994, p. 21) argue that “learners must believe they have some control over the outcomes of the learning process” and they need to possess a “sense of effectiveness within themselves” so that they can handle new learning skills or tasks.

1.2.2.1.4. Learners’ Individual Differences and Strategy Use

*Individual differences* refer to a field that has been of great interest and discussion among educators and researchers (e.g., Abdellatif, 2012; Arnold, 1999; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2013). They refer to individual characteristics among learners, including, but not limited to, their learning needs, abilities, interests, levels of performance, the way and pace in which they learn (e.g., the way they use learning strategies), as well as their affective factors that may affect positively or negatively on their learning processes and their performance, in general.

In describing individual differences among learners, researchers (Graham et al. 2013, Saddler, et al., 2004; Sasaki, 2000) use different terms. Thus, the terms *skilled* versus *unskilled* are used interchangeably with other paired categories. Examples about these pairs include: *expert*
versus novice, proficient versus non-proficient, experienced versus inexperienced, and professional versus reluctant or struggling. The terms skilled and unskilled refer to the writer’s writing performance, with its different aspects: language use, rhetorical skills and strategies, and the writing conventions.

With regard to how language proficiency is related to the writing performance, it is argued that unskilled students do not struggle only with language use; rather, their writing problems are more likely to be attributed to their inefficient use of the planning and revision strategies (Graham et al., 2013; Leki, Cumming, and Silva, 2008). In more concrete terms, these researchers claim that the writers’ language proficiency may contribute to their writing development in as far as content generation, vocabulary and grammar use are concerned, but does not guarantee a good writing performance. Similarly, Akyel (1994) and Sasaki (2000) pointed out that there is little or no significant difference between skilled and unskilled writers in producing organized compositions, and that their language proficiency level does not interfere to a great extent in strategy use.

Given that individual differences may interfere in the learning process, learning strategies may also differ among learners in the sense that the latter do not use the strategies in the same way. This may depend on various factors, including the degree of awareness among learners about the strategies and their importance, as well as the elements, previously referred to as individual characteristics (or differences), which may affect their learning processes positively or negatively. For example, more experienced learners generally use the learning strategies more effectively than do their less experienced counterparts. They are believed to have a higher degree of awareness about their own abilities and needs; hence, they are more skilful at using the strategies more purposefully and strategically in dealing with problem-solving situations of
different types and levels of difficulty. Less skilled learners, on the other hand, are more reluctant and they are at a loss trying to decide which strategy (ies) fits into a given situation and how to use it (them) effectively to overcome the problem (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006).

1.2.2.2. Subject-related Factors: Complexity of the Writing Skill and Composing Processes

The complex nature of the writing skill and composing processes is one key factor, among others, that contribute to second/foreign language learners’ writing difficulties. In more concrete terms, composing requires a combination of a number of operations: “affective, cognitive, linguistic and physical” that function in coordination with each other to achieve certain goals related to “genre-specific conventions, audience needs, and communicative purposes” (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006, p. 324).

The physical demands of writing can be related to the effort that students devote to the act of writing (MacArthur et al., 2006), mainly handwriting or typewriting. The latter is a source of difficulty for some writers, mainly those with a slow pace or those having physical impediments. Whether it has to do with handwriting or typing, writing, especially essays and longer assignments, requires a considerable amount of physical effort. Writing several drafts, mainly for revision purposes, is even more demanding for writers. Thus, in addition to the mental effort that writers exert during the writing process, they are required to physically accomplish their writing assignments, and in some cases, in a limited amount of time. In doing so, they have to pay attention to spell words correctly, transcribe letters clearly, consider the formal aspects of the piece of writing, such as, spacing between words, sentences, and paragraphs, margins, and capitalization. Although they are superficial low-order aspects of
writing, they require attention from the writers. It is argued that inexperienced writers usually struggle with the cognitive and linguistic tasks of writing because they pay more attention to the surface-level aspects of writing, afore-mentioned. Experienced writers, on the other hand, consider them at later stages of the writing process; i.e., during editing and rewriting (MacArthur et al., 2006).

In addition to the physical effort student writers have to devote to writing, the linguistic demands can be more challenging for many ESL/ EFL writers, particularly struggling ones (MacArthur et al., 2006). Writing requires a considerable knowledge of the linguistic features and their use in the target language. Moreover, academic writing requires a mastery of the target language for academic purposes, which is even more challenging for writers in general and their ESL/ EFL peers in particular. In other words, in academic contexts, the mastery of a second or foreign language requires much effort and practice among learners in order to develop their grammatical, lexical, syntactic, and semantic proficiency, in addition to meta-knowledge related to various academic topics and registers across genres.

In this respect, Kroll (1990) asserts that the complex nature of writing, which requires a mastery of multiple skills at the same time, is considered as an important source of difficulty among ESL students. Thus, she states:

For English as a second language (ESL) students, it seems fair to say that writing is particularly difficult. ESL students must learn to create written products that demonstrate mastery over contextually appropriate formats for the rhetorical presentation of ideas as well as mastery in all areas of language… It is partially the multiplicity of skills involved which contributes to the overall difficulty of writing (p.140).
Moreover, the mastery over the rhetorical, organizational, and conventional aspects of writing has a cognitive nature in that they are related to the complex mental and behavioural skills that writers make use of during the writing process. In more concrete terms, writing is cognitively complex and challenging, because it is a productive skill that requires particular composing strategies and conventions, in order to produce clear, organized and coherent pieces.

Furthermore, academic writing is audience and genre-oriented (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013; Kroll, 1990; Murray, 2012). Therefore, student writers are required to have an awareness of audience expectations or needs, which, in turn, call for other considerations of academic registers and styles. They also need to possess a considerable knowledge of a variety of academic topics and academic genre conventions, which also involve different styles, organizational patterns, and communicative purposes (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006). These cognitive components operate simultaneously and in coordination with each other during the writing process, which combined with the linguistic demands of writing, create a mental overload for writers, mainly struggling ones, because they have to handle all these mental and behavioural operations at the same time.

Added to the above-mentioned demands that characterize writing, the affective dimension may be related to the social and psychological aspects that may affect positively or negatively on the writer’s processes as well as their writing performance (Graham et al., 2013; MacArthur et al., 2006). In other words, aspects like motivation, attitude, and apprehension, or anxiety, may interfere in students’ success or failure in writing. For example, students’ attitudes towards writing may affect the way they approach a writing task. Thus, when they
view writing as a complex skill, they tend to devote less effort and time to write, or in some cases avoid writing. Likewise, when students are apprehensive, they often perform lower than their peers, because apprehension hinders their ability to write (Abdellatif, 2007). The source of apprehension for many of them originates from the difficulty of writing, which makes them avoid writing situations.

In contrast, students who demonstrate higher levels of motivation towards writing tend to achieve better, than their peers, because they devote a greater effort and time to the act and process of writing regardless of how difficult the latter is (Abdellatif, 2007). According to MacArthur et al. (2006), affective factors may exert an effect on students’ writing processes and their behaviours towards writing. Thus, writers with positive affect often take risks and try various writing activities and genres; they devote more time and effort to the writing processes, and they achieve better than their peers, who exhibit negative affect.

1.2.2.3. Instruction-related Factors: The Quality and Environment of Instruction

Another factor that may be a source of the students’ writing difficulties can be attributed to the quality of instruction (instructional methods) and the nature of the environment in which instruction takes place. The latter refers particularly to the large and mixed-ability writing classes, which appear to be a characteristic of many ESL/ EFL classrooms.

At the university setting, the “demands for higher levels of writing performance” create a real challenge for ESL/ EFL students in general and struggling ones in particular. The challenge consists not only in the mastery of linguistic competence pertinent to the target language, but also the manipulation of the content related to the topic of writing or genre. This is, on the one hand, challenging to the students, who are concerned with the production of a variety of
academic assignments in a second or foreign language and, on the other, to their instructors, who
have to deal with students with varying types and degrees of writing difficulties. The challenge
for these teachers is to deal with a “higher proportion of students who struggle not only with
composing but also with basic writing skills”. The latter make it difficult for them to manage
various pressures simultaneously because they lack the required pedagogical knowledge and
experience (MacArthur et al., 2006, p. 324).

In addition, the “quality of instruction that students receive is a major determinant of their
writing achievement” (Graham & Harris, 2002 a; in MacArthur et al., 2006, p. 324). The quality
of instruction refers mainly to both the instructional method (s) and the type (s) of activities used
in writing instruction. In this respect, it is argued that in some ESL/ EFL classrooms, writing
instructors give little consideration to achieving meaning and authenticity in writing (MacArthur
et al., 2006). In other classrooms, instructors provide different opportunities for students to write
and engage them in the writing process; yet, they devote little consideration to teaching higher
level writing skills and strategies to promote students’ progress and performance (MacArthur et
al., 2006). It is only in a minority of classrooms that writing instruction is given by experienced
educators who use a combination of methods, including, process integrated skills and strategy
instruction, through writing workshops, conferencing, and sharing (MacArthur et al., 2006).

This implies that, although blended methods are applied in some writing classrooms, many
other classrooms lack effective instructional methods, which is attributed to the writing
instructors themselves, most of whom are ill-equipped to deal with the challenging problems of
ESL/ EFL learners. MacArthur, Graham, and Fitzgerald (2006) claim that despite the
effectiveness of the blended method, afore-mentioned, students with writing difficulties require
more practice through intensive, individualized and explicit teaching of composing strategies and
transcription skills. Writing instructors may not be able to deal with their students’ diverse problems in writing for the reason that they have insufficient pedagogical knowledge, professional competence, and resources for teaching writing (MacArthur et al., 2006).

Another factor that is related to the environment where writing instruction takes place is the class size; the latter may be a source of the students’ writing difficulties. Thus, if students with writing difficulties require individualized instruction, learning to write in a large classroom can create challenges for their instructors to deal with their individual needs. In addition, dealing with a large class generally impedes the students’ progress because they have little or no opportunities to receive attention from their instructor. The challenge is greater for struggling writers who need more practice and individual attention. In this type of classrooms, it is quite difficult for writing instructors to provide regular feedback to individual students, which affects negatively on their progress and the development of their writing skills (MacArthur et al., 2006).

1.3. The Effect of Writing Strategy Training on Learners’ Writing Performance and Affect

Writing instruction in an EFL context can be a challenging experience for many instructors. The challenge can be related not only to the demanding skills of writing, but also to the learners’ multi-faceted needs, with particular emphasis on less experienced and struggling students (Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013). In this respect, it is argued that the need for explicit writing strategy instruction, or training, has become of paramount importance due to the considerable advantages this approach provides for students, particularly those with writing difficulties.

The “ultimate goal of strategy instruction in writing” is to make students work independently, or as the Italian educator, Maria Montessori (in Graham & Harris, 2005), noted,
an instructor can make sure that success is taking place in her/ his classroom when s/ he is able to see that her/ his students are able to work without her/ his assistance (Graham & Harris, 2005, p. 37). This explains the important role of the instructor and her/ his contribution to her/ his students’ progress, which can only be achieved once they become autonomous and confident writers. Writing experts (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1980; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006) claim that writing strategy instruction/ training is considered to have positive effects in enhancing students’ writing performance, both at the process and product levels, and their positive affect.

The following is a description of writing strategy training, within the process approach, and its effect on students’ writing performance and affect. A definition is provided to the key concepts discussed in this section of the chapter. It is worth noting that the terms ‘instruction’, ‘teaching’ and ‘training’ are used interchangeably, as they are mentioned in the literature.

1.3.1. Writing Strategy Training: Defined

Writing strategy training, or writing strategy instruction (e.g.; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006), refers to an explicit and systematic teaching of the writing strategies and steps that facilitate the planning, composing, revising and editing processes for students. It may also involve teaching pre-writing processes (e.g., brainstorming) or peer revision, collaboratively. In addition, strategy training can refer to teaching strategies to facilitate particular writing tasks, like writing academic (argumentative or expository) essays or personal stories (Graham & Harris, 2005).

Strategy training has as a main goal teaching students to become autonomous users of the writing strategies. An explicit teaching of these strategies, mainly, planning and revision/ editing,
has proven to have positive effects on the quality of students’ writing. Studies have shown that low-achieving student writers were found to benefit considerably from writing strategy training, especially through the Self-regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) approach, introduced by Graham and Harris (2005). This approach is based on explicit teaching of writing and self-regulation strategies, such as self-assessment and goal setting. It also focuses on criterion-based learning and individualized teaching, particularly to students with writing difficulties (Graham & Harris, 2005).

1.3.2. Writing Strategy Training within the Process Approach Framework

The process approach to writing instruction was introduced early in the eighties by a number of writing researchers and experts, and Flower and Hayes (1980) were the pioneers. This approach came as a reaction to traditional methods, which focused on the product and neglected the composing processes through which writers develop their writing.

Since the late seventies and early eighties, researchers and writing experts introduced new interpretations to the writing process and its constituent elements. For example, Flower and Hayes (1980) proposed a three-stage model of ‘pre-write, write, and rewrite’, which is still considered as a well referenced definition of the process approach. Later, White and Arndt (1991) argued that the process is dynamic and is related to other aspects like purpose, audience and the type of writing. However, the view that the writing process was linear has remained until Flower and Hayes (1980) and Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) embraced the recursive one. Based on this view, researchers have concluded that the writing process does not have a fixed order; rather, writers may process their writing differently, which explains the recursive nature of the writing process. In other words, writers do not follow a fixed order while composing; rather,
they display differences in undertaking the different stages of the process (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Kroll, 1990; White & Arndt, 1991).

The post-process era further introduced the need for including the different genres in process writing instruction (Graham et al., 2013). Researchers believe that the process approach is most suitable and effective in writing instruction, be it to native or SL/FL learners (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Elbow, 1973; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Graham & Harris, 2005; Kroll, 1990; Murray, 2012; White & Arndt, 1991). This approach is particularly effective because it allows writing instructors to focus both on the writers’ composing processes and their produced texts, which reflect their writing performance.

In this respect, it is argued that a considerable body of research has been conducted on adult and young learners, and the results have yielded important data about the way the mental processes operate during the act of writing (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Graham & Perin, 2006). These results have been employed to shape the contemporary writing instruction design, focusing on the planning, drafting, and revision process model. This model considers writing as a set of related processes that function simultaneously. To facilitate these processes, instructors guide their students by means of different writing strategies. In addition, the process approach to writing instruction focuses on the need to create means by which low-achieving student writers build their motivation and self-efficacy, which in turn promote their writing performance (Graham & Perin, 2007).

The process approach to writing instruction calls for several interrelated activities or tasks that consist of:

- Creating extended opportunities for writing;
- Emphasizing writing for real audiences;
- Encouraging cycles of planning, translating, and reviewing;
- Stressing personal responsibility and ownership of writing projects;
- Facilitating high levels of student interactions;
- Developing supportive writing environments;
- Encouraging self-reflection and evaluation; and
- Offering personalized individual assistance, brief instructional lessons to meet students’ individual needs, and, in some instances, more extended and systematic instruction (Graham & Perin, 2007, p. 19).

Following these fundamental activities would create a favourable atmosphere that enables student writers, in general and low-achieving ones in particular, to develop writing skills and strategies and improve the quality of their writing. What follows is an account about the effect of strategy training on students’ writing performance and a definition of the latter within the context of the process approach to writing instruction.

1.3.3. The Effect of Writing Strategy Training on Students’ Writing Performance

1.3.3.1. Writing Performance: Defined

The advocates of the process approach (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1980; Graham et al., 2013; Kroll, 1990; MacArthur et al., 2006; Sasaki, 2000) view the writing performance as a combination of both the process of composing and its end product (the text produced). In other words, writing performance is not restricted to the product of writing; rather, it involves the process through which student writers develop and compose a text, including the skills and strategies they use during the process.
Similarly, Pennington and So (1993) claim that both the product and the process of writing have to be considered with equal importance because neither of them can independently reflect the writer’s performance. They believe that if performance is assessed with reference to the product of writing alone, it would be insufficient to gain insight about the students’ strategies and processes they go through while composing. On the other hand, paying full attention to the writing processes and neglecting the end product would be difficult to assess the writers’ performance quantitatively and satisfactorily (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Graham et al., 2013). Considering both the product and the process of writing provides more objectivity and a detailed understanding of the students’ actual performance, which reflects their multi-faceted writing abilities (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006; Kroll, 1990; Sasaki, 2000).

Further, Kroll (1990) argues that considering both the product and the process provides a more comprehensive picture of the writers’ performance. That is to say, the product of writing is the result of various drafts that students go through during the process of planning, composing and revising. Therefore, focusing only on the product may not guarantee a clear understanding of how the student writers have gone through the various stages of the process of text production.

Based on the claims made about the nature of the writing performance within the process approach to writing instruction, it is recommended that an explicit training of the writing strategies is fundamental to enhance students’ writing performance. To achieve this goal, writing experts (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur et al., 2006; Sasaki, 2000) suggest a number of ways to enhance both the product and the process of writing. These can be improved through planning, composing, and revision (and editing) strategy instruction, as it is explained below.
1.3.3.2. Enhancing the Writing Performance through Strategy Training

As mentioned earlier in this section, writing strategy training has proven to have considerable effects on students’ writing performance. Research has shown that explicit writing instruction facilitates students’ writing processes and improves the quality of their written products through the use of writing strategies (e.g., Alhaisoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur et al., 2006). The following is a description of some of the ways used by expert writing instructors and researchers to enhance students’ writing performance, both at the level of the process and product of writing.

1.3.3.2.1. Enhancing the Process of Writing through Planning and Composing Strategy Training

Planning is considered as an important stage in the process of writing because most of the cognitive tasks pertinent to writing occur during this stage. In other words, planning involves generating, outlining and organization of ideas, which are the most demanding cognitive processes for student writers, in general, and reluctant ones in particular. In order to ease these demands, writing experts recommend that teaching students planning strategies explicitly would enhance and facilitate their writing processes and prepare them for the next stage of writing, i.e., composing or drafting.

Although a quite clear account was given earlier, in the first part of this chapter, on the planning processes and strategies, it is worth referring to three important strategies introduced by two well-known experts in writing instruction, Steve Graham and Karen, R. Harris (2005). These strategies are known as: PLANS, a goal-setting strategy, STOP and LIST, which refer mainly to goal setting, brainstorming, and organizing.
'PLANS’ is a planning strategy that stands for pick goals, list ways to meet goals, and make notes, sequence notes. In applying the strategy, a writing instructor guides student writers as to divide the writing process into separate, but interrelated, tasks (Graham & Harris, 2005). In performing these tasks, students:

- Develop a plan for writing their paper by selecting goals for what the paper will accomplish, specifying how they will meet these goals, and generating and organizing possible ideas for their paper. These goals are based on the topic (and content), the purpose of writing, including the type or genre, as well as the audience expectations.

- Write the paper, using their plan as a guide, expanding and reshaping the plan as they write.

- Check to see whether their goals are met and make appropriate revisions of their created plans and ideas (adopted from Graham & Harris, 2005, p.48).

The STOP and LIST strategies, on the other hand, stand for stop and think of purposes and list ideas and sequence them, respectively (p.55-56). As their names suggest, these strategies have similar goals as PLANS, in that they aim to guide the students through goal setting, generating ideas and organizing them. They are taught explicitly in order to raise the students’ awareness about the beneficial uses of these strategies, the focus of which is on facilitating their planning processes and enhancing the quality of their writing. Teaching these strategies has been proven to be beneficial to different ages and levels of writing ability, and has been specifically recommended for students with varying writing difficulties (Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006).
In addition to explicit planning strategy training, teaching students to use effective composing strategies can help facilitate and enhance their writing processes, hence, the quality of their drafts. During the process of composing, or drafting, student writers are engaged in deep complex cognitive processes during which they generate more text to the previously created ideas or plans, organize them into coherent and clear sentences and paragraphs. These processes require various cognitive and linguistic skills that struggling students find difficult to handle. In order to facilitate these complex composing processes, it is recommended to teach composing strategies explicitly to student writers, with particular emphasis on those experiencing different writing difficulties. This can ease the simultaneous cognitive demands of writing and improve the quality of their writing (Graham & Perin, 2007).

During the composing process, students can be encouraged to try multiple drafts, by elaborating on their previously developed ideas, evaluating them, and making possible revisions in order to improve their products (Graham & Harris, 2005). Trying multiple drafts allows students to reflect deeply on their ideas, in a stress-free atmosphere, and consider checking their goals throughout the composing processes. This will give them the opportunity to check their plans in order to guide their composing process and organize their ideas more meaningfully. By doing so, they refer to the goals they set for the topic/ content, the purpose and the type/ genre of writing, as well as the reader’s needs. It is, however, argued that many student writers tend to skip planning and are impatient to finish their one and only draft because they are unaware of the benefits of using multiple drafts while planning and composing (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013). The role of a writing instructor in this case is to raise the students’ awareness and train them to use different planning and composing strategies to help them improve their drafts during the various stages of the writing process.
Composing generally involves generating more ideas and elaborating on the previously created ones, during the planning stage, and organizing them into coherent sentences and paragraphs. In order to achieve this goal, students can be trained through using different strategies to generate more content and combine sentences and paragraphs to express a given purpose (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013). Different writing types/genres require different paragraph and essay organizational patterns. For example, students can be trained to use strategies to combine and organize ideas for a comparison-contrast type of essay. The latter may involve a point-by-point or block pattern, which in turn, may take different other organizational methods. In addition, expressing a particular purpose while connecting ideas may require some knowledge of sentence combining and syntactic structures specific to a given purpose. For example, students may wish to express opposition, addition, concession, or an argument. In doing so, they are required to use specific transitions and connectors to express the desired goal.

In addition to these, students need to be trained to use an appropriate language of analysis (e.g., vocabulary and grammatical and syntactic structures) that is specific to a given genre and goal of writing (Murray, 2012). In other words, academic writing involves a deep analysis of ideas to explain or evaluate information, elaborate on and/or illustrate a previously generated thought, or interpret statistics or other form of evidence. Therefore, an explicit training of these skills and strategies is recommended to help student writers throughout their composing processes.

To further explain the effect of planning and composing strategy training on students’ writing performance, especially at the level of the process, it is worth referring to the claims
made by some writing researchers (e.g., Graham and Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013; Murray, 2012; Yousun, 2008). The latter argue that the planning and composing strategies help writers considerably in the creation and organization of coherent writing, which entails that the actions of planning and composing that writers engage in may affect positively on their writing, whether these actions occur at a specific stage or throughout the whole process of writing. In addition, planning is considered to have facilitating effects on task completion and the quality of the written text (Kellogg, 1990; Yousun, 2008). In other words, planning processes facilitate not only the mental and behavioural multi-tasks that a writer engages in, but also improves the written product at the level of organization and text quality.

Moreover, Kellogg (1990) claims that planning and composing enhance the writing quality and fluency in a considerable way, mainly at the level of text generation and organization. Hence, planning and composing strategy use can affect positively on the process as well as the product of writing. In this respect, Graham et al., (2013), recommend that planning, composing, as well as revision strategies be better taught explicitly to students with writing difficulties and limited writing experience. They further explain that when students plan strategically and revise purposefully at the deep and surface levels, they develop organized, coherent and fluent pieces. In other words, an effective use of these strategies facilitates the processing and organization of ideas, which, in turn, results in better writing quality.

1.3.3.2.2. Enhancing the Writing Product through Revision and Editing Strategy Training

The goal of revision and editing in writing is to improve the quality of a written product, which is an important aspect of a student writer’s performance. Improvement at the level of the product involves major and minor aspects. The former include organization (internal and
external), content, and language, while the latter refer to aspects like writing conventions and mechanics. Writing experts (e.g., Alhaissoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013; Leki, 1998; Murray; 2012) claim that these major aspects of revision are considered at the early stages of revision, be it after or during the drafting stage of the writing process. This is usually the case with the student writers who revise recursively. The minor aspects are generally considered at the end of the revision stage, or what is referred to as editing. In order to improve their written products, it is recommended that students be taught revision and editing strategies explicitly and effectively (Graham & Harris, 2005).

Training, or teaching, students to use revision and editing strategies is considered of paramount importance in enhancing their writing performance, mainly at the level of text quality (Graham & Harris, 2005; Murray, 2012). The latter includes mainly aspects of text organization and language use. As for the amount of information/ ideas (i.e., text length), it is generally related to the students’ knowledge about the topic (meta-knowledge). Text length can be addressed during the composing process, especially if students consider trying multiple drafts. This will allow them to elaborate more on their ideas, modify, and rewrite at their convenience. Improving the quality of ideas and language use, especially vocabulary choice, may take place during and after composing, if the students revise recursively. Text organization (overall essay structure and internal aspects, e.g., sentence combining, organizational pattern of ideas/ essay) is an important aspect that can be addressed during the planning and composing processes. However, more improvement can be undertaken after composing, i.e., during the revision and editing stage (Graham et al., 2013).
As mentioned, above, some student writers revise recursively while others prefer to do it at later stages of the writing process (Alhaisoni, 2012; Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013). The former category of students, most of whom are generally skilled writers, tend to go through minor revisions and editing after they finish drafting their essays, because they generally tackle the major aspects of revision during the composing process. The latter category of students, however, needs more time and effort to make the necessary revisions and editing. They struggle with aspects like: the external structure of the piece of writing, grammar, and the mechanics, and give little importance to substance, i.e., content, organization and language use. In order to help students, particularly the struggling ones, to improve the quality of their written products, it is recommended that writing instructors train them to use revision and editing strategies effectively.

In more concrete terms, writing experts claim that EFL student writers, particularly low-achieving ones, tend to have low language proficiency, which impacts negatively on their written products (Abdellatif, 2007; Graham & Harris, 2005; Sasaki, 2000). In order to assist these students to improve their written products at the level of language accuracy and fluency, Graham and Harris (2005) and Graham, MacArthur, and Fitzgerald (2013) recommend that writing instructors teach revision and editing strategies, explicitly, with focus on the linguistic features of writing, such as general and genre-specific sentence combining, academic vocabulary and grammatical forms. It is, also, argued that teaching revision strategies explicitly enhances students’ linguistic abilities, regardless of their writing performance (Alhaisoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013). In addition to revision strategy training, providing individual feedback, particularly to learners with difficulties, promotes their progress, hence, their writing performance, especially when feedback is given on a regular basis (Graham & Harris, 2005).
There are various revision and editing strategies that can be taught explicitly to students with or without writing difficulties; some of these strategies can be genre-specific. They include, but are not limited to the CDO (compare, diagnose, and operate), peer revision, self-assessment, teacher-student (one-on-one) conferencing, and portfolio-assessment strategies (Alhaissoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013; Murray, 2012). These strategies, excluding the CDO, are explained, below, in relation to students’ affect; therefore, and in order to avoid repetition, the focus, here, will be on highlighting the effect of the CDO revising strategy on enhancing the written product.

The CDO revising strategy stands for: compare, diagnose, and operate (Graham & Harris, 2005, p.69). Comparing refers to identifying the area that requires revision; diagnosing has to do with the problem in question, which needs to be specified; and operating refers to the act of revision or, in the authors’ words, “specifying and executing the intended revision” (p.70). The CDO strategy guides students, particularly those with writing difficulties, to revise beyond the surface level. That is to say, the focus of revision is on substance rather than form (Graham & Harris, 2005). It involves revision at the level of content, organization and language use, rather than on mechanics and form. In doing so, students use the CDO strategy to revise every single sentence of their pieces of writing to make sure that all sentences are correct, clear, meaningful, and coherent. The surface level revision is also taken into consideration, but at a later stage, i.e., editing. This involves revising for punctuation, spelling and capitalization. These aspects do not interfere much in the meaning and organization of the text.

Training students to use the CDO, and other revision strategies (e.g. self- and peer-assessment strategies), requires guided practice from the instructor (Graham & Harris, 2005).
This can be introduced by modelling the strategy, to make the experience easier and explicit, especially for struggling students. Modelling can be followed by practice, by trying the strategy with a variety of tasks. Finally, if required, scaffolding practice may be provided, especially for unskilled students.

1.3.4. The Effect of Writing Strategy Training on the Learners’ Affect

In addition to its positive effect on the students’ writing performance, strategy training may impact positively on their affect. The latter is, on the other hand, thought to have an influence on the students’ writing performance with varying degrees. In other words, affect is considered to enhance or inhibit students’ writing abilities, hence, their performance. The following is an account about the nature of affect in writing, some affective factors that influence writing, and some of the ways through which writing strategy training can enhance students’ affect.

1.3.4.1. Affect: Defined

The term ‘affect’ has been used in a number of overlapping but slightly different ways in the literature. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) believe that:

One’s affect toward a particular thing or action or situation or experience is how that thing or that action or that situation or that experience fits in with one’s needs or purposes, and its resulting effect on one’s emotions. The inclusion of emotion along with needs and purposes is not surprising when we consider that emotions are commonly responses to how one’s various needs and purposes are or are not being met (p. 44).

Similarly, Hurd (2008, p. 3) relates affect to the learners’ emotions and feelings, moods and attitudes, anxiety, tolerance of ambiguity and motivation. The affective domain is
“connected with dispositions and preferences” (Oatley & Jenkins, 1996). It “[plays] a part in conditioning behaviour and influencing learning”.

Affect and cognition are viewed as “multidimensional overlapping and interdependent constructs” (Hurd, 2008, p. 3). Arnold (1999) claims that “neither the cognitive nor the affective has the last word, and, indeed, neither can be separated from the other” (p.1). On the other hand, it is argued that “the way we feel about ourselves and our capabilities can either facilitate or impede our learning...” (in Arnold & Brown, 1999, p.8). In this respect, affect is believed to interfere in the learning process in the sense that it “affects how efficiently students can use what they have”. Thus, “strong motivation tends to help students marshall their assets and skills” while “low motivation or intense anxiety interferes with their ability to use their skills and abilities” (Ehrman, 1996, p. 138).

In the context of second or foreign language writing, the concept of affect has been given more importance in the last few decades. However, the relationship between affect and second/foreign language writing processes still creates a controversial issue. In this respect, there has been an unsatisfactory body of research, mainly the empirical type that has explained the effect(s) of affective factors on the learner’s writing processes (MacArthur et al., 2006).

1.3.4.2. Affective Factors Influencing Writing

As mentioned earlier, affect can be a predictive factor of the students’ performance in general, and writing in particular. Although the effect of affective factors on students’ writing may not be seen clearly, it may impact positively or negatively on their writing processes and/or the final product. There are various affective factors that may be considered to have an influence on students’ writing, which include, but are not be limited to, their motivation and attitudes.
towards writing, their writing self-efficacy, and writing apprehension. The two last constructs are explained, below, being an important part of this work.

1.3.4.2.1. Writing Apprehension

Writing apprehension can be defined as a learner’s “general predisposition that determines how s/he responds to the situation in or through which s/he may be involved in performing writing tasks or in which her/his writing may be evaluated” (Abdellatif, 2007, p. 60). So, it involves both the student’s writing process and their produced text.

In the literature pertaining to affect in writing, writing apprehension appears to be one of the most researched affective aspects (Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2006). This can be explained through the considerable effect apprehension may have on student writers, with particular emphasis on struggling ones. Daly and Miller (1975) were the first researchers who introduced the construct of writing apprehension. Later, Daly and Shamo (1978) went further in trying to understand the effect of this affective aspect on students’ writing. They came to a conclusion that writing apprehension reflects the students’ likelihood to avoid writing tasks or, in more general terms, approach writing situations.

Writing apprehension and writing anxiety have been used synonymously in the literature (Abdellatif, 2007; Johnson & Roen, 1989). However, in some contexts the two terms may be used differently. Thus, writing apprehension is generally referred to in relation to writers’ disposition towards a writing situation or task, while writing anxiety is considered as a situational aspect of their affect. In some other contexts, writing apprehension and writers’ block are referred to synonymously. In any of these cases, student writers, in general, demonstrate uneasiness, hesitation, avoidance, or lack of pre-disposition to write (Bannister, 1992).
Regarding the effect of apprehension on students’ writing, particularly in EFL or ESL contexts, students tend to avoid writing because of one or more among many factors including, but not be limited to, the target language (native vs second/ foreign language), the type of writing (e.g., personal vs. academic), writing situation (e.g., homework vs. classroom assignment or exam), or their writing background (high vs. low). In this respect, research shows that students can develop writing apprehension as a result of: the nature of the writing assignment, lack of/ or limited knowledge about the writing skills and conventions, low level of self-confidence, history of low writing performance, or negative feedback received from others (Abdellatif, 2007; Graham et al., 2013). Similarly, based on their previous writing success or failure, learners of different backgrounds can develop judgements of their writing ability.

In addition, students’ affective factors (such as, their attitudes towards writing or the writing instructor, their motivation to write in the target language, and their writing self-efficacy level) are considered as an important contributing factor in determining the level of their writing apprehension. Thus, research on L2/ FL writing research found that L2/ FL writing apprehension correlates with L2/ FL classroom anxiety, writing self-efficacy, L2/ FL proficiency self-esteem level, writing proficiency, and L1 writing apprehension (Abdellatif, 2007; Arnold, 1999). In other words, L2/ FL students may develop writing apprehension as a result of one or more of the above-stated factors or situations. For example, they may be apprehensive because they have low self-efficacy beliefs about their writing ability or language proficiency, or because of their L1 writing apprehension. However, they may display a lower level of writing apprehension because their good reading habits.
1.3.4.2.2. Writing Self-efficacy

Like writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy is considered among the common contributing factor to students’ writing performance and behaviour. However, to writing self-efficacy has received less attention compared to writing apprehension. It was until recently (late 1980s and early 1990s), where researchers started to consider it as an important motivational construct of writing.

In its simplest definitions, writing self-efficacy refers to the beliefs learners have about their writing abilities (Bandura, 1997). These beliefs can determine what and how the student writers use the knowledge and skills they have about writing in performing a particular writing task or situation. In other words, self-efficacy beliefs have an influential effect on students’ behaviour, as Pajares and Johnson (1994, p. 314) put it:

Self-efficacy beliefs influence on one’s behaviour by determining her/ his achievement goals, how much effort s/ he will devote to performing the task, the perseverance s/ he exerts when facing difficulties and challenges, and her/ his thought patterns and emotional responses.

Writing self-efficacy and writer’s confidence have been used synonymously in the literature. Thus, Shell et al. (1995) define writing self-efficacy as the learners’ confidence in their ability to perform their writing tasks, successfully; while Pajares & Valiante (2002) claim that writing self-efficacy has to do with the learners’ judgement of their writing ability and skills.

Like writing apprehension, students’ self-efficacy can be influenced by a number of factors, including, but may not be limited to, their writing background/ ability, their history of writing performance, evaluation received from others, their attitudes and motivation towards the writing
situation/ task or the target language, as well as writing apprehension. This implies that these factors correlate with writing self-efficacy positively or negatively. For example, when students display a positive attitude or motivation towards writing/ or a writing task, they are likely to have a high level of writing self-efficacy. In contrast, if they experienced a low writing performance and/ or received negative feedback from others, they are very likely to develop a lower level of writing self-efficacy. The same thing applies to writing apprehension in relation to writing self-efficacy.

With respect to the students’ writing performance, studies have reported that writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy correlate with the L1 and L2/ FL writing process and product. Thus, Flower and Hayes (1980) claimed that, during the writing process, high apprehensive student writers tend to make longer pauses while composing compared to their low apprehensive peers. In addition, they devote little or no importance, effort, and time to planning their essays (Graham & Harris, 2005). Low self-efficacy, on the other hand, was found to have a hindering effect on the students’ metacognitive strategy use (Abdellatif, 2007), which affects negatively on their overall writing processes.

As for the relationship between writing apprehension and the students’ writing product, it is argued that the former correlates negatively with the latter. In other words, writing apprehension was found to have a negative correlation with students’ written texts, in terms of length, language use, and writing proficiency (Bannister, 2002). In another study, however, writing self-efficacy was found to have a positive correlation with text quality (Pajares & Valiante, 2002).

The above-stated results and claims made by writing researchers show that while writing self-efficacy and writing apprehension may exert an effect on each other, they may also have a
considerable effect on the student writers’ performance. It is, therefore, important for writing instructors to consider these affective constructs in teaching writing, mainly when it has to do with students with moderate or serious writing difficulties. By doing so, teachers may set teaching goals to help learners promote their positive affect and their writing performance.

1.3.4.3. Enhancing Positive Affect through Strategy Training

In order for writing progress to take place, learners, particularly those with writing difficulties need to be taught in a stress-free atmosphere, where they can receive constructive formative feedback that would improve their writing performance and enhance their positive affect (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013; MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006).

There are various ways through which writing instructors can help their students achieve progress in writing and enhance both their performance and affect. One way to achieve this goal is teaching writing collaboratively, particularly during the pre-writing (brainstorming and planning) and revision stages of the writing process. Other effective strategies that writing experts recommend include, but may not be limited to, teaching students peer- and self-assessment strategies as well as using portfolio assessment and teacher conferencing in order to enhance their writing autonomy and positive affect (Graham & Perin, 2007; Graham et al., 2013; Miao, Badger, and Zhenc, 2006; Min (2006). These strategies are explained below.

1.3.4.3.1. Enhancing Positive Affect through Collaborative Writing

Collaborative writing is considered as an effective strategy in teaching writing to young as well as adult learners because it has a positive impact on enhancing their writing performance and positive affect. It involves peers working in pairs or small groups whereby they make arrangements as they plan, compose, revise and edit their pieces of writing (e.g., essays)
(Graham & Perin, 2007). This process is guided by a writing instructor, who observes, instructs, provides feedback and encourages students’ progress.

Researchers (e.g., Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013;) claim that collaborative writing helps reduce students’ affective constraints. In other words, using the collaborative writing strategy has been found to have positive effects on reducing students’ writing apprehension and enhancing their self-efficacy beliefs. To achieve this goal, Graham et al., (2013, p. 385) recommend three major instructional practices, which consist of the following:

- Engaging students in collaboration where they interact with each other about texts they are reading and writing…;
- Making connections to [their] lives, thereby connecting their background knowledge to the content they are learning …; and
- Creating responsive classrooms that acknowledge students’ voices, giving them an element of choice in learning tasks, and strengthening their literacy skills

Collaborative writing involves peers working as partners in the process of planning, composing, and revising their writing (Yongjin, 2013). During this process, they can assist each other with generating ideas and constructing meaning, organizing and outlining their pieces of writing, evaluating and revising ideas, and editing spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors. During these sub-processes, the writing instructor can intervene as monitor, whereby s/he encourages student writers to interact and benefit from the process, and responds to their needs and inquiries whenever necessary (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013).

Within this collaborative environment, writing instructors can teach students effective strategies, such as using peer-assessment during revision and editing. This strategy has been
reported to help students considerably in gaining self-esteem and motivation. Thus, the engagement of students in a collaborative peer-assessment, as writers and readers, has been found to be effective in reducing “the degree of anxiety among them and [helping] them acquire a ... higher level of confidence in their ability to write” (Moussaoui, 2012, p. 1782). Moreover, studies have shown that compared to students’ who wrote individually, those who worked in a collaborative environment were found to have produced better writing quality and experienced a higher level of motivation and self-confidence.

1.3.4.3.2. Enhancing Positive Affect through Peer-assessment Strategy Training

Peer-assessment is a technique of evaluation, also known as ‘peer-feedback’, ‘peer-review’, or ‘peer-response’ that is usually used during the writing process. Johnson and Roen (1989) define it as the process of “integrated activities” during which students are socially involved in “responding to each other’s writing”. This implies that peer evaluation is a process that calls for several interactive skills, namely, “reading, writing, speaking, listening and thinking” (p. 208). During this process, the student writers are set in a real communicative context where they can actively practise the language in its different ways and forms.

The peer-evaluation process can take different forms. A pair response is one way through which two student writers exchange their writing and give feedback to each other (Kwok, 2008). A small-group response is another way through which students receive feedback from a “supportive audience”, who are the members of the same group (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001, p. 212). Another form of peer-evaluation is a whole-group response, which is generally the case in class conferencing or seminar discussions, where the student speaker receives feedback from the audience, who is the rest of the group members.
Implementing peer evaluation in EFL writing classes has been empirically proven to be beneficial to EFL learners from “cognitive, affective, social, and linguistic” perspectives (Min, 2006, p. 118). During the process of peer evaluation, students can develop their communicative and critical thinking skills as they exchange, discuss, and evaluate each other’s writing. The latter would enable them to increase their understanding and awareness of the evaluation criteria, which would, in turn, help them improve their written drafts. The involvement of students in a social environment, as writers and readers, helps reduce their writing anxiety and promote their motivation and self-esteem (Johnson & Roen, 1989), as well as a higher level of confidence in their ability to write (i.e., their writing self-efficacy) (Moussaoui, 2012).

In EFL writing contexts where instructors cannot respond to individual students more regularly, mainly with time constraints and large class size, peer evaluation is considered as a beneficial technique (Miao, Badger & Zhen, 2006) in the sense that it encourages students' learning autonomy and productivity in writing. In this respect, writing instructors and researchers (Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006) claim that peer evaluation in a writing classroom is an effective strategy that fosters student writers’ autonomy and develops their critical thinking skills. Through regular practice, students learn to think critically, write, and provide feedback to each other, and revise and edit their own writing. They learn to take responsibility over their writing and understand the sense of audience more properly. Developing autonomy in writing helps them considerably in gaining confidence in their writing abilities and encourages them to take risks and try new writing tasks.

It is important that student writers receive training on the use of the peer-assessment strategy to help them in the process of collaborative pair or group work (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006). Therefore, for an effective use of this strategy in the classroom, writing
instructors are required to provide guidelines, explicit strategies through modelling, and evaluation checklists to facilitate the process of evaluation among peers. Checklists can guide the evaluator(s) (i.e., student reader(s)) to follow certain steps and criteria in order to effectively participate in peer evaluation.

1.3.4.3.3. Enhancing Positive Affect through Self-assessment Strategy Training

Self-assessment, or self-evaluation, is a technique of revision that instructors may adopt in a writing classroom to help their students revise their writing on their own. In doing so, they can provide guidelines and strategies to enable individual students use the strategy. The key factor to effective use of self-evaluation, as it is the case in other revision strategies, is the “knowledge of evaluation criteria and the ability to apply them in one’s own writing” (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013, p. 220). In this respect, it was reported that studies that adopted this technique have yielded positive effects on revision and writing quality (Graham et al., 2013). Moreover, student writers reported that the self-assessment strategy has enhanced their motivation and self-efficacy, on the one hand; on the other, it relatively lowered their apprehension as they developed more autonomy and ownership as writers.

The principle of teaching self-evaluation in a writing class is that writing instructors have to consider two main aspects: teaching specific rather than general criteria of evaluation and providing support and practice to apply these criteria in various writing situations (Graham et al., 2013). That is to say, revising particular aspects in a piece of writing is easier for students to understand and apply. In addition, applying this within a specific genre of writing provides possibilities for students to consider specific criteria within various types of writing (e.g., expository writing differs much from narrative writing).
In order for students to grasp the self-evaluation technique and apply revisions on their own writing, they need practice and teacher support. Thus, *modelling* (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald, 2006) is an effective strategy to demonstrate sample situations or writing problems that need to be addressed during revision. By doing so, the instructor provides explanations and examples that illustrate how specific criteria of evaluation can be applied. Thus, instead of applying revision on essay organization as a general criterion, the instructor may give specific aspects of organization that need to be treated. For example, revising cohesive devices in a comparison-contrast genre requires a sample paragraph revision that includes cohesion errors. Students can take part in the revision process while the instructor is modelling the strategy of self-assessment.

When students receive sufficient training and become efficient users of the self-assessment strategy, they will be able to monitor their writing development and improve their self-confidence as autonomous writers. They will also acquire a sense of ownership and develop their level of awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses in writing, which will enable them to use self-regulated strategies and set personal goals for writing and revision (Graham & Harris, 2005).

Self-assessment may be used along with peer-assessment strategy or teacher conferencing for a more effective revision to take place. A combination of different types of assessment improves students’ writing performance and fosters their writing motivation and self-efficacy beliefs (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2006).
1.3.4.3.4. Enhancing Positive Affect through Portfolio Assessment and Teacher Conferencing

Portfolio assessment is known to be among the modern ways of assessing the writing progress as it is more effective for process instructional methods. It is considered as an effective strategy to promote learning and motivation to write. Graham et al. (2013) claim that writing portfolios have an important role in keeping students actively engaged and motivated during the writing process, which impacts positively on their writing progress, hence, their performance, both at the level of process and writing quality.

Portfolio assessment is related to the students’ academic performance. Thus, students are actively engaged in the process of knowledge construction and skills development throughout a specific academic period. This allows them to achieve greater academic performance and motivation. In this respect, Calfee (2000) explains the benefits of using writing portfolios for both the learners and the institutions where they are enrolled, stating that:

A writing portfolio, through which students may become aware of their advancement in writing, is now a self-evaluation method adopted in [academic institutions]. It documents the development of writing competence, as well as motivation to write, through students’ narration and description of their involvement, satisfaction, and also frustrations in the various writing experiences (in Graham et al., 2013, p. 305).

This implies that writing portfolios are used as a communication report (or dialogue) between students and their instructors and/ or institutions, where the former report on their successful and unsuccessful writing experiences from different perspectives: cognitive, linguistic, and socio-affective. This helps the instructors examine and identify their students’ writing strengths and problems on an individual basis, which would help them think of ways and
intervene to remedy their problems whenever necessary. In addition, the portfolio assessment strategy helps decrease the level of apprehension among students as they exchange frequently and on individual basis with their instructor. Moreover, the progress that they obtain throughout a period of time would enhance their writing self-efficacy beliefs (Graham et al. 2013).

Teacher conferencing, or what is known as one-on-one conferencing, is another strategy among those that have been adopted successfully by writing instructors, mainly with struggling writers. Although it may be time and effort consuming, it has considerable effects on the writers’ improvement from various perspectives: linguistic, cognitive, and affective (Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013).

Teacher conferencing enables student writers, mainly those who experience writing difficulties, to discuss their weaknesses with their instructors individually (Graham et al., 2013). When students feel that they have attention from their instructor, who supports them through constructive feedback on an individual basis, they develop more interest and motivation as well as a better level of confidence in their abilities to write and use the target language. They also become more aware of their strengths and weaknesses, which would, through time, enhance their autonomy as writers and language learners.

Conclusion

Writing is defined in a different ways. It is both a process and a product, and it can be genre specific, in the sense that genres differ in purpose, form, and style. The product of writing is the result of a number of cognitive processes and behaviours that a writer engages in to create a meaningful piece. It requires highly cognitive multitasks that are complex and require a mastery of language and rhetorical skills to perform them. Learning to write in a second or
foreign language can be more challenging to learners with language difficulties and/or to those who lack the necessary writing skills and strategies. Strategy instruction can be an effective way to alleviate these learners’ cognitive, linguistic and affective difficulties and improve their writing performance and affect.
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Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the study population and sample, with a brief discussion of the participants’ profile and the sampling procedures. It also describes, in some detail, the different instruments used in the study, followed by an explanation of the way in which the data were analysed. The instruments included pre- and post-tests, pre- and post-questionnaires, in-training writing tasks, and think-aloud protocols; each of which is described below. The chapter also provides a brief description of the methods, materials and the timeline of the experimentation, including the phases through which the experiment was conducted. At the end of the chapter, a brief explanation is given to the aspects of validity and reliability of the instruments as well as the ethical issues that concern data collection and participants’ information.

2.1. Participants and Setting

The study was conducted at Setif 2 University English Department. The population consisted of second-year students of English as a foreign language. The participants were female and male students, aged between twenty (20) and twenty-two (22) years. The gender and age factors were disregarded in this study.

The population of the study consisted of 297 students. The original sample considered in the exploratory study was equal to 150 participants. However, this number decreased to 127 because the rest (23) of the participants did not answer most of the questionnaire items. Therefore, and for the sake of facilitating the statistical analysis of the results, conducted through the Software Package of Social Sciences (SPSS), the 23 participants were disregarded. Among the 127 participants who answered the pre-questionnaire, 73 of them sat the pre-test (writing an essay). This sample, (N=127), represents more than a third of the total population, while 73
represents almost a quarter (24.58 %). In the experimental phase of the research, two groups, among the 73 participants who sat the pre-test, took part in the experimental (EG) or control (CG) group, with 24 in the former and 09 in the latter. The original number of participants in the CG was 14, but 05 of them withdrew and did not sit the post-test; so, they were disregarded.

A further sampling was made at the end of the experimental phase of the research, which was purposive. Thus, 05 participants from the EG were selected for the think-aloud procedure, but 01 participant was disregarded because the recorded data was of low quality. These participants were selected from different levels of writing performance, according to their post-test scores. In other words, two were categorized as high-achieving writers (HAW), one was an average-achieving writer (AAW), and the fourth one was a low-achieving writer (LAW). The following table displays numerical details about the population and sample categories used in both the exploratory and experimental phases of the study.

Table 5
Sample Categories in the Exploratory and Experimental Study Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments per phase</th>
<th>Exploratory Phase</th>
<th>Experimental Phase</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-questionnaire</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-questionnaire</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-hoc Test</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1. Sampling Procedure

Three different sampling procedures were used in the study: random and purposive, depending on the aims set for each phase and each research instrument used in the study. Random sampling was deemed more appropriate for the exploratory phase. In the experimental
study, however, the *random* and *purposive* sampling methods were employed. The latter was used at the end of the study to carry out the think-aloud procedure.

The pre-questionnaire was administered to the whole population, which was equal to 297 students, but only 150 were collected, among which 23 were disregarded because they were not fully answered. The total sample is, then, equal to 127. As for the pre-test, 73 participants were selected, among whom 33 participated in the *experimentation*, and the choice was voluntary; i.e., the participants volunteered to take part as a control or experimental group. Those who joined the experimental group expressed a need and an interest in improving their writing skills as they were experiencing writing difficulties at various levels. Others, who were not interested in taking training sessions, expressed their willingness to take part as a control group (CG) and they accepted to participate, later, in the post-test and the post-study questionnaire.

Finally, a think-aloud procedure was conducted at the end of the study to confirm the results of the post-study test as well as compare, among the experimental group participants, the writing processes and strategies used by two (02) high-achievers (HA), one (01) average-achiever (AA) and one (01) low-achiever (LA), which makes 04 participants out of 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Think-aloud Participants’ Post-test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Score (100)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample in this part of the study was purposive, the choice of which was attributed to the fact that the researcher was interested in conducting a qualitative analysis of the participants’ writing strategies while processing their essay writing, in order to back up the quantitative results
of the post-test. The above table demonstrates the post-test scores, upon which the participants were categorized as HA, AA, and LA writers.

2.2. Research Method and Instruments

This research sought to explore the factors that were related to undergraduate students’ difficulties in expository essay writing and to investigate the effect of strategy training in improving their writing performance and enhancing their positive affect. To achieve this two-fold aim, a triangulation of methods was used, involving a combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments for the exploratory and experimental phases of the study. To conduct each of these study phases, a set of instruments was used. In the exploratory phase, a pre-test and a pre-questionnaire were used. The former was employed to seek data about the participants’ writing performance while the latter was used to gain insight about their writing difficulties, writing processes and strategies as well as their affective factors. Further instruments were used to conduct the experimental phase of the research. Thus, a post-test and a post-questionnaire were employed to collect data on the effect of strategy training on the participants’ writing performance and their affect. Finally, a think-aloud procedure was used to confirm the post-study results and compare the writing processes and strategies of high-, average-, and low-achievers.

2.2.1. Pre- and Post-study Tests

A pre-test was designed to explore the writing difficulties encountered by the participants prior to the experimental phase of the research. The pre-test results also served in setting the grounds for the experimental study whereby the strengths and weaknesses (needs analysis) of the study participants were analysed.
The post-test was designed to examine the effect of strategy training on the participants’ writing performance. The results of the test were compared to those of the pre-test, at a later stage. Both tests consist of writing an expository essay about one of the topics that were suggested by the researcher. The topics in the pre-test were different from those in the post-test, but they were of the same nature (Appendix II: 1, 2).

Before the test was administered, the researcher provided clear instructions for the participants. The latter were encouraged to take the required time (120 minutes) to write their essays, using as many drafts as they needed. The aim behind was to collect, not only the final drafts of the essay (test), but also the rough drafts that the participants used so as to gain insight on the way they wrote, the stages and steps they followed, and whether or not they planned and revised their writing (writing process and strategies). These details were taken into consideration in the evaluation of the pre- as well as the post-tests. The researcher used a graded analytical evaluation rubric (Appendix IV.1), containing various criteria, with details related to each criterion. The major criteria included: content (of the essay), organization (internal and external), language (accuracy and fluency), mechanics, and the writer’s engagement in the writing process (e.g., planning, revision, and the number of drafts used). The following is a brief description of the main criteria, the sub-criteria, and the scoring system.

2.2.2. Pre- and Post-study Questionnaires

2.2.2.1. Description of the Pre- and Post-study Questionnaires

A questionnaire was employed at two different phases of the study. A pre-study questionnaire (Appendix I: 1) was used to conduct the exploratory study. Its aim was to explore the participants’ affective factors and their writing background, including their writing
difficulties and their writing processes and strategies. The post-study questionnaire (Appendix I: 2), on the other hand, was intended to examine the experimental and control group participants’ degree of improvement, if any, at the level of their affect (i.e., whether there had been any decrease in their writing apprehension and increase in their writing self-efficacy after the training period). It consists of one major section that was referred to in the pre-questionnaire as “Students’ Affective Factors”. It is composed of two sub-sections: The Writing Apprehension Scale (WAS) and the Writing Self-efficacy Scale (WSES). The latter are explained, below, under ‘Section Two’.

Section One: Students’ Writing Background

This section of the questionnaire was designed by the researcher and it sought to collect data on the participants’ general writing background prior to the experimentation. It is divided into three sub-sections of eleven (11) questions: Students’ Writing Difficulties and Students’ Writing Processes and Strategies.

The first sub-section, i.e., the ‘Students’ Writing Difficulties’, comprises five (5) questions (Q₁ through Q₅), aiming at obtaining information on the writing difficulties the participants’ experienced prior to the study. The second sub-section, i.e., the ‘Students’ Writing Processes and Strategies’ was intended to elicit answers about the participants’ writing processes and strategies, and it includes six questions (Q₆ through Q₁₁). The questions in this section of the questionnaire are given multiple choice answers, where the respondents have to circle the appropriate option (s), with one or more answers, depending on the aim of the question. A further option (other, please, specify …) provides for the respondents the possibility to add any further answer, and specify it, wherever necessary.
Section Two: Students’ Affective Factors

This section of the questionnaire consisted of two sub-sections: The English Writing Apprehension Scale (EWAS) and The English Writing Self-efficacy Scale (EWSS). These scales were used in a study, among others, conducted by (Abdellatif, 2007) to investigate the factors that contributed to the Egyptian EFL students’ negative writing affect.

A. The English Writing Apprehension Scale

The English Writing Apprehension Scale (EWAS) comprised twelve (12) items, each of which aimed at eliciting information on the participants’ writing apprehension. The scale consisted of a five-point Likert-type scale that ranged from strongly agree (=1) to strongly disagree (=5). The items were categorized into positive (i.e., items: 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12) and negative statements (i.e., items: 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8). This scale was reversed, mainly for the purpose of analysis, because some of the items were worded positively and others negatively in the original EWA scale. The negatively worded items were stated in the direction of apprehension; therefore, and in order to adopt a consistent scale for all the items, the scale of the positively worded statements was reversed.

B. The English Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

This sub-section is divided into two parts: the first one (EWSE-1) contained eight (08) items, among which 1, 3, 4, and 7 were negatively worded, while the second one (EWSE-1) consisted of ten (10) items, which were positively worded. The former set of items aimed at measuring the participants’ confidence level in their general writing ability, and the latter sought to measure their confidence level in using specific writing skills (e.g., organization, language use, and mechanics). The scale adopted in EWSE-1 was a five-point Likert-type ranging from
strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5), while in EWSE-2, the scale ranged from very unconfident (1) to very confident (5). In order to achieve consistency in the scales, the former scale was reversed into: strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1) for the negative statements.

The basic idea behind choosing the negative and positive statements is that some of them go in the direction of the increase of writing apprehension and others (1 to 7) reveal the opposite. For example, statements 8 to 12, in the Writing Apprehension Scale 1, are likely to indicate no apprehension case. In this way, if a participant’s answer is “strongly agree”, it means that s/he is not apprehensive. Therefore, the scoring (of the scale) was reversed.

2.2.2.2. Pilot Study of the Pre-study Questionnaire

The pre-study questionnaire was piloted prior to the exploratory phase of the study in order to test the clarity and comprehension of the questions among a different sample of students. Thirty (30) questionnaires were administered three weeks before the actual administration of the pre-questionnaire. The questions were reviewed and modifications were made as necessary.

In designing the pre-study questionnaire, a few open questions were designed in order to elicit detailed answers about the participants’ writing background and writing skills. However, most of those open questions were completely disregarded by the respondents, and others were not fully answered, unclear, and unsatisfactory. Therefore, alternative questions were considered, with multiple choice answers, in order to facilitate the task for the respondents. Considering direct questions, with multiple choice answers, was also thought to facilitate the statistical analysis of the results, using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS), which requires exact data to be uploaded numerically. Apart from the open questions, those that were posed
under the form of direct or multiple choice questions were answered by all the respondents and they required no modifications.

The second section, entitled “Students’ Affective Factors”, was part of both the pre- and post-study questionnaires. The section consisted of other sub-sections, and the statements were displayed in tables, with two different five-Likert scales. The respondents answered all the section with no difficulty. Therefore, no changes were adopted.

2.2.3. Think-aloud Procedure

The think-aloud procedure was conducted after the post-test, and it aimed at examining, qualitatively, the degree of progress among high-, average-, and low- achieving writers, mainly at the level of strategy use. The participants were five (05) in number, selected purposefully from the experimental group, but only four (4) protocols were considered in this research because the fifth participant’s recording was of low quality and inaccessible for transcription; hence, the researcher disregarded it.

In performing this procedure, the participants were asked to think-aloud while planning, drafting and revising their essays. The aim of using this technique was to examine the way (s) in which the participants processed their writing and the type of strategies they used during the three main stages of writing (planning, drafting, and revising).

2.2.3.1. Think-aloud Protocols: The Verbalized Data

The Think-aloud protocols refer to the recorded data of the participants’ thinking and writing processes and strategies as they composed their essays. It is an introspective research technique that is considered as a suitable tool to access the writers’ composing processes. The technique involves highly cognitive activities and processes (Charters, 2003) as the writers think
about, translate, and evaluate content, strategies, and rules of composing an essay in the target language.

In this study, the researcher employed this procedure in order to analyse and compare the writing processes and strategies used by high-, average-, and low-achieving writers as they wrote expository essays, at different levels of the process (planning, drafting, and revising). The task of the participants was to think-aloud for a period of time (limited to 120 minutes) while writing an essay on one of the topics that were suggested. They were encouraged to use as many drafts as they needed.

Before employing this procedure, the participants were trained to use the technique properly and effectively, as it is explained later in this chapter. The recorded data of the think-aloud were transcribed (Appendix VII.I-4), and the strategies were identified, coded and analysed qualitatively. The procedure of transcription, coding, and analysis are explained later in this chapter.

2.2.3.2. Think-aloud Training

In order to provide a clear picture of the nature of the think-aloud and facilitate the procedure, the participants were trained during four sessions of two hours each. The training sessions included four major steps (Mebarki, 2008) that can be summarized in the following: explaining and modelling the technique, practice and rehearsing, feedback and scaffolding practice, and, finally, the actual think-aloud, covering the whole process of writing. The following is an explanation of each of the above-mentioned steps.
- **Explaining and Modelling the Technique**

   At the beginning, the researcher explained the nature of the think-aloud by defining and, then, modelling the technique. In doing so, she demonstrated, by thinking aloud, a brief brainstorming activity. She repeated the activity twice and asked the participants to repeat it, one by one, in their own pace. The participants followed the step carefully and started thinking aloud while brainstorming a topic of their choice. The researcher observed each participant, while the others were listening and following. She provided more details about the technique and explained what is required of the writer.

   You are not required to explain what you are doing; rather, your task is to verbalize what you are thinking about while you are doing the activity. Try to speak even when you have nothing to say. Try not to keep silent and do not think silently. Speak continuously without having long pauses (of more than 10 seconds).

   The researcher also provided models of think aloud for the rest of the stages of writing, i.e., while drafting (composing) and revising the essay. This took place during the first session of training.

- **Rehearsing and Practice**

   After explaining and modelling the think-aloud technique, the researcher set the participants to work individually. They were asked to write about the same topic (they started within the first session) and think-aloud while performing the rest of the stages of the writing process, starting by planning, drafting, and then, revising. The participants did not have to complete the whole stage of writing; rather, the aim of the activity was for them to rehearse and
practise as much as they needed to grasp the technique of think-aloud throughout the various stages of the process.

- **Feedback and Scaffolding Practice**

  The researcher provided recorders to the participants so that they record themselves as they performed each activity (from each stage of writing). She did so in order to provide a detailed feedback for each participant so that more practice would take place as needed. In giving feedback, the researcher made each participant listen to the recorded activities and explained the areas of strength and weakness in each activity so that more guidance and scaffolding practice would take place to improve the quality of the think-aloud. Scaffolding included, but was not limited to, improvements at the level of:

  a. Verbalization of more details, regardless of the activity type, language or writing ability,

  b. Pausing behaviours, whereby the verbalizer was asked to reduce the number of pauses and try not to pause for long periods of time,

  c. Pitch level, which had to be adjusted to improve the quality of the protocols and achieve clarity.

- **Think-aloud Procedure**

  After the participants grasped the think-aloud procedure and were able to use it effectively, the researcher set them to write an expository essay about one of the assigned topics and think-aloud throughout the whole process of writing (planning, drafting, and revising). Writing materials (such as: paper, pens, pencils) and professional recorders were provided for
each participant. The recording of the think-aloud was done in separate rooms and it lasted for a period of 90 to 120 minutes, depending on the writing pace of each participant.

2.3. Description of the Exploratory and Experimental Phases of the Study

This study was both exploratory and experimental. The former aimed at exploring the major factors that may be the cause of the students’ writing difficulties, while the latter was conducted to instruct the participants on the effective use of the writing strategies to improve their performance level and enhance positive affect among them. The following is a description of each phase, with a hint to the instruments used to conduct each of them as well as an explanation of the materials, the stages, and the timeline of the experimental part of the study.

2.3.1. The Exploratory Phase

In this phase of the study, the researcher used a pre-questionnaire to gain insights on the participants’ background in writing, including their writing difficulties, habits and attitudes towards writing as well as their affective factors. The pre-test, on the other hand, provided information on the participants’ writing abilities and their overall performance. Through these two instruments, the researcher was interested in identifying the participants’ writing difficulties and the factors that may be related to them. In other words, factors like negative affect (high level of apprehension and low level of self-efficacy), poor writing background experience (including, a lack of practice, and unawareness or misuse of the writing conventions and strategies), and low proficiency levels in the target language could be the sources of the participants’ writing difficulties and low performance.

The initial analysis of the results of this phase of research prepared the grounds for the experimental phase of the study. That is to say, the researcher made use of the results of the pre-
test and the pre-questionnaire to examine the participants’ weaknesses in order to identify the areas of focus of the training sessions. In doing so, she considered a number of aspects, including but not limited to, the nature of training that would be given to the participants and the method(s) of instruction, their varying levels of ability, the amount of time and number of sessions that would be attributed to the whole phase of experimentation, the instruction method and materials, and the evaluation methods to examine the participants’ progress.

The results of the pre-questionnaire and pre-test were, later, compared to those of the post-questionnaire and post-test, respectively, at the end of the experimental phase of research, in order to examine the progress of the experimental and control group participants. More details about this are provided in the section about procedures of data analysis, below.

2.3.2. The Experimental Phase

After investigating the participants’ writing difficulties and the factors that may be related to them, the researcher moved to the next phase of the study: the experimentation. The latter had as a main aim training the participants (experimental group), through instructional activities and workshops, to effectively understand, monitor, and self-regulate the writing strategies that are required in expository essay writing. This training would at a long-term level develop their writing performance, write more organized, coherent academic assignments. It would also foster their positive affect through collaborative writing activities, effective use of strategies, and the metacognitive awareness that would, in turn, facilitate their writing.

The training went through three main stages, each of which consisted of specific aims, activities, and materials. The method used in strategy training instruction was based on the process approach, where the participants went through different stages of planning, drafting, and
revising their essays. The instruction also included several methods of evaluation, ranging from self-, peer-, to one-on-one conferences, in addition to written feedback provided and monitored by the researcher. The individual (one-on-one) conferences were video-taped so as to assess the utility of each training session and make adjustments accordingly. The following sub-section explains the main phases of strategy instruction, with the procedures, timeline, as well as the materials used in the training.

### 2.3.2.1. Strategy Training: Procedure and Materials

The design of the training sessions and the instruction method was partly based on the Graham et al.’s Instruction Model (Graham & Harris, 2005), referred to as the Self-regulation Strategy Development (SRSD). The latter is an approach that focuses on teaching the writing strategies to students, explicitly, through guidance and practice so that they learn to manipulate and self-regulate the use of strategies more effectively to achieve a given writing goal. The model was applied mainly to English-speaking (native) learners, at various age categories and levels. The researcher, in this study, applied the approach, partly, by adopting some of the techniques used by the above-mentioned researchers to the aims of the course; i.e., training the participants for an effective understanding and use of the writing strategies. The design of the activities, strategy instruction lesson plans, and the evaluation techniques were designed and manipulated by the researcher.

The following is an explanation of the different phases of strategy instruction followed during the period of training.
2.3.2.1. The Procedure of Strategy Training

a. Explicit instruction/ training of the major features and conventions of expository writing, followed by practice (04 weeks)

In the initial phase of training, which lasted for four (04) weeks with two (02) sessions of two (02) hours each, the researcher prepared the atmosphere for the training to take place effectively. The participants (experimental group) were introduced, through mini-lessons followed by practice, to the features and conventions of expository writing. The lessons were under the form of small group workshops, following the process approach, whereby the participants took part in group activities through the guidance of the instructor (researcher).

The sessions were divided into mini-lessons of about 20 to 30 minutes, followed by practice (activities). The features and conventions of expository writing included aspects related to: paragraph and essay structure, organizational patterns (such as: cause-effect, comparison-contrast relationships, exemplification, definition, analysis and explanation) in expository writing, academic writing style and register in relation to the topic, genre, and purpose of writing, as well as the audience needs. In addition, aspects like internal and external organization, unity, cohesion, coherence and mechanics (spelling, punctuation and formatting) were introduced through activities.

b. Explicit instruction of the pre-writing strategies (advanced planning), followed by group activities (02 weeks).

During the second phase of training, which lasted for two (02) weeks with two (02) sessions of two (02) hours each, the participants were taught brainstorming and planning (pre-writing) strategies explicitly, the aim of which was to guide them through:
- The selection of a topic, through analysing key words, narrowing down a topic if necessary, and discussing genre/type, organization pattern(s), register, style, and audience in relation to the topic.

- Writing a thesis statement, attention grabbers, and topic sentences (for the body paragraphs),

- Generating ideas for the topic(s), with various strategies of brainstorming (like, listing, questioning, mind mapping, clustering, and free writing),

- Drawing an initial outline for the essay, following the essay structure (introduction, body (1-3 paragraphs), and conclusion) and pattern(s) of organization (block, point-by-point, chain methods), mainly in relation to the cause-effect and comparison-contrast types of essays that were the focus of the training.

- Developing the brief outline into a more detailed plan, following the structure of the essay and the body paragraphs (i.e., writing a thesis statement for an introduction, a maximum number of supporting details for each paragraph, with their topic and concluding sentences, and a conclusion, by summarizing the main ideas of the essay).

**c. Explicit instruction of the drafting/composing strategies, followed by practice (02 weeks)**

In the third phase of training, which lasted for two (02) weeks with two (02) sessions of two (02) hours each, the participants were taught strategies, explicitly, to generate more content, analyse ideas and organize them cohesively into coherent paragraphs and essays. In doing so, the participants were guided during the process of composing and encouraged to try:

- Developing/elaborating on the previously brainstormed ideas,
- Using linking words and transitions to express the intended relationships (e.g., cause-effect) between ideas and paragraphs in relation to the essay genre, purpose, and pattern of organization,
- Focusing more on content and organization rather than grammar and mechanics at the drafting stage of writing.

d. Explicit instruction of the revision strategies, followed by practice (04 weeks)

This phase focused on introducing the participants to and raising their awareness about the importance of revision and the effect it has on improving the written products. A number of revision strategies were taught through mini-lessons, with practice. Revision included aspects like:

- Rereading the first (previous) draft, with a focus on the ideas and global organization,
- Considering the macro aspects of revision: development of ideas (variety, amount, and relevance) and organization (essay structure, paragraph structure, pattern of organization, relationship between the ideas, focus (e.g., from general to specific), cohesive ties, and coherence),
- Consulting the plan again and making possible revisions,
- Applying the revisions and writing a second draft,
- Considering further revisions based on language use (academic vocabulary, formal style, sentence variety and correctness, verb forms and tenses),
- Peer reviewing (with peer conferencing), using guided checklists,
- Further revision (ideas and organization) and editing (mechanics: punctuation and spelling).
- Written feedback and one-on-one conferencing with the instructor were conducted with each participant.

- Editing and writing a final draft.

To conduct self-evaluation and peer-reviewing, the participants were given instructions on how to perform each of the evaluation techniques, and a checklist was provided on each technique to help and facilitate the evaluation process.

After turning in the final draft on one type of essay (cause-effect), the participants were given the first in-training self-evaluation questionnaire (Appendix VI.1) to track their progress. The questionnaire included questions on the various aspects that were covered during the first phase of the training. It enabled the researcher to collect information and evaluate the participants’ level of understanding, awareness, and manipulation of the different strategies and conventions they were taught on the cause-effect type of expository writing. Further scaffolding activities, guidance, and feedback were provided according to each participant’s needs.

After this stage, the participants went through the same processes and steps in developing a similar essay in length and structure, but with a different pattern of organization: the comparison-contrast essay type.

Once the participants finished the final draft of the comparison-contrast essay, they were administered a second in-training self-evaluation questionnaire (Appendix VI.2) to track their progress. Hence, more practice and guidance were provided for the participants who needed more improvement. Writing a fourth draft was, in some cases, required.
e. Individual Tasks: Collecting and Evaluating the In-training Writing Tasks (Cause-effect and Comparison-contrast Essays)

After the participants had an explicit instruction of the revision strategies, they were set to write cause-effect and, then, comparison-contrast essays on different topics, and go through the process of pre-writing, drafting and revising, individually. They were encouraged to use as many drafts as they wanted. The researcher gave clear instructions but did not provide feedback during the process of writing. The essays were collected for a qualitative evaluation. In doing so, the researcher was interested in tracking the participants’ progress in writing.

f. Administration of the Post-test, Post-questionnaire, and Think-aloud Procedure

After the training sessions were completed and the in-training writing tasks were collected from both the experimental and control groups, the researcher administered the post-test, followed by the post-questionnaire, and finally, the think-aloud procedure. The period of time between the collection of the in-training writing tasks and the post-test was one (01) week, whereas the time lapse between the post-test and the think-aloud procedure was limited to three (03) weeks. The reason for this was that the participants, who took part in the think-aloud procedure, were given a further training on the nature and use of the think-aloud technique, which lasted for two (02) weeks with two (02) sessions each.

2.3.2.1.2. The Materials of Strategy Training

To conduct the training sessions, the researcher used different materials, including, but not limited to: lesson plans, handouts for some writing activities, and evaluation checklists and rubrics (self- and peer-evaluation checklists as well as checklists for the cause-effect and comparison-contrast essay evaluation). In addition to this, the researcher designed in-training
self-evaluation questionnaires (Appendix VI.1, 2) and used them at two different stages of the training phase in order to evaluate the participants’ progress. Other materials were provided for the participants, and that included writing tools (like paper, pens, pencils) and professional recorders (camcorder, audio recorder, and computer) for the think-aloud procedure, the in-training videos, and the one-on-one conferences.

2.4. Procedures of Data Analysis

The present research is based on triangulation, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods. Therefore, different instruments were used, including pre- and post-tests, pre- and post-questionnaires, and think-aloud protocols. The results of the first two were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively, while the latter are analysed only qualitatively. The following is a description of the analysis procedure used for each data set.

2.4.1. Analysis Procedure of the Pre- and Post-tests

The pre- and post-tests consist of expository essays, which include at least one (minimum) draft. The evaluation of the essays is done by means of a graded evaluation rubric that includes five major criteria; each of which is divided into other sub-criteria. The major criteria include: content, organization, language accuracy and fluency, mechanics and format, and the writer’s engagement in the writing process. The rubric is graded out of 100 points, added from the sub-scores of each criterion (Appendix IV. 1). The total score of the participant is considered as her/his writing performance.

The results of the tests (scores) are analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis is achieved through the use of the SPSS software, including descriptive statistics of the total and sub-scores (criteria) and a One-sample Test to compare the results of the
pre- and post-tests for each of the experimental and control groups. The analysis provides the researcher with information on the participants’ overall writing performance, as well as their areas of strength and weakness through their sub-scores. It also shows the differences between high-, average-, and low-achieving writers through using percentile analysis.

In order to establish comparisons between the participants’ writing performance within and across groups (CG, EG), the researcher used a One-sample Test. The former is used to compare the means of scores between the pre- and post-test for the same group; i.e., experimental and control groups.

Table 07
Description of the Major Essay Evaluation Criteria (Think-aloud Method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>A well-written essay demonstrates well-elaborated ideas in well-developed paragraphs, with relevant, specific details and varied examples. Development is clear, precise, and thorough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>An organized essay is unified and coherent, with a developed introduction, body, and conclusion. Ideas are expressed in a progressive way, and appropriate transitions show logical relationships among ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language (accuracy and fluency)</strong></td>
<td>A well-written essay demonstrates an interesting correct language use that engages the reader; i.e., there is a clear command of the language, with a variety in sentence length and structure, in addition to an appropriate word choice, characterized with variety and precision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>A good essay demonstrates a rare occurrence of grammatical and mechanical errors; i.e., occasional spelling inaccuracies, missing commas that do not interfere with meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td>A well-formatted essay has clear indentations, margins, and spacing between paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the quantitative analysis of the pre- and post-tests, a qualitative analysis was used to interpret the quantitative results of the participants’ writing performance, in relation to specific criteria of essay writing evaluation. The latter are described in Table 7, above. These criteria are included in the graded rubric that was used for the evaluation of the participants’ written drafts (pre- and post-tests). The qualitative analysis also involves the degree of the participants’ progress in the writing performance, between the two phases of the study (pre- and post-training).

2.4.2. Analysis Procedure of the Pre- and post-study Questionnaires

The analysis of the questionnaires was quantitative, involving a statistical analysis of the different variables (writing difficulties, writing processes and strategies, and affective factors) of the study, using the Software Package of Social Sciences (SPSS), version 22.

In this study, the researcher was interested in examining the relationship between the variables, using descriptive statistics such as, the mean, median, standard deviation, percent analysis (in percentages), as well as the percentile analysis for comparisons between different categories of participants; i.e., high- and low-achievers.

The questions in the pre-questionnaire consisted of both nominal (a, b, c …) and ordinal (1, 2, 3 …) types. In order to facilitate their analysis through the SPSS software, the nominal data were coded differently and uploaded to the software. In doing so, each option (answer) from the set of options in each question is coded as “1” for a positive answer (a tick in the actual option/answer of the question) and “0” for a negative answer (no tick). The same technique was applied to the rest of nominal questions that contain more than one possible answer (tick).
In terms of analysis, the first section of the questionnaire was considered, separately, with each question regarded as a variable in itself in as far as the nominal data are concerned. In section two (students’ affective factors), the section or sub-section was considered as a major variable, encompassing complementary sub-variables. The data for the pre- and post-questionnaires were coded in the same way, with respect to the sub-samples of the study.

The number of the questionnaires considered in the exploratory phase (pre-questionnaire) was reduced in the experimental phase (post-questionnaire) into only 33, including both the experimental and control groups. However, the order of the participants’ responses (questionnaire) remained the same (i.e., 1 through 24 for EG and 25 through 33 for the CG participants) so as to consider the comparisons between the pre-and post-questionnaire results of the respective participants.

In order to establish comparisons between the participants’ answers within and across groups (Experimental and Control Groups), a One-sample Test was used. It was conducted through the same software (SPSS). Comparisons were made among as well as between the sub-groups. Further comparisons were also drawn between the pre- and the post-study questionnaire results, namely at the level of the participants’ affective factors, in order to examine the degree of progress, if any, at the level of their affect.

The qualitative analysis of the questionnaire involved mainly an interpretation of the quantitative results, and an analysis of the relationships between the study variables, in each phase of the study.
2.4.3. Analysis Procedure of the Think-aloud Protocols

The researcher’s main aim in using the think-aloud procedure was to identify and analyse, qualitatively, the writing processes and strategies used by each of the four participants included in this final phase of the research. The recorded data were first transcribed, and then coded for analysis.

2.4.3.1. Transcription of the Think-aloud Protocols

In transcribing the recorded data, the researcher considered every single utterance, including full sentences, phrases, words, as well as the sounds (such as: coughing, sighing, murmuring or whispering) that were produced during the activity. The short (1-5 seconds) and long (+ 5 seconds) pauses that were made by the verbalizers were also taken into consideration. The short pauses were transcribed as ellipsis (…) while the long ones were written between brackets as long or longer pause. Sounds like cough, sneeze, sigh, hesitation (such as “Eh” or “Em”), murmuring, or whispering were written between brackets too. In addition, the repeated words, expressions, or parts of/ full sentences were transcribed according to the number of times they were mentioned; i.e., they were typed in words, not in number. To separate the repeated utterances, the transcriber used ellipsis so that they become clear. The researcher also considered utterances referring to the use of another language (s), mainly French, but that was observed in very few instances. The following is an example of the transcribed data, with some of the aforementioned details.

I think that I will choose the second topic… discuss the effects of the internet on your civilization. It will be eh…yes a cause and effect essay…it will focus on the causes… eh on the effects of the internet… the internet is the cause… the effects… em…
The repeated utterances refer to words like *internet* and *causes*, and the hesitations include examples like *eh* and *em*. The repeated parts of a sentence, the incomplete or interrupted (with hesitations) ones, as well as the full sentences are separated with ellipsis.

**2.4.3.2. Coding of the Writing Strategies**

The transcribed data were divided into three sections that correspond to the three major stages of the writing process (pre-writing, drafting, and revising), for the purpose of clarity and data analysis. As for the coding scheme, the researcher referred to some strategy coding schemes used by Abdellatif, 2009, Akyel & Kamisli (1996), Mahfoudi (2003), Perl (1979), Raimes (1985), and Wong (2005). She, then, adopted a scheme that is appropriate to the aims of the study, the focus of which was on the writing strategies used by the participants during the three stages of the writing process (planning, drafting, and revising). She also considered some modified and new labels, such as: *reference to cohesion/ coherence, grammatical structure, audience/ topic/ genre/ or pattern of organization*. The full list of the writing strategies, per stage, with their codes, definitions, and examples, are given in *Appendix V*.

The following is a sample of the initial stage of protocol analysis, with the corresponding strategies (identified) and their definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Corresponding definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People here would have a dissatisfied attitude towards… the policy of their … countries</td>
<td>Analyzing or evaluating content</td>
<td>Judging one’s writing positively or negatively/ or evaluating content in relation to the topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For clarity purposes, it is worth noting, here, that the researcher was not interested in the quantity or frequency, but rather in the types of strategies and the way in which they were used.
by the participants. The type of strategies refers to the variety of strategies that writers employ in the process of generating, organizing, and revising their writing.

### 2.4.3.3. Analysis and Interpretation of the Recorded Data

Given that the study used a triangulation of methods, a combination of quantitative and qualitative, to cover the various dimensions of the research, the think-aloud protocols (the recorded data and the written drafts) were used to provide qualitative data for the study. In other words, the qualitative data were used to back up and complete the missing gaps that were not completely covered through the quantitative data.

The participants were categorized into high-, average-, and low-achieving writers according to the results of the post-test. A comparison was made between them in terms of the strategies used and the way they were used throughout the stages of the writing process (planning, drafting, and revising).

### 2.5. Ethical Considerations

In order to achieve a higher level of objectivity and an academic standard of research ethics, the researcher considered important measures throughout the various stages of her study. The major aspects that were considered are explained below.

#### 2.5.1. Participants’ Consent Form

For ethical considerations that are employed internationally in experimental as well as other types of research, it is important to mention, here, that prior to the second phase of the study, the participants in both groups (EG and CG) were required to sign a consent form, labelled ‘Contract of Agreement’ (Appendix III). The aim behind this was to make them express, in written form, their deliberate participation and ensure a sense of responsibility towards their
decision to participate in the various tasks set forth during the whole period of experimentation.

2.5.2. Administrative Permission

The researcher obtained an administrative permission to conduct the experimental study because the training sessions took place at the level of the Setif University (2) English Department, where the participants were taking their ordinary courses. Therefore, the training sessions were scheduled according to their primary timetable, with consideration to their preferences as well as their free time. During the winter and spring breaks, which lasted for fifteen days each, and during the exams’ period (fifteen days), no training sessions were organized. The latter was done purposefully as the researcher considered the exams’ period as quite sensitive for the students to focus on extra-curricular training. More importantly, the period of exams’ may provoke a higher level of anxiety, which was an important aspect of the study that required a relaxing atmosphere.

Moreover, because writing is a dynamic and recursive (non-linear) process, the researcher considered that the break periods that the participants had during the training would not affect negatively on their learning to write and improve at the level of writing performance.

2.5.3. Data Confidentiality

The pre- and post-study questionnaires were anonymous except for the experimental and control groups, for whom the researcher attributed codes (initials and numbers) so as to keep a record of the participants’ answers that were intended to be compared at a later stage. In other words, the pre-and post-study questionnaire results of both the experimental and control groups were compared so as to examine the degree of improvement, after the training sessions. The same procedure was followed in dealing with the pre- and post-tests and the think-aloud protocols. In other words, codes were used, instead of complete names of the participants, in
order to ensure a high level of confidentiality.

In addition, in-training videos were considered highly confidential and no data were disseminated to third party. The videos were not used as a research instrument in this study; rather, they were intended to keep a record of the experimental group participants’ activities, the one-on-one conferences, and other brief interviews that served the researcher to track the participants’ progress and, hence, provide necessary guidance, scaffolding practice, or feedback.

2.5.4. Subjectivity Statement

This research was more experimental in nature; therefore, a triangulation of method was used to avoid bias and achieve more objectivity and validity throughout the various aspects and dimensions of the study. In addition, an external evaluator was used to code the think-aloud protocols. The evaluator has a considerable knowledge in academic writing and writing research. Clear and detailed instructions were provided for the evaluator to understand the procedure.

Conclusion

This chapter was a thorough description of the methodology design of this research. By using a triangulation of methods, the researcher sought to cover the various dimensions of the study, including both the exploratory and the experimental phases. Thus, gathering a combination of quantitative and qualitative data through different instruments, namely, pre- and post-study questionnaires, pre- and post-tests, and think-aloud protocols, would achieve a higher level of objectivity and reliability.

Chapters three and four would provide a detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the results in light of the hypotheses set for this research.
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Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the results of the exploratory phase of the study, the aim of which was to investigate the factors that may be attributed to the participants’ writing difficulties. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section is devoted to the analysis of the pre-test results, both quantitatively, using descriptive statistics, and qualitatively, through pre-selected criteria. The second section tackles the analysis of the pre-questionnaire results, with its different sections and sub-sections; the results of each are analysed quantitatively, through descriptive statistics and percentages, and are interpreted qualitatively. The third section is a discussion of the exploratory study results, through which the factors attributed to the participants’ writing difficulties are identified and analysed. It also hints to previous research studies that reached similar results, and finally, analyses the hypotheses set for this phase of the research.

3.1. Analysis of the Pre-test Results

The aim of the exploratory phase of the present study was to explore the factors that may be related to the participants’ writing difficulties. To achieve this aim, a pre-test was used to collect data about the participants’ writing difficulties. The analysis of the pre-test (essays) results has revealed the overall writing performance of the participants, which is represented under criteria.

The evaluation of the participants’ essays (pre-test) was conducted through a graded rubric that consists of five (05) major criteria, which in turn are divided into sub-criteria. The major criteria are: (1) content, (2) organization, (3) language fluency and accuracy, (4) mechanics, and the (5) student writer’s engagement in the writing process. The evaluation scheme is displayed in
Table 8, below, and a detailed graded rubric, with a respective evaluation scheme of the sub-criteria, is given in Appendix V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in the writing process</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is displayed in Table 8, above, the total score is graded out of a 100%, and it represents the participants’ writing performance. Each criterion represents an aspect of the writing performance and is given a score. The choice of the latter is based on the importance attributed to the respective criterion. Thus, because the focus of the exploratory study is on the factors that may be related to the participants’ writing difficulties, the results of the pre-test, i.e., writing performance, reflect two main factors: (meta-) cognitive and linguistic. The former refers to: *content, organization, mechanics,* and the student’s *engagement in the writing process,* while the latter refers mainly to the *language accuracy and fluency* criterion.

The choice of these criteria and the sub-score attributed to each one of them is made with reference to some of the evaluation rubrics/schemes mentioned in the literature, where aspects like organization, content, and language use are given more weight than mechanics and form (e.g., Boardman, 2008; Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013; Leki, 1999; Murray, 2012). The ‘engagement in the writing process’ criterion is mentioned as part of the evaluation rubric
because it is an important aspect in the present research. The following is a brief description of
the five criteria, with their respective sub-criteria, as they are displayed in the evaluation rubric
(Appendix V).

Content: It refers mainly to the content of the essay, the amount and quality of ideas, and the way
they are analysed. It includes three sub-criteria, graded out of 20 % and displayed under
the form of statements to check whether:
1. The ideas are fully and logically developed with respect to the genre and topic/ thesis,
2. There is a clear discussion and analysis of the topic/ thesis,
3. All the information is relevant to the topic/ thesis.

Organization: It includes the overall essay organization, including its external and internal
aspects. These consist of eight (8) sub-criteria, graded out of 25 %, and they check whether:
1. The essay follows an outline and it has an introduction, a body, and a conclusion,
2. There is a clear thesis statement with a clear sense of purpose,
3. Each paragraph reflects the thesis statement and has a clear topic sentence,
4. Each sentence in each paragraph supports the respective topic,
5. The ideas are logically organized with an appropriate pattern (topic and genre based),
6. Support examples are given with smooth transitions, with respect to the topic/ genre,
7. The topic is controlled and there is care for coherence and unity,
8. Conclusion ties in with the introduction and restates the thesis in a way, avoiding
   repetition.

Language accuracy and fluency: This criterion includes five sub-criteria, graded out of 25%, and
it checks whether:
1. Grammar structures are used accurately and appropriately,
2. The language of analysis is used clearly and appropriately,
3. A variety of structures are used appropriately,
4. The sentences are complete and syntactically correct,
5. There is good range of vocabulary for academic purposes.

Mechanics and format: This criterion includes three sub-criteria and is graded out of 10%. It checks whether:

1. There is a correct use of punctuation and capitalization,
2. Spelling forms are used appropriately,
3. The essay is formatted appropriately with clear indentations, spacing, and margins.

Engagement in the writing process: The fifth criterion consists of five sub-criteria, graded out of 20%, and it is included to check whether:

1. There is a clear plan, with a clear organization of the essay,
2. Goal is set based on audience, topic, and genre,
3. More than one draft is written,
4. Revision is done based on organization and content,
5. Editing and proofreading is done (style and mechanics),
6. Rewriting (improving the form) has taken place without revision.

The evaluation of the participants’ essays (including any additional pre-writing and/ or revision drafts) was conducted with reference to the above-mentioned criteria and sub-criteria. The latter are also graded as it is mentioned in the graded rubric (Appendix V).

The following is a quantitative (statistical) analysis of the pre-test results (i.e., essay scores), displayed in Tables 9 (a) and 9 (b), and it covers: the mean of the total score and sub-scores (per criterion), the standard deviation, the median, mode, and the maximum and minimum values. The statistical analysis is followed by a brief interpretation of the results.
3.1.1. Quantitative Analysis of the Pre-test Results: Students’ Writing Performance

3.1.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

The sample selected for the pre-test of the exploratory phase of the study is equal to 73 participants, representing the total sample (100 %). Tables 9 (a) and 9 (b), below, display the pre-test results, which refer to the participants’ writing performance. Table 9 (a) displays the sub-scores that correspond to the first four criteria (content, organization, language, and mechanics), and Table 9 (b) shows the sub-scores that correspond to the fifth criterion (the writing process) and the total score of the five criteria.

Table 9 (a)
Descriptive Statistics of the Pre-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test Scores Content</th>
<th>Test Scores Organization</th>
<th>Test Scores Language</th>
<th>Test Scores Mechanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.7192</td>
<td>13.3464</td>
<td>11.9478</td>
<td>6.0753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>12.8600</td>
<td>12.5000</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.79507</td>
<td>3.61672</td>
<td>4.87319</td>
<td>1.71932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>7.812</td>
<td>13.081</td>
<td>23.748</td>
<td>2.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>782.50</td>
<td>974.29</td>
<td>872.19</td>
<td>443.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is indicated in Table 9 (b), below, the mean of the total score (overall writing performance) is equal to 50.49, with a standard deviation (SD) of 13.25. The latter indicates that there is an abnormal distribution of the scores, with a total score value moving from 49.50 (median) to 63.00 (mode). This means that the mean score of the whole sample is around the
average level. However, and with reference to the evaluation scheme, which is not equally distributed among the sub-criteria (Table 8), it would be important to consider the maximum and minimum scores, the values of which are equal to 87.00 and 24.00, respectively. It is, therefore, possible to assume that the participants’ overall writing performance level is around the average (49.50). More details about these results are given, below, with reference to the five major criteria (content, organization, language, mechanics, and writing process).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scores</th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Process</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.37657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>5.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>594.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the sub-scores (per criterion) are concerned, the above tables show that the mean score value of each criterion varies. Thus, with reference to the evaluation scheme of each criterion, mentioned above, the mean values of the sub-scores are distributed as follows: content = 10.72 (SD= 2.79507), organization = 13.35 (SD = 3.61672), language = 11.95 (SD= 4.87319), mechanics = 6.07 (SD= 1.71932), and (the students’ engagement in) the writing process = 8.14
The mean and standard deviation values of these sub-scores indicate that despite the fact that the overall performance is average, the participants display some weaknesses (or difficulties) at various levels (referred to as criteria) of their writing performance, particularly at the level of *language accuracy and fluency* and their *writing processes*. As for content and organization, their level tends to be average, while it is slightly above the average in mechanics.

The following is a qualitative analysis of the pre-test results, which reflect the participants’ writing performance, with its afore-mentioned criteria (aspects).

### 3.1.2. Qualitative Analysis of the Participants’ Writing Performance

As mentioned earlier, the participants’ pre-test scores refer to their writing performance level, which is graded out of 100 points, with five major criteria indicating the different aspects of the writing performance. The statistical analysis of the results displayed in Tables 9 (a) and 9 (b), above, demonstrates that the (total) scores and the sub-scores (per criterion) show that the participants of the study appear to have varying weaknesses, which can be interpreted as difficulties. Thus, although the mean value of the total score shows that these participants have a relatively average level of performance, the mean values of the sub-scores indicate that they have various difficulties, mainly at the level of *language fluency and accuracy* and their engagement in the *writing process* and, to a lower degree, in *content* and *organization*. These aspects are discussed in some detail, below.

At the level of *content* (mean = 10.72) and *mechanics* (mean = 6.07), the participants appear to have relatively average scores. This means that these aspects do not appear to be the major sources of difficulty for the average number of the participants. However, and with reference to the their written drafts (Appendix VIII), many of them demonstrate difficulties at the level of content analysis and the amount of details generated to support the selected topics, which
seems to be related to their limited knowledge about the topic (meta-knowledge). It also appears that many participants have a relatively low mastery over the use of punctuation (mechanics), which, despite its minor contribution to the writing performance, may be a source of their writing difficulties.

At the level of organization (mean = 13.35), the mean score indicates that the participants demonstrate an average level, but with reference to the qualitative analysis of their written drafts (Appendix VIII), many of them demonstrate various kinds of difficulties at the level of essay organization. The latter consists of the external and the internal levels of essay organization. External organization refers mainly to essay and paragraph structure while the internal one refers particularly to the way the ideas and sentences are connected to each other, with respect to the essay organizational pattern (s) (e.g., establishing a cause-effect relationship), and its cohesion and coherence. Therefore, an average mean score of the participants’ organizational skills does not reflect a good mastery of the latter; rather, it shows that many of these participants are likely to have difficulties, of varying degrees in essay organization.

At the level of language use (accuracy and fluency), the mean score is relatively low (11.95), which reflects the participants’ limited linguistic abilities in essay writing. These abilities tend to be lower than the average for many of them. Language accuracy and fluency refer mainly to the use of grammatical forms, academic vocabulary, and syntactic structures. The participants’ written drafts (essay products) show that many of them appear to have a low level of academic language proficiency.

Finally, the mean score value (mean = 8.14) of the participants’ engagement in the writing process indicates that they demonstrate a low level of awareness and a limited or no use of the planning and revision processes and strategies. This was observed in their rough drafts,
most of which lacked general and/ or detailed plans, and no deep-level revision took place. The most apparent aspect of the writing process that was relatively present was editing for mechanics (mainly spelling) and rewriting without revision, that is, improving the overall form of the piece of writing and handwriting. In addition, the participants’ essays showed that many of them ignored audience needs and that appeared in their use of a personal style and language. Scanned copies of the participants’ written drafts (essays, with any planned or revised drafts) are given in Appendix VIII, as a proof of their writing performance (process and product).

3.2. Analysis of the Pre-questionnaire Results

The pre-questionnaire was the second instrument used to collect data for the exploratory phase of this research. It consists of two major sections, each comprising two sub-sections. The aim of the first section was to explore the participants’ background in writing, mainly their difficulties in essay writing, the factors attributed to these difficulties, and their knowledge about and use, if any, of the writing processes and strategies. The aim of the second section was to obtain data on the participants’ affective factors, namely, their writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy levels, which might be among the origins of their writing difficulties.

The results of the pre-questionnaire are analysed quantitatively, using the Software Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). The results are displayed, below, in tables, including percent analysis and descriptive statistics. In the discussion section, later in this chapter, a categorization of the factors related to the participants’ writing difficulties is given based on the results obtained from the pre-test, discussed previously in this chapter, and the pre-questionnaire, and in relation to the research hypotheses set for the exploratory phase of this study.
3.2.1. Analysis of the Students’ Background in Writing

3.2.1.1. Analysis of the Students’ Writing Difficulties

This sub-section of the pre-questionnaire was intended to elicit information on the participants’ writing difficulties and the factors that may be attributed to these difficulties. It contains five questions (Q₁ through Q₅).

What follows is a quantitative analysis of the results obtained from the participants’ answers to these questions, followed by a brief interpretation of the results. The analysis involves descriptive statistics and percent analysis. The former include the different score values of the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the results obtained from the fourth (Q₄) and fifth (Q₅) questions, which are considered the most important in this section of the pre-questionnaire as they address the participants’ writing difficulties and the factors that are related to them, respectively. The latter (i.e., percent analysis), on the other hand, is a representation, in percentages, of the results obtained from the participants’ responses to the five questions.

3.2.1.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

Tables 10 and 11, below, display the descriptive statistics of the results obtained from the participants’ answers to questions four (Q₄) and five (Q₅) that are part of this sub-section of the pre-questionnaire; i.e., the Students’ Writing Difficulties. These questions are given more weight in comparison to the rest of questions for the reason that the former was intended to elicit information about the participants’ writing difficulties while the latter sought to explore the possible factors that may be related to these difficulties, which was the aim set to achieve in this exploratory phase of the study. The following is a brief description of each question, followed by descriptive statistics of the results obtained from each one of them.
Thus, the aim of question four (Q₄) was to obtain information on the nature of the participants’ writing difficulties. These difficulties can be at the level of one or more of the following aspects of essay writing: Language and mechanics, vocabulary use, development and organization of ideas, meta-knowledge (knowledge about the topic), writing processes and strategies, and/or expressing/ generating ideas. The mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of each of the above-mentioned aspects are displayed in the following table.

Table 10
Descriptive Statistics: Students’ Reported Writing Difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language &amp; Mechanics</th>
<th>Vocabulary Use</th>
<th>Development &amp; Organization</th>
<th>Meta-knowledge</th>
<th>Writing Processes &amp; Strategies</th>
<th>Expressing/Generating Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.3504</td>
<td>.3675</td>
<td>.2393</td>
<td>.3932</td>
<td>.1368</td>
<td>.1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.47916</td>
<td>.48420</td>
<td>.42850</td>
<td>.49055</td>
<td>.34506</td>
<td>.37808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results displayed in the above table indicate that the mean scores of the mentioned aspects (referring to the participants’ writing difficulties) range between .1368 and .3932, with a standard deviation ranging between .34506 and .49055, the values of which are below .5. More specifically, the mean scores of language and mechanics, vocabulary use, and meta-knowledge are approximately similar, with values ranging between .3504 and .3932, and a standard deviation that is approximate to .5 (ranging between .47916 and .49055). Compared to the afore-mentioned aspects, the mean score value (.2393) that represents the development and organization of ideas, is slightly lower, with a standard deviation that is equal to .42850. The last two aspects, i.e., the writing processes and strategies and the generation/ expression of
ideas, receive the lowest mean values of .1368 and .1709, with a standard deviation of .34506 and .37808, respectively. These mean values are closer to .00, which means that the scores are normally distributed.

The above displayed results indicate that the participants, in general, are not likely to have major difficulties in the above-mentioned aspects, but they may display minor difficulties at varying degrees and at different levels. In order to confirm these results, it is worth considering the percent analysis of the results, given below, which reveals more details about the nature of the participants’ writing difficulties.

As for question five (Q5), it was intended to explore the possible factors that may be attributed to the participants’ writing difficulties. The factors may include one or more among the following: the participants’ (low) motivation to learn the English language, their (low) motivation to write, their (negative) attitude towards their writing instructor, their (low) ability to use the English language, their (low) ability to write, and/ or their limited writing practice.

The descriptive statistics of the results obtained from the participants’ answers to this question are displayed in the following table.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics: The Factors Related to the Students’ Writing Difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low motivation to learn English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.0769</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.26762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low motivation to write</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.2906</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.45599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude towards the instructor</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.1197</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.32596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited language ability</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.1197</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.32596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited writing ability</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.2564</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited writing practice</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.3162</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.46701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results displayed in Table 11, above, indicate that the mean scores of the mentioned factors range between .0769 and .3162, with a standard deviation that is close to .5, ranging between .26762 and .46701. This means that the scores tend to be equally distributed. To confirm these results, it is worth considering the median and mode values that are equal to .00, a value that is close to the mean, or, in other words, there are no common or central values. These results indicate that the participants’ writing difficulties are not likely to be related to the above-mentioned factors. To confirm or infirm these results, it is worth providing more details, through percent analysis, about the nature of the participants’ writing difficulties and the factors to which they may be attributed.

3.2.1.1.2. Percent Analysis

The percent analysis of the results related to the participants’ writing difficulties are displayed below in Tables 12 through 16. The analysis covers the results obtained from the respondents’ answers to the five questions of this sub-section of the pre-questionnaire. The aim of each question is given, followed by an interpretation of the statistical results.

Q1. Do you find writing in English:

A. An easy task
B. An average task
C. A difficult task

This question sought to elicit answers from the respondents about the level of difficulty they have, if any, in writing in English. The results are given in percentages in Table 12, below.
Table 12
*Students’ Degree of Difficulty in Writing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy task</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average task</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult task</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results demonstrate that a considerable number of participants (69.3 %) find writing to be of an average level of difficulty, or, in other words, neither an easy task nor a difficult one. 16.5 % of the respondents consider writing as a difficult task, while only 6.3 % find it an easy one. The latter represents a small number of students compared to those who view writing as a difficult task.

These results can be explained in two possible ways. Thus, the students who consider writing to be neither difficult nor easy may either have no major difficulties in writing (i.e., they may have minor problems) or that they have a limited level of awareness of their own difficulties in writing. The results obtained from the participants’ answers to question two (Q2) and the rest of questions, later in this section, will confirm or infirm these interpretations.

**Q2. At which level of English writing performance do you place yourself?**

A. Advanced level.

B. Intermediate level.

C. Low level.
This question (Q₂) was intended to confirm or infirm the participants’ answers to the previous question (Q₁). It sought to elicit information about their level of writing performance. The results are displayed in Table 13, below.

Table 13
Students’ Writing Performance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of participants who reported that they have an intermediate level of writing performance is equal to 71.7 %, which is a considerable number compared to the total number of answers. However, only 7.1 % of the respondents consider themselves to have an advanced level, while 13.4% others report that their performance level is low. These results do not contradict those displayed in Table 13, above. That is to say, the number of students who reported that they consider writing to be of an average level of difficulty (69.3 %) is approximate to that of the students who display an average level of performance in writing (71.7%).

The results displayed in Tables 12 and 13, above, reveal that a few students (13 %) may have major difficulties in writing, while a large majority of them (71.7) may have minor difficulties that may not have a great effect on their writing performance.
Q3. If you have a low level in English writing, is it because:

A. You have difficulties in using the English language.
B. The writing skill is difficult?
C. You have little writing practice inside and outside the classroom?
D. You are not motivated to write?
E. The teacher is not helpful?

This question sought to elicit answers about the reasons behind the participants’ low level of performance in writing. The category of participants concerned with this question constitutes normally 13.4% of those who answered the previous question (Q2); however, it appears that the rest of the participants, also, answered this question (Q3). This can be seen through the results given in Tables 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, below, in which the total number of respondents is 92.1% (with 7.9% missing), which is the case with all the questions. Therefore, the analysis of the results of this question (Q3) is considered in relation to the whole sample, including the category of participants who display a low level of writing performance (Q2). The answer categories ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ in the tables refer to whether the respondents, respectively, ticked or did not tick in the given answer, among the above five options (A-E).

Table 14

Reasons for Students’ Low Writing Performance: Linguistic Difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the participants who answered this question (Q2), only 3.1% appear to have linguistic difficulties, which can be considered as a very low percentage compared to the total number of answers. However, a considerable number of the respondents (89%) report that they have no linguistic difficulties, according to the results displayed in the above table. This can be explained through the fact that these students’ low level of writing performance may not be related to linguistic difficulties, but can be attributed to other difficulties.

To confirm or infirm these results and those discussed in this sub-section, a comparison will be made with the pre-test results in the discussion section, later in this chapter.

Table 15
Reasons for Students’ Low Writing Performance: Complexity of the Writing Skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the results displayed in Table 14, above, it appears, from the results displayed in Table 15, that among the participants who answered this question, only 3.1% (out of 92.1%), compared to 89%, of them attribute their low level of writing performance to the complexity of the writing skill.

These results can be interpreted through two different possibilities: (1) either these students attribute their low performance level to other reasons, other than the linguistic and (meta-) cognitive difficulties (complexity of the writing skill), or that (2) they are unaware of these reasons.
Table 16
*Reasons for Students’ Low Writing Performance: Insufficient Writing Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results displayed in Table 16, above, show that the participants’ low level of performance in writing is not attributed to insufficient writing practice, except for a few of them (6.3 %) who, compared to the rest of the participants (85.8 %), have ticked in this answer. The latter can be interpreted by the fact that most of the students’ low writing performance level may either be related to other reasons, or that they are among the participants who do not fall under the category of low performers in writing.

Table 17
*Reasons for Students’ Low Writing Performance: Lack of Motivation to Write*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results given in Table 17, above, indicate that the participants’ low level of performance in writing does not appear to be attributed to their lack of motivation to write. Thus, only 2.4 % among the total number of respondents (117) seem to have a lack of
motivation to write. This percentage is insignificant compared to the one (89.8 %) that represents the participants whose low writing performance is not related to a lack of motivation.

Similarly, the results displayed in Table 18, below, demonstrate that there is a very low probability that the students’ low writing performance is attributed to a lack of guidance from the instructor.

Table 18

Reasons for Students’ Low Writing Performance: Lack of Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In brief, the results obtained from the above question (Q3) show that despite the fact that a limited number of participants (13.4 %) reported that their writing performance level is low, it is unclear which reasons are behind. To clarify this, further details about the participants’ writing difficulties and the factors that may be behind them will be examined throughout this section.

Q4. At your current level of writing performance, do you find difficulties when writing essays in English at the level of:

A. Mechanics and language use, e.g. grammar usage, punctuation, spelling?

B. Vocabulary use (amount, choice, and appropriate use)?

C. Development and organization of ideas?

D. Knowledge related to the topic,

E. Writing strategies, e.g. generating ideas, planning, drafting, and revising?

F. Expressing/ generating ideas?
This question (Q₄) was intended to seek answers from the participants as to whether they face writing difficulties, among the above suggested ones (A through F). The results are displayed in Tables 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, below, which correspond, respectively, to the writing difficulties, mentioned above, labelled A, B, C, D, E, F.

Thus, a careful observation of the results shown in Tables 19 through 24, below, demonstrates that a large majority of the participants appear to have a low degree of difficulty in the above-mentioned aspects of writing, while others face difficulties at different levels.

Table 19
*Students’ Reported Writing Difficulties: Language and Mechanics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20
*Students’ Reported Writing Difficulties: Vocabulary Use*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In more concrete terms, the results displayed in Tables 19 and 20, respectively, show that 32.3% of the participants appear to have difficulties at the level of *language and mechanics*, and
33.9% of them have difficulties using vocabulary appropriately. These percentages are considerable in as far as the importance of the mentioned aspects of writing is concerned.

The results displayed in Table 21, below, indicate that 22% of the participants demonstrate difficulties at the level of essay development and organization, which, compared to the total number of the participants, is a relatively low percentage.

Table 21
Students’ Reported Writing Difficulties: Development and Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tables 22 and 23, below, the results show that the participants’ difficulties in meta-knowledge (36.2%) are greater than those related to the use of the writing processes and strategies (12.6%). The difficulties related to meta-knowledge can be explained by a limited knowledge the participants have about the topic in question and/or the way they employ this knowledge in essay writing.

Table 22
Students’ Reported Writing Difficulties: Meta-knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Finally, Table 24, below, shows that expressing/ or generating ideas is not a serious concern for the majority of participants (76.4 %), compared to those (15.6 %) who demonstrate difficulties in this aspect. These results seem to be somehow contradictory in relation to the results displayed in Table 22, above, because generating ideas and meta-knowledge are closely related in the sense that student writers who have a limited knowledge about a given topic will most probably face difficulties in generating ideas about that particular topic. Therefore, it is not clear whether these participants have reported their actual difficulties objectively.

To confirm or infirm the answers reported by the participants to the above question, a comparison will be made between the above discussed results and those obtained from the pre-
test (discussed in the first section of this chapter), which reflect the participants’ actual writing performance, and further interpretations will be provided, later in this chapter.

Q5. If you ticked one or more options in the above question, do you think that your writing difficulty (ies) is (are) related to:

A. Your (low) motivation to learn the English language?
B. Your (low) motivation to write?
C. Your attitude about your writing teacher?
D. Your ability to use the English language?
E. Your ability to write?
F. Your writing habits are very limited (i.e., you write only when you are asked to)?

This question (Q5) sought to obtain answers about the factors related to the participants’ writing difficulties, already introduced in question four (Q4). The results are displayed, below.

Thus, from the results displayed in Table 25, below, it appears that a considerable number of participants (85 %) report that their writing difficulties are not related to a low motivation towards the English language, while it is the case with a little minority (7.1 %) among others.

Table 25
Factors Related to Students’ Writing Difficulties: Low Motivation towards English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the results given in Table 26, below, indicate that the participants (26.8 %)’ *low motivation to write* can relatively be a factor for their writing difficulties. On the other hand, *(negative) attitudes towards the writing instructor* do not seem to be an important factor behind the writing difficulties for the majority of participants; thus, only 11 %, out of 92 % of all the respondents, display negative attitudes towards their writing instructor(s) (Table 27).

**Table 26**
*Factors Related to Students’ Writing Difficulties: Low Motivation to Write*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 27**
*Factors Related to Students’ Writing Difficulties: Negative Attitudes towards the Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results given in Tables 28, 29, and 30, below, demonstrate that the participants’ *limited linguistic ability* (11 %) appears to be a minor factor of their writing difficulties, compared to their *limited writing ability* (23.6 %) and their *limited writing practice* (29 %). The
last two factors seem to be moderately attributed, with varying degrees, to the participants’ writing difficulties.

Table 28
*Factors Related to Students’ Writing Difficulties: Limited Linguistic Ability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29
*Factors Related to Students’ Writing Difficulties: Limited Writing Ability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30
*Factors of Students’ Writing Difficulties: Limited Writing Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results displayed in Tables 25 through 30, above, indicate that the students’ writing difficulties are relatively related to the above-mentioned factors. Those that appear to be relatively significant factors consist of the participants’ low motivation to write, their limited writing ability and their limited writing practice. The rest of the factors (i.e., low motivation towards the English language, low motivation towards the writing instructor, and limited linguistic ability) do not seem to be related to the participants’ writing difficulties. Whether the participants’ reports (answers) were objective or not, more details will be provided later, in this chapter. The results obtained from the pre-questionnaire will be compared to the pre-test results in order to uncover the most common factors that may be attributed to the students’ writing difficulties.

3.2.1.2. Analysis of the Students’ Writing Processes and Strategies

The aim of this sub-section of the pre-questionnaire was to explore the participants’ background knowledge and use of the writing processes and strategies. It comprises six questions (Q_6 through Q_11), some of which are used to confirm others. The aim of each question is described, below, with its corresponding percent analysis. Before that, a statistical description is given for the results of each question, with the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation scores, as it is displayed in Table 31, below.

3.2.1.2.1. Descriptive Statistics

The questions related to this sub-section of the pre-questionnaire are given in an abbreviated form (i.e., Q_6 through Q_11). Each question addresses an aspect of the participants’ background knowledge or use of the writing processes and strategies. In other words, the six questions cover the following, and the results are displayed in Table 31, below.

- Students’ pre-writing processes and strategies,
- The stages followed during the writing process,
- The number of drafts written,
- The importance of revision,
- The nature of the evaluator, and
- The aspects of revision considered (emphasised).

The results given in Table 31, below, demonstrate that the mean scores of the results obtained from the six different questions range between 1.5128 and 1.9316, with standard deviation values ranging between .80532 and .73960. These values are below 1.00, which means that the scores are, generally, distributed normally. However, the results of Q_{11} receive the mean score of 2.2137 and a standard deviation of 1.06536, which is slightly above 1.00. It is, therefore, worth considering the median and mode, the values of which are equal to 2.00 and 1.00, respectively, which means that the values are moving towards the mode. These results indicate that the participants are more likely to make use of the writing processes and strategies, but with varying degrees and frequencies.

Table 31
Descriptive Statistics: Students’ Writing Processes and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Q₆</th>
<th>Q₇</th>
<th>Q₈</th>
<th>Q₉</th>
<th>Q₁₀</th>
<th>Q₁₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9145</td>
<td>1.9316</td>
<td>1.6838</td>
<td>1.6496</td>
<td>1.5128</td>
<td>2.2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.86675</td>
<td>.73960</td>
<td>.76169</td>
<td>.79129</td>
<td>.80532</td>
<td>1.06536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown
For a deeper analysis of the participants’ answers to the six individual questions, it is worth considering percent analysis, as it is shown in the following.

3.2.1.2.2. Percent Analysis

As mentioned earlier, this sub-section of the pre-questionnaire sought to gather information on the participants’ background knowledge and use of the writing processes and strategies. Each question addresses a particular aim, and the results are displayed in Tables 32 through 37, below, corresponding to the six questions.

**Q6. Before you start writing, do you:**

A. Brainstorm (generate) ideas for your topic?

B. Outline (plan) your piece of writing?

C. Start drafting (write your ideas) directly?

The aim of this question was to elicit information on whether or not the participants make use of some pre-writing processes and strategies, such as, brainstorming and planning. Answer ‘C’ means that the participants write (or draft) their ideas without any planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 32</th>
<th>Students’ Pre-writing Processes and Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Brainstorm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is displayed in Table 32, above, 30.7% of the participants tend to start drafting their essays at the beginning of the process, without going through any brainstorming or outlining. A slightly higher number of participants (38.6%) use the brainstorming strategy in the pre-writing stage, while only 22.8% of them outline (plan) their writing (essay). These results indicate that, in general, about a third of the participants tend to start writing without any planning or brainstorming for one or more reasons among the following. Thus, participants may skip these pre-writing processes and strategies due to their limited awareness about the benefits of the latter, time constraints, or to a lack of ability or willingness to devote time and effort for these processes and strategies.

**Q7. While writing, which among the following stages do you go through?**

A. Pre-writing  
B. Drafting  
C. Revising  
D. Editing and proofreading

This question was, particularly, intended to check whether the participants of the study possess background knowledge about the writing process and its various stages and whether they follow some or all of these stages while writing their essays. On the other hand, the results obtained from the participants’ answers to this question (Q7) would partially confirm or infirm those displayed in Table 32, above; i.e., whether or not the participants go through the pre-writing stage of the writing process or start writing (drafting) immediately. The results are given in Table 33, below.

Thus, in addition to the results displayed in Table 32, above, and according to those given in Table 33, below, it appears that a considerable number of participants (44.1%) do not go
through the planning stage of the writing process; rather, they tend to start drafting at the beginning. Moreover, almost all the participants (except for .8 % of them) neglect the revision stage of the writing process, which is an apparent feature among all the participants. This can be interpreted by the fact that these students are either unaware of the benefits of the writing process, particularly the planning and revision stages, or that they avoid them for one or more of the reasons mentioned in the analysis of the previous question (Q₆). There are, however, 19.7 % of the participants who edit and proofread their written drafts, but at the surface level, i.e., editing for mechanics and form. The latter are considered as minor aspects of revision.

Table 33
*Stages Followed During the Writing Processes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-writing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and proofreading</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q₈. Before you come up with your final writing product, how many drafts do you generally write?

A. One draft.

B. Two drafts.

C. Three drafts.

D. More (please, specify the number of drafts)

This question was mainly intended to confirm whether the participants plan and revise their writing, which can be proven if they write more than one draft. It is, therefore, related to the
previous question (Q7) and it has as a main aim confirming or infirming part of the results displayed in Table 33, above; i.e., those indicating the number of participants who go through the planning and revision stages of writing. The results are shown in Table 34, below.

Table 34

*Number of Drafts Written*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One draft</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two drafts</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three drafts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More ...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing System</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is indicated in the above table, it seems that an important number of the participants (43.3 %) tend to write only one draft, which can be a quite important proof of them not going through revision and/ or planning stages of writing. A slightly lower percentage of the respondents (37.0 %) report that they write two drafts, which can be explained by the fact that they either go through planning and drafting, or through drafting and revising. It is not clear whether they are more likely to go through revision because the results displayed in Table 33, above, indicate that almost no participant (.8 %) revises her/ his writing.

In addition, only a few participants appear to devote three drafts (9.4 %) or more (2.4 %) to compose their essays, which can be interpreted by the fact that they might be more aware, than their peers, about the writing process and the importance of planning and revision. On the other hand, skipping these stages (i.e., planning and revision) maybe related to a number of reasons,
among those mentioned previously. These may include, but are not limited to, the participants’ low level of awareness about the writing process and its importance; insufficient time devoted to the writing process/ tasks; unwillingness to devote extra time and effort for planning and revision; and factors that may have an affective nature, such as, a lack of motivation or a high level of apprehension towards the writing process/ or task.

Q9. Do you find that revising your piece of writing is:

A. Extremely important?
B. Important?
C. I don’t know?
D. Somehow important?
E. Not important?

This question is particularly intended to gain insight on the degree of importance the participants give to revision. On the other hand, the results obtained from their answers will be used to evaluate the extent to which they are aware about revision and/ or whether or not they revise their writing. The results are given in Table 35, below.

The results displayed in the Table 35, below, demonstrate that many participants consider revision to be of a high (45.7 %) or an average (37.0 %) level of importance, compared to those who consider it to be moderately important (2.4 %) or not important (.8 %) and those (6.3 %) whose answer (C. I do not know) reflects their lack of awareness about the importance of this stage in the writing process.

These results can be interpreted by the fact that the majority of the participants appear to have a relatively average to high level of awareness about the importance of revision in the
writing process. However, these results seem to create some contradiction if they were to be compared to those reported by the respondents in the previous questions (Q8 and Q9). In other words, the results discussed above (i.e., displayed in Tables 33 and 34), show that the majority of the participants do not revise their writing while they consider revision as an important stage of the writing process. Therefore, it would be fair to say that although these participants are aware of the importance of revision, they tend to avoid or skip it for one or more reasons among those mentioned earlier in this section (i.e., those related to the results given in Tables 33 and 34).

Table 35
*Importance of Revision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. *When revising your piece of writing, do you:*

A. Do it yourself (self-evaluation)?

B. Do it with your peer (s)?

C. Ask for the teacher’s help?

D. Other (please, specify)?
The above question sought to elicit answers from the respondents about the nature of the evaluator of their writing, that is, the person (self-, peer-, teacher, or other) who provides them with feedback during or at the end of the writing process. The results are displayed in Table 36, below.

Table 36
_The Nature of the Evaluator_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that the majority of the respondents (62.2 %) report that they evaluate their writing by themselves, while others report that they receive evaluation from their peers (13.4 %) or their teacher (s) (15.7 %). Only one participant (.8 %) states that the evaluator is someone else other than the ones mentioned above.

A possible interpretation of these results would be to explain some of the possible reasons why most of the participants received no feedback from their writing instructors. One reason can be related to an insufficient time available for teachers to provide sufficient (and regular) feedback for students, especially if they are dealing with large classes. The latter may create challenges for these teachers to pay attention to individual students at a regular basis. A second reason can be related to a lack of/ or little attention or importance given, by the
instructor, to the students, the subject matter (writing) or task, and/or to the concept of evaluation itself. Another reason can be attributed to the fact that some instructors may think of guiding and training their students for self- or peer-evaluation so that the latter develop autonomy, particularly within conditions of large class sizes or a lack of time to provide feedback for individual students.

Q_{11}. Which aspects of revision does the corrector emphasize?

A. Grammar and mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation).
B. The development and organization of ideas (content and arrangement of ideas)
C. The originality of ideas in the piece of writing.
D. The style of your writing (type of sentences, cohesion and coherence)
E. Other (please, specify)

The aim behind this question was to obtain information on the aspects (criteria) of revision on which the evaluator(s) puts more emphasis in correcting the students’ written products.

The results given in Table 37, below, demonstrate that 29.1 % of the participants report that they/their evaluators (the student herself/himself, a peer, a teacher, or other) tend to focus more on grammar and mechanics, which is considered by writing experts as minor aspects of revision. A similar number of participants/their evaluators (29.1 %) tend to pay more attention to the development and organization of ideas, two major aspects of writing/revision upon which experienced or skilled writers emphasise. The rest of the evaluators tend to emphasise either on the originality of ideas (18.9 %) or the style of writing (15 %).

To explain these results, it is worth referring to the nature of the evaluator, as mentioned in the previous question (Q_{10}). Thus, considering that writing experts give more weight to aspects
like the development and organization of ideas than to mechanics and grammatical forms, and
given that most of the evaluators are the participants themselves (62.2 %), as indicated in Table
36, above, it is more likely that these evaluators are inexperienced. Hence, paying equal attention
to two aspects, or criteria, that are not of equal importance (grammar and mechanics vs.
development and organization) or focusing on minor aspects of writing (e.g., grammar and
mechanics) over major ones is a proof of a lack of/ or limited level of experience (hence,
awareness) and/ or proficiency in writing.

Table 37
Aspects of Revision Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Mechanics</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and organization of ideas</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality of ideas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of writing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the results reported by the participants in this sub-section of the pre-
questionnaire show that, in general, these students tend to have a low level of awareness about
the writing process and its various stages, and the benefits it has, particularly, planning and
revision. Moreover, the results show that many students tend to start composing their essays at
the beginning, without making use of pre-writing processes and strategies, especially planning.
Many of them, also, skip revision, and those who revise tend to ignore or avoid the major
aspects of revision, such as content and organization (substance); they rather focus on editing for mechanics and form. The latter may be due to a lack of experience and practice.

It is, therefore, possible to claim that the students’ low level of awareness about the writing process and its benefits and their limited use of the writing processes and strategies, mainly planning and revision, is an indication that they have a limited or lack of experience and knowledge about the importance of the latter. These can be considered to have a cognitive and metacognitive nature, and may, very probably, be a source of the students’ writing difficulties.

What follows is an analysis of the results of the second main section of the pre-questionnaire, the students’ affective factors, which may be among the factors related to the students’ writing difficulties. It covers descriptive statistics and percent analysis, followed by qualitative analysis of each of the affective constructs: the students’ English writing apprehension and their English writing self-efficacy levels.

3.2.2. Analysis of the Students’ Affective Factors

3.2.2.1. Analysis of the Students’ English Writing Apprehension Level

The aim of this section of the pre-questionnaire was to explore the participants’ affective factors in relation to writing, i.e., their English Writing Apprehension (EWA) and English Writing Self-efficacy (EWSE) levels. These affective factors (i.e., high level of EWA and/ or a low level of EWSE) may be among the origins of the participants’ writing difficulties, as it is hypothesised in the exploratory phase of this study.

To measure the EWA level, a five-Likert scale was used. The latter ranges from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. This scale was reversed in the analysis of the results because some of the items were worded positively and others negatively in the original EWA
scale (Appendix I.1.). The negatively worded items are stated in the direction of apprehension, as it is originally used in the Dally and Miller’s Model (1975); therefore, and in order to adopt a consistent scale for all the items, the scale of the *positively worded statements was reversed*, as it is displayed in Table 38, below. The statements for which the scale was reversed (i.e., those that are positively worded) include items: 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. For more details about this section of the pre-questionnaire, a detailed description of each sub-section, including the nature of the statements, is given in the methodology chapter (II) of this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EWA Original and Reversed Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversed Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To put it in more clear terms, it is worth providing an example about how negative and positive statements are measured, using the reversed scale (for the positively worded items). Thus, the statement “*unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays*” is negatively stated. If a respondent agrees with the statement (=5), it means that s/he is apprehensive. Likewise, if s/he disagrees (=2) with a positive statement (e.g., *whenever possible, I would use English to write essays*), this implies that s/he is apprehensive. By applying a consistent scale to all the statements (positively and negatively worded), the latter would receive the score of 4 (= disagree) instead of 2, so that it would be in the direction of apprehension. This applies to the rest of items that are positively stated.
It is worth clarifying that the reversed scale has been applied for analysis purposes in order to achieve consistency within the whole EWA variable, but the interpretation of the results, given in tables, does not refer to how the statements were worded. The analysis is conducted in relation to the categories into which the statements are classified (Table 39).

Table 39
Categories of the English Writing Apprehension Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Avoidance Behaviour</th>
<th>Fear of Evaluation</th>
<th>Negative/Positive Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would rather read than write in English.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not like my English essays to be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I like writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I like discussing my English writing with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the twelve EWA statements are grouped into three categories, depending on the aim they sought to achieve. Some of the statements refer to the participants’ avoidance behaviour, others to their fear of (negative) evaluation, while others indicate their (positive or negative) attitudes towards writing, the writing situation/task, or towards writing in the target language (English). The above table displays these three categories with their respective EWA statements.
What follows is a statistical analysis of the results related to the respondents’ EWA level. Descriptive statistics, including the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation, are displayed in Table 40, below, and the percent analysis of the different items corresponding to the participants’ EWA level is given in Tables 40 through 48.

3.2.2.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

The total sample of the pre-questionnaire, which was used to collect data for the exploratory phase of this study, was originally equal to 150 participants, representing the total sample. However, as it is displayed in the tables of the results, only 117 of the participants answered all the sections of the questionnaire, while 10 are missing; i.e., the latter did not provide complete answers and/or missed complete sections. The total sample is, therefore, equal to 127 (100%). Table 40, below, displays the descriptive statistics that correspond to the participants’ EWA level.

The results indicate that the average mean score of the participants’ EWA level is equal to 2.5712, with a standard deviation of .48446, which is below 1.00. This means that the scores have a normal distribution. In other words, the participants, in general, tend to demonstrate an average to low level of apprehension. With regard to the participants’ EWA individual items, the mean score values range between 1.8803 and 3.3761, with standard deviation values ranging between 1.00 and 1.22282. The latter implies that the scores of the individual items are not equally distributed. Therefore, in order to interpret the values of the EWA individual items, it is worth referring to their respective categories (Table 39) in relation to the mean of the EWA.

Thus, with reference to the EWA mean value, it appears that the mean values of items 1, 3, 6, and 7 (2.3504, 2.4530, 2.5983, and 2.5214, respectively) are close to the total mean score of EWA (2.5712). This indicates that the participants display a moderately low to an average level
of English writing apprehension, particularly with respect to their *avoidance behaviour* and their *attitudes towards writing*.

Table 40
*Descriptive Statistics: Students’ Writing Apprehension Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.3504</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.94974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.2479</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.28590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.4530</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.15591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather read than write in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.3761</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.1966</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.95808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my English essays to be evaluated</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.5983</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.12234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.5214</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.14167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.2308</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.03711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.7949</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.15623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.8803</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.8376</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.18872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like discussing my English writing with others</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.3675</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.18611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Apprehension</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.5712</td>
<td>2.5833</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.48446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown*

On the other hand, the mean values of items 2 and 4 (3.2479 and 3.3761), referring respectively to the participants’ *fear of evaluation* and *avoidance behaviour*, show that their level of apprehension is above the average. This can be seen through the median and mode values, which are equal to 4.00. More details about these results will be revealed through percent analysis of the EWA level, mainly in relation to the categories mentioned earlier.
3.2.2.1.2. Percent Analysis

The English Writing Apprehension Scale (EWAS) consists of twelve (12) statements, as it was mentioned earlier. These statements are classified into three categories: avoidance behaviour, fear from evaluation, and attitudes towards the writing task/ situation or writing in English. To conduct the percent analysis of the results, a number of statements are selected from each category. The reason for this selection is that some statements are used to confirm others, but are stated differently or are worded negatively, with a similar meaning as others. The results of the students’ EWA level are displayed in tables and are organized according to the categories mentioned above.

**Avoidance Behaviour**

This category refers to the statements, in the EWAS, that express the participants’ avoidance or fear of approaching English writing tasks or situations (e.g., avoiding English essay writing). From the EWAS, items 1, 4, 5, and 7, as indicated in Table 39, above, are within this category. The percent analysis of the items 1, 5, and 7 is given, below, in Tables 41, 42, and 43, respectively.

The results displayed in Tables 41, 42, and 43, below, demonstrate that a considerable number of participants do not demonstrate avoidance behaviour towards English essay writing. In other words, they have a low to average level of apprehension about English essay writing, in general. This can be observed in the percentages displayed in Table 41, below. Thus, for example, with regard to whether or not the participants ‘avoid essay writing in the English language’ (item 7, Table 43), it is indicated that 36.2 % of them disagree, and 16.5 % others strongly disagree, with the statement; i.e., they display no avoidance behaviour. However, only 12.6 % of the respondents and 6.3 % others show avoidance behaviour, with the latter being
more apprehensive than the former. The rest of the respondents (20.5 %) seem to be ‘uncertain’, which can be interpreted in two possible ways: that the participants display neither a high nor a low level of apprehension, or that they are unaware about their own affect towards English writing.

Table 41

Avoidance of English Essay Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 1.

Table 42

Avoidance of English Writing Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5.
Table 43
Avoidance of Essay Writing in the English Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing System            | 10        | 7.9     |               |                    |
| Total                     | **127**   | **100.0**|              |                    |

Statement 7.

On the other hand, the results displayed in Tables 41 and 42, above, show that 42.5 % (Table 41) and 46.5 % (Table 42) represent the number of participants who appear to have no avoidance behaviour towards essay writing tasks or situations, compared to those who are apprehensive, representing 12.5 % and 8.6 % (5.5 % + 3.1 %), respectively. These results indicate that the majority of the participants display no avoidance behaviour or, in more technical terms, a low level of apprehension in relation to English essay writing, in general.

**Fear of Evaluation**

This category involves the EWA statements that express students’ *fear of evaluation* from others, be it an instructor, a peer, or other. That is to say, these students demonstrate a feeling of *apprehension*, which can be explained as a fear that is developed through an experience (s), where a student received, most probably, a negative evaluation or criticism from others. Therefore, whenever s/ he thinks that her/ his writing will be evaluated, s/ he would develop/ express a feeling of apprehension. From the EWAS, the items 2, 6, 11, and 12 fall within this
category. The following tables (44 through 46) display the results that correspond to this type of apprehension, i.e., fear of evaluation, which is represented through items 2, 6, and 12. Item 11 is not treated, here, as it is used simply to confirm statement 2.

The results show that a considerable number of participants demonstrate a fear of evaluation. In other words, they are apprehensive about receiving evaluation from others or, in other words, they display fear of writing essays in English when they know the latter will be evaluated (EWAS, item 2). This indicates that this category of students have developed a feeling of apprehension (fear) as a result of prior experience of negative evaluation. For example, the results given in Table 44, below, show that 35.4 % of the participants are apprehensive and 14.2 % others are more apprehensive about writing English essays when the latter are supposed to be evaluated. This is not the case with others who represent more than 25 % (i.e., 17.3 % + 11.8 %) of those who expressed disagreement or strong disagreement, respectively, about statement 2.

Table 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 2.
However, the results shown in Table 45, below, contradict with those discussed above. Thus, while 35.4 % (Table 44) of the participants show fear of evaluation, more than 40 % (33.1% + 15%) others demonstrate no negative attitudes or, in other words, they may have positive attitudes, towards evaluation, as it is shown in Table 45, below.

Table 45  
Negative Attitudes towards Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 6.

On the other hand, it is observed from Table 46, below, that more than 60 % (41.7% + 21.3%) of the respondents “like discussing [their] English writing with others” (item 12), while only about 20% (13.4% + 6.3%) others have negative attitudes towards peer discussion, or peer feedback. These results seem, also, to contradict those displayed in Table 44, above.

The above discussed results show that a considerable number of participants show positive attitudes towards peer discussion, i.e., not apprehensive, which contradicts with the above discussed ones. This can be interpreted in two possible ways. Either these participants lack in the awareness about their own level of apprehension about evaluation, or that those who have fear of evaluation are not the same, or among, those who display positive attitudes towards
evaluation. In other words, if the number of respondents who agree with statement 6 (15 %) is added to that of those who strongly agree (5.5 %) and those who are uncertain (23.6 %) about it, the total number would make more than 40 % of them (Table 45). The latter may correspond, totally or partially, to those who demonstrate fear of negative evaluation.

Table 46
Attitudes towards Peer Feedback/ Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing System | Total   | 127  | 100.0 |

Statement 12.

Therefore, and despite the contradiction that exists in the results displayed in Table 44 and those given in Tables 45 and 46, above, it is clear that while many participants display positive attitudes towards evaluation and peer discussion, a considerable number of other respondents tend to have a relatively high level of apprehension towards evaluation.

Attitudes towards English Writing

This category refers to the type of apprehension that is related to students’ attitudes towards English writing. In other words, students who demonstrate negative attitudes towards writing tasks, writing situations, or writing in English are more likely to be apprehensive. In contrast, if they display positive attitudes, this means that they are not apprehensive. Statements
3 and 10 can be grouped under this category. The former expresses a negative attitude while the latter is positive. They are analysed in Tables 47 and 48, below.

The results given in Table 47, which refer to whether the participants display negative or positive attitudes towards English writing classes, show that less than 20 % (i.e., 15 +4.7 %) of them have negative attitudes compared to about 54 % (i.e., 33.9 + 20.5%) of those who seem to display positive attitudes. In addition, 18.1 % others express a neutral attitude (uncertain) towards English writing classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 3.

On the other hand, a considerable number of participants appear to have positive attitudes towards writing in English (Table 48), with 31.1 % of them demonstrating a quite stronger attitude than others (40.2 %). However, only 7.1 % of the respondents show negative attitudes. Based on these results, it can be deduced that most of the participants appear to have a low level of writing apprehension while a little minority of them tends to be apprehensive about writing in English and English writing classes.
Table 48
Positive Attitudes towards Writing in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 10.

The results discussed, above, indicate that the overall participants’ level of writing apprehension is generally low, except for their fear of negative evaluation, which is a characteristic of a considerable number of students. Writing apprehension can, therefore, be one related factor, though to a moderate degree, to the students’ writing difficulties.

The following sub-section is an analysis of the results of the participants’ English Writing Self-efficacy (EWSE) level. The latter is considered as one of the affective factors that may account for the study participants’ writing difficulties. The results are displayed in tables and they include descriptive statistics and percent analysis.

3.2.2.2. Analysis of the Students’ English Writing Self-efficacy Level

As mentioned earlier, the sample considered for the pre-questionnaire, was limited to 127 (100%) participants for the reason mentioned earlier. There are ten (10) missing answers among the 127, as it is displayed in all the tables of results.
This sub-section of the pre-questionnaire corresponds to the participants’ English Writing Self-efficacy (EWSE) level, and it is divided into two parts. The first part (EWSE-1) consists of ten (10) items, while the second (EWSE-2) contains eight (8) statements. The EWSE is measured by means of two different five-Likert scales that correspond to its two respective parts (categories). The EWSE-1 is measured with a similar scale as the EWAS, ranging from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree while the EWSE-2 is measured with a confidence level scale, ranging from (1) very unconfident to (5) very confident. The scale in part one (EWSE-1) is reversed for negative statements and kept for the positive ones to obtain a consistent scale. Thus, statements 1, 2, 3, 4 are negatively worded, so their scale is reversed so that they become in the direction of high self-efficacy, like the others items. The interpretation of the results is, hence, done accordingly. The analysis of the results pertaining to the participants’ EWSE level is given, below, through descriptive statistics and percentages. Because there are two categories of EWSE, the analysis is conducted accordingly.

3.2.2.2.1. Descriptive Statistics

Tables 49 and 50, below, display the descriptive statistics of the results corresponding to the two parts of the English writing self-efficacy level; i.e., EWSE-1 and EWSE-2, respectively.

The results displayed in Table 49, below, indicate that the total mean score of the EWSE-1 level is equal to 2.7147, with a standard deviation that is equal to .62647, which means that the scores have a normal distribution. This implies that the participants’ confidence level in essay writing is relatively low (i.e., lower than the average). On the other hand, an observation of the mean values of items 1, 2, 3, and 7, ranging between 2.4615 and 2.7949 (i.e., close to the mean score of EWSE-1), with standard deviation values ranging between .99601 and 1.14875 respectively, shows that the distribution is in a way abnormal for some items (SD= closer to
It is, therefore, worth considering the mode and median values (2.00), which are below the mean value of EWSE-1. This confirms that the participants’ self-efficacy level is below the average.

Table 49

*Descriptive Statistics: Students’ English Writing Self-Efficacy (EWSE-1) Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not good at writing in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7949</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.99601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5897</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.05988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4615</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.14875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0171</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.12175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to write good essays in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1282</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.88608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1197</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.80046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seem to like what I write in English</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5812</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.75703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0256</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.92346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Self-efficacy-1</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7147</td>
<td>2.7500</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.62647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the participants tend to demonstrate an average level of confidence in three aspects (items 4, 5, and 8) that are related to their confidence level in their ability to ‘*write as well as their peers*’ (mean= 3.0171), ‘*write a good essay in English*’ (mean = 3.1282), and ‘*write better than their peers*’ (mean= 3.0256). These participants seem to have an average level of confidence in their ability to write when they compare themselves to their peers, mainly in relation to essay writing quality and their general writing performance.

Table 50, below, displays the descriptive statistics of the EWSE-2, i.e., the second part of the English Writing Self-efficacy Scale. This part consists of ten (10) statements, as displayed in
the table, below, and they correspond mainly to the participants’ confidence level in English essay writing, including aspects of language use (e.g., grammar and vocabulary), organization (e.g., essay overall organization and cohesion), and mechanics (e.g., spelling and punctuation).

Table 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.0769</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.11536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly punctuate a one page essay</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.9060</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.05031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.5983</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.6239</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.12745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.6154</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.08156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.0684</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.03995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.5897</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.4188</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.13137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.5043</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.03910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with a good overall organization (i.e. ideas in order, effective transition, etc.)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.1368</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.07404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing Self-efficacy-2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.2538</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.60008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results, given in the above table, indicate that the total mean score of the EWSE-2 level is equal to 3.2538, with a standard deviation of .60008, which means that the scores are normally distributed. Likewise, the median (3.3000) and mode (3.00) values are close to the mean. This implies that the participants’ writing self-efficacy level is, generally, average. In other words, they tend to have an average level of confidence in relation to the different aspects
of English essays, mentioned above. However, they demonstrate a slightly low level of confidence in two aspects (items 2 and 7), which are related to ‘punctuating a one page essay’ (mean= 2.9060; SD=1.05031) and ‘writing compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure’ (mean = 2.5897; SD= 1.00133). These values indicate that the students’ level of confidence in these two aspects of writing is relatively low.

In order to provide more details about the participants’ English writing self-efficacy level, the percent analysis of different items (statements) from each category (EWSE-1 and EWSE-2) is given, below.

3.2.2.2. Percent Analysis

As mentioned above, the English Writing Self-efficacy scale consists of two parts, each of which is used to achieve a specific aim. The first part (EWAE-1) comprises eight (08) statements and it is intended to seek answers about the participants’ level of confidence in relation to English essay writing, while the second (EWSE-2) consists of ten (10) items, which aim at gaining insight on the respondents’ confidence level in using different writing skills, such as language, organization, and conventions.

To display the results of the participants’ EWSE level in percentages, a selection of a number of items from each category (part) is considered. The results are, therefore, displayed under each category.

**Students’ English Writing Self-efficacy Level in Essay Writing (EWSE-1)**

This category refers to the participants’ self-efficacy level in relation to English essay writing, in general. It includes eight (08) statements, among which four items (3, 4, 6, and 8) are
considered in this percent analysis. The selection is based on variety, not on the degree of importance, as the whole variable is considered in descriptive statistics, above.

The results given in Tables 51, 52, 53, and 54, below, corresponding respectively to items 3, 6, 4, and 8, show that an important number of participants seems to demonstrate a relatively low (below the average) level of self-efficacy in English essay writing. However, many others are ‘uncertain’ about their confidence level, which may be due to a lack of awareness about their writing abilities or a lack of confidence expressed through an ‘uncertain’ response.

Table 51
Confidence Level in English Writing Classroom Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 3.

Thus, a careful observation of the results displayed in Table 51, above, show that a considerable number of the respondents (31.5% + 20.5%) report that they have a relatively low level of confidence, with varying degrees, in their English writing classes (i.e., their classroom performance). In contrast, about 17% (11.8% + 5.5%) others seem to have a slightly higher self-efficacy level, and about 22% others are uncertain about their confidence level.
Similarly, as it is displayed in Table 52, below, it is observed that many participants (42.5 %) demonstrate an uncertain feeling of confidence about their ability to write good quality essays in English. This can be interpreted in relation to the students’ limited/ or lack of awareness about their writing ability or their confidence level in writing. It can also be interpreted as an average level, given that the participants have neither a low nor a high level of confidence.

Table 52
*Confidence Level in Essay Writing Ability (Essay Quality)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above discussed results, Tables 53 and 54, below, reveal other findings. Thus, in as far as the way in which the participants’ compare their writing in the target language (Table 53) and the quality of their essays (Table 54) to their peers, they appear to have a relatively average to low self-efficacy level. In other words, more than 27 % (27.6 % + 7.1 %) of them report that they “*do not think [they] write in English as well as [their] classmates*”. On the other hand, 26.8 % others are uncertain about their confidence level in writing in English.
Table 53  
Confidence Level in English Writing (Comparison with Peers)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, about 25% (i.e., 20.5% + 4.7%) (Table 54) of the participants demonstrate a relatively low level of confidence in relation to the quality of their essays, while others (44.9%) seem to be uncertain about it. The latter may either be unaware about their confidence level or that they have average level of confidence (neither low nor high). The second interpretation is more likely to be true, as it is indicated in the descriptive statistics in Table 50, above.

Table 54  
Confidence Level in Essay Writing (Comparison with Peers)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above discussed results, in this sub-section, reveal that despite the fact that a considerable number of students report that they have an average level of confidence in their English writing performance, many others tend to have a low self-efficacy level in their ability to write good quality essays in general. In addition, the results reveal that there is a considerable number of students who have uncertain feelings about their self-efficacy beliefs in their ability to write well in English or produce good quality essays in comparison to their peers. Their feelings of uncertainty can be interpreted in different possible ways. On the one hand, these feelings may be related to their previous experience in English essay writing classes, low writing performance, or their peers’ or instructors’ negative feedback. They can, also, be attributed to the students’ lack/ or limited level of awareness about their own writing abilities, or their low level of proficiency in the target language, which may have affected their overall confidence in writing. On the other hand, their uncertainty can be attributed to other affective factors, such as having negative attitudes towards writing classes, the writing tasks/ situations, or the target language.

In brief, the results discussed above show that students’ low English writing self-efficacy level, with particular focus on essay writing ability, appears to be a relatively important factor that can be a source of their writing difficulties.

Students’ English Writing Self-efficacy Level in Using Writing Skills (EWSE-2)

This category (EWSE-2) displays the results related to the participants’ self-efficacy level in relation to their use of the different English essay writing skills, such as, essay organization, language use, and mechanics. It includes ten (10) statements, the results of some of which are displayed in Tables 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, below. The latter refer, respectively, to the EWSE-2 items 8, 10, 3, 6, 7, and 2.
The results given in Tables 55 and 56, below, report the respondents’ self-efficacy level in English essay organization and paragraph writing, respectively. Those displayed in Tables 57 and 58 show their confidence level in language use, mainly the correct use of parts of speech and appropriate vocabulary, respectively, and Tables 59 and 60 display the results corresponding to the participants’ confidence level in their ability to use appropriate vocabulary, and use correct grammatical structures and punctuation, respectively.

**Table 55**  
*Confidence Level in Paragraph Writing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Confident nor Unconfident</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item 8.*

**Table 56**  
*Confidence Level in Essay Organization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Confident nor Unconfident</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item 10.*
Table 55, above, indicates that the participants’ confidence level in writing a good quality paragraph (with particular focus on the topic sentence/main idea) is relatively high, with 33.9% of them demonstrating a moderate and 15% others a high level of confidence. In addition, about 25% of the respondents display an average level of confidence while only less than half the number (11%) shows a low self-efficacy level in paragraph writing. As far as essay organization (overall organization, e.g., order of ideas and effective transitions) is concerned, the results given in Table 56, above, show that the participants’ level of confidence is relatively average (36.2%) to high (26.8%). Compared to those who are confident, only half the number (13.4%) displays a low self-efficacy level. These results show that, in general, the students’ self-efficacy level in paragraph writing and essay overall organization ranges from average to high.

Table 57  
Correct Use of Parts of Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Confident nor Unconfident</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 3.

The results displayed in Table 57, above, and Table 58, below, refer to the participants’ self-efficacy level in language use, mainly the correct use of parts of speech and vocabulary in essay writing. In more concrete terms, their confidence level appears to be generally average to high, with a slightly higher level in the use of the former (i.e., parts of speech). Thus, a
considerable number of the respondents (30.7%) report that they have a moderate level, others (25.2%) a high level of confidence in using the parts of speech correctly, while only about 19% (13.4% + 6.3%) others are unconfident. The remainder of the participants (16.5%) display an average level of confidence. Similarly, the results displayed in Table 60, below, show that the self-efficacy level in vocabulary use among the majority of participants (35.4%) is generally average. However, 24.4% respondents demonstrate a high level, and only 18% others have a low confidence level.

Table 58
*Appropriate Vocabulary Use*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Confident nor Unconfident</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 6.

Finally, and in relation to punctuation use and grammatical structure, particularly with compound and complex sentences, it is observed from Tables 59 and 60, below, that the overall students’ confidence level is relatively between average and low. Thus, the results, given in Table 59, show that about 43 % (26.8 % added to 14.2 %) of the participants have a low confidence level in “writing compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure”, followed by 37 % with an average level, and only 14 % (11 % + 3.1 %) others, demonstrating a high level of confidence. Similarly, the participants’ confidence level in
using correct punctuation (Table 60) ranges between average to low. Thus, 30.7% of them demonstrate an average level, 32.3% others display a low level, and only 15.7% demonstrate a high level of confidence.

Table 59
Use of Correct Punctuation and Grammatical Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Confident nor Unconfident</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 7.

In brief, the results discussed in this sub-section show that while the students’ self-efficacy level tends to be generally average, it appears to be high in some aspects and low in
others. A relatively low English writing self-efficacy level can, therefore, be one of the affective factors that account for the students’ writing difficulties, mainly the aspects of confidence that concern their overall essay writing ability.

So far, in the analysis of the students’ affective factors, it has been observed that despite the fact that some participants’ responses were uncertain, in some cases, the self-efficacy level of many of them is average in relation to their writing abilities, in general, and ranges between low to high, in certain aspects of writing. Likewise, it has been observed that many students were apprehensive in some aspects of writing and less or not apprehensive in others. It is, therefore, possible to claim that a high level of English writing apprehension (EWA) and a low level of English writing self-efficacy (EWSE) are among the factors that account, though relatively, to the students’ writing difficulties, in this study, be it at the level of their overall writing performance or some of its aspects.

What follows is a qualitative analysis of the pre-questionnaire results, previously discussed quantitatively, followed by an identification of the major factors that were found, according to the results of the pre-test and the pre-questionnaire, to be related to the students’ writing difficulties. Later, in this chapter, a section will be devoted for the analysis of the results in light of the hypotheses set for this exploratory phase of the present research.

3.2.3. Qualitative Analysis of the Pre-questionnaire Results

The pre-questionnaire consists of two major sections. Section one contains two sub-sections designed to elicit answers about the participants’ writing difficulties (Q₁- Q₅) and their writing processes and strategies (Q₆- Q₁₁), respectively. The second major section is devoted to the participants’ affective factors, and it includes two sub-sections: the English writing apprehension scale (EWAS) and the English writing self-efficacy scale (EWSES).
Because the focus of the exploratory study is on investigating the factors that may be related to the participants’ writing difficulties, the analysis of the questionnaire items is, hence, conducted accordingly. These factors, identified from the pre-questionnaire analysis, are categorized into: (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and affective.

According to the results discussed above, it was found that cognitive and meta-cognitive factors appear to be the main sources of the students’ writing difficulties. This can be observed through the participants’ responses to the different questions, mainly those related to their background knowledge and use of the writing processes and strategies. Not only do they have a limited practice and use of the writing processes and strategies, but they also lack the necessary knowledge about the latter and the benefits they have in facilitating writing in general. For example, in the analysis of the results related to the students’ writing processes and strategies, it was observed that many participants reported having a tendency to write only one draft, which means that they are more likely to skip revision. In addition, many of them start drafting their essays without going through any pre-writing processes, such as brainstorming and planning. These students seem to ignore the benefits of planning and revision, which are considered, by expert writers (e.g., Alhaissini, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005; MacArthur, Graham & Harris, 2006), to be of great importance in guiding student writers through organizing, developing, and revising their writing.

In addition, the results obtained from the analysis of the first section of the pre-questionnaire (Students’ Background in Writing), mainly the sub-section related to the students’ writing difficulties, the participants reported that the main sources of their difficulties are attributed to their limited writing ability (23.6 %) and limited writing practice (29 %). The latter, i.e., limited writing practice can be attributed to either motivational or cognitive factors,
particularly for struggling students. These two factors (i.e., limited writing ability and practice), which tend to have a cognitive nature, are very likely to account, with varying degrees, for the participants’ writing difficulties. Likewise, the participants’ limited meta-knowledge (36.2 %) seems to be another important (meta-) cognitive factor that is very likely to be related to their writing difficulties. Meta-knowledge has to do with the writers’ knowledge about the topic and genre of writing and the way they employ this knowledge in essay writing.

At the linguistic level, most of the respondents reported that they generally have no serious difficulties related to language use in essay writing. However, the results obtained from section one of the pre-questionnaire, mainly the one related to their writing difficulties, showed that a considerable number (33.9 %) of participants have problems with vocabulary use, and 32.3 % others have difficulties in language and mechanics. These numbers are important despite the fact that the majority of the participants reported that they have no linguistic difficulties. It is therefore possible to say that the participants’ limited linguistic ability appears to be a minor factor that account for their essay writing difficulties.

At the affective level, the participants appear to have a relatively low level of English writing apprehension, except for their fear of negative evaluation, which was observed among a considerable number of participants. On the other hand, their English writing self-efficacy level in essay writing appears to be relatively average, except in relation to the quality of their essays, when compared to their peers’ writing. In addition, the percent analysis of the students’ affective factors showed that many participants were uncertain about their self-efficacy level, which can be interpreted as a lack or limited awareness of their confidence level in writing, or that they had an average (i.e., neither confident nor unconfident) level of confidence in their writing abilities. Other participants demonstrated a high level of self-efficacy in some aspects of English writing.
and a low level in others. Likewise, the results showed that many participants demonstrated a high level of apprehension in some aspects of writing and lower level in others.

In short, the results discussed above show that students’ low writing self-efficacy, with particular focus on their essay writing ability, and high writing apprehension levels, mainly their fear of evaluation, appear to be relatively important factors that can be a source (s) of their writing difficulties.

To sum up, the results obtained from the analysis of the pre-questionnaire revealed important facts about the participants’ writing difficulties and, particularly, the factors that are attributed to them. The factors that were found to account for their difficulties are mainly of a (meta-) cognitive nature, followed by linguistic and affective factors, to a lesser degree.

The following is a discussion of the results obtained from the pre-test and pre-questionnaire in light of the hypotheses set for the exploratory phase of the present research.

3.2. Analysis of the Research Hypotheses in relation to the Exploratory Study Results

The aim of this exploratory phase of the research was to explore the factors that may be related to the participants’ writing difficulties. To achieve this aim, it was hypothesized that these students’ difficulties in writing can be attributed to cognitive (including meta-cognitive), linguistic, and/ or affective factors. In order to test the hypotheses, a pre-test and a pre-questionnaire were used to collect data on the participants’ writing performance level (pre-test scores), their writing background (i.e., their writing difficulties with possible related factors and their use of the writing processes and strategies), as well as their affective factors, mainly their writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy levels.
The quantitative and qualitative analyses of the results obtained from the pre-test and the pre-questionnaire demonstrate that the participants appear to have various difficulties and at varying levels. These difficulties can be attributed to different factors, namely: (meta-) cognitive, linguistic and affective.

The meta-cognitive and cognitive factors can be seen through the participants’ answers to the set of questions presented in section one of the pre-questionnaire, namely the ‘students’ writing difficulties’ and the ‘students’ writing processes and strategies’. The pre-test results also revealed a considerable amount of information about the participants’ writing difficulties, particularly those that have a (meta-) cognitive and linguistic nature.

In more concrete terms, and with reference to the pre-test results, discussed in the first section of this chapter, the factors that account for the participants’ writing difficulties are generally of a cognitive (and meta-cognitive) nature, followed by linguistic ones, to a moderate degree. This is observed in the participants’ scores related to their writing performance, and its major aspects, referred to as criteria. The latter include aspects of essay writing, mainly content (meta-knowledge), organizational skills, language use, mechanics, and the participants’ engagement in the writing process. Thus, it was observed that many participants demonstrated a limited meta-knowledge, related to their respective topics (meta-cognitive). In addition, they displayed a limited of analytical skills pertinent to the topic and genre of writing (cognitive), relatively weak organizational skills (cognitive), and a moderate to low level of mechanical skills (cognitive). Moreover, it was observed from the analysis of the participants’ drafts that most of them made very little or no use of the writing processes and strategies (cognitive), mainly those related to planning and revision, which may be attributed to a lack of awareness (meta-cognitive) among them.
On the other hand, the results obtained from the participants’ answers to both sections of the pre-questionnaire brought important information about their writing difficulties and some of the related factors (origins of these difficulties), as well as their level of awareness and use of the writing processes and strategies. The cognitive (and meta-cognitive) factors reflect mainly the aspects related to the participants’ writing performance and their writing difficulties, which were revealed through the results obtained from the participants’ answers to the first five questions of the pre-questionnaire. In addition, the analysis of the results of the second sub-section of the pre-questionnaire suggests that the participants seem to have a limited knowledge (meta-cognitive) about the writing process and strategies and that they have a limited use (cognitive) of the latter. For example, many participants reported that they consider revision as an important stage in the writing process, but in the pre-test, a large majority of them have neglected, or skipped, revision. They consider the latter to be a rewriting of their drafts to improve the form and handwriting, which is a characteristic of unskilled student writers, according to writing experts.

These aspects of writing have been investigated abundantly in many studies (e.g., Abdellatif, 2007; Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013; Sasaki, 2000) the results of which have revealed that ESL and EFL students, with particular emphasis on struggling or low-achieving ones, display different kinds of difficulties that are of a cognitive origin. For example, at the process level of writing, many students struggle with planning, composing, and revising, and many of them tend to skip planning and revision because of the demanding cognitive loads that are required to process ideas, plan, organize and develop them into a coherent essay.
The above-discussed findings confirm that the participants of the study appear to have varying degrees of writing difficulties most of which are attributed to (meta-) cognitive factors. The results obtained from the pre-test and the pre-questionnaire confirm, to a large extent, the first research hypothesis ($H_1$) that states that: **Students’ writing difficulties are related to cognitive factors.** Its null counterpart (students’ writing difficulties are not related to cognitive factors) is, then, rejected.

As far as the second hypothesis is concerned, the analysis of the pre-test and pre-questionnaire results revealed that the participants’ writing difficulties are, relatively, related to linguistic factors. The latter are represented through the major criterion of **language accuracy and fluency**, which is an important aspect of the writing performance, as it is displayed in the graded evaluation rubric used for the evaluation of the pre-and post-tests (Appendix IV). This criterion consists of five (05) sub-criteria, including, but not limited to **grammar correctness, usage, syntactic structures and academic vocabulary use**. From the results obtained from the pre-test, it was observed that the participants’ linguistic competence in relation to essay writing is relatively low. However, and with reference to the results of the pre-questionnaire, most of the participants reported that linguistic factors do not appear to be a major source attributed to their writing difficulties.

Therefore, and based on the pre-test and pre-questionnaire results, discussed above, the second hypothesis, which states that the **students’ writing difficulties are related to linguistic factors**, is confirmed, to a certain extent.

Finally, and in order to answer the third hypothesis which relates the students’ writing difficulties to affective factors, it is important to refer to the results obtained from the pre-questionnaire, mainly the section about the participants’ affective factors, i.e., their English
writing apprehension (EWA) and English writing self-efficacy (EWSE-1 and EWSE-2) levels. Thus, although many participants displayed a low level of writing self-efficacy, mainly in relation to their ability to write English essays, a considerable number of other participants demonstrated a relatively average level of confidence. On the other hand, the writing apprehension level of many participants was observed to be generally average, except in relation to their fear of evaluation, which appeared to be relatively low.

Based on the analysis of the results of the pre-questionnaire, namely, the section about the students’ affective factors, the third hypothesis, which states that students’ writing difficulties are related to affective factors, is partially confirmed.

To sum up, and in light of the results discussed so far in this chapter, the hypotheses set for this investigative phase of the research have proven to be relatively confirmed, especially the first one that states that students’ writing difficulties may be related to (meta-) cognitive factors. The second hypothesis that states that students’ writing difficulties may be related to linguistic factors was partially confirmed, according to the results of the pre-test and the pre-questionnaire. The third hypothesis, which attributes the students’ writing difficulties to affective factors, is also partially confirmed, according to the results of the pre-questionnaire. Therefore, the factors related to the students’ writing difficulties consist of the three factors mentioned above, but the most contributing one seems to be the cognitive factors.

**Conclusion**

This chapter brought about the results of the exploratory phase of this research, which sought to explore and uncover the major factors behind the study participants’ writing difficulties. The data used to conduct this phase were collected from a pre-test and a pre-questionnaire. The results of the pre-test revealed different aspects about the participants’ writing
performance, which was estimated to be generally of an average level. They, also, uncovered important facts about the participants’ writing difficulties, mainly of the (meta-) cognitive nature. The results of the pre-questionnaire showed that the participants reported important information about their writing background, including their own writing difficulties, processes and strategies, as well as their level of affect in writing. Concisely, the results obtained from both the pre-test and the pre-questionnaire demonstrate that the participants’ writing difficulties are, generally, attributed to (meta-) cognitive factors, followed by linguistic and affective factors, to a lesser degree.

The findings of this exploratory phase have prepared the grounds for the experimental phase of the present research, taking into consideration the participants’ writing difficulties and the related factors in planning and executing the intervention; i.e., training the participants to achieve a better level of performance in writing and enhance their positive affect. The following chapter (Chapter IV) is a description and analysis of the results obtained from the experimental phase of the research, including the results of the post-test, the post-questionnaire, and the think-aloud protocols.
Introduction

This chapter discusses the quantitative and qualitative results of the experimental study. The aim of the latter was to investigate the effect of strategy training on students’ writing performance. The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the results of the post-test, statistically and qualitatively. The second part is devoted to the analysis of the post-questionnaire, and the third one consists of a qualitative analysis of the think-aloud protocols.

The analysis of the pre-test scores is displayed through tables, followed by a qualitative analysis. Reference will be given to the participants’ written drafts to show evidence about their writing performance. Likewise, the analysis of the post-questionnaire results will be given statistically, including descriptive statistics and percentages, followed by brief interpretations. Moreover, comparisons will be made between the results of the pre- and post-tests, and the pre- and post-questionnaires for the experimental and control groups, as well as a comparison between the two groups, in order to measure the effect (s) of strategy training on the participants’ writing performance.

4.1. Analysis of the Post-test Results

The aim of the experimental phase of the present study was to investigate the effect (s) of strategy training in promoting the participants’ writing performance and positive affect. To achieve this aim, a post-test, among other instruments (a post-questionnaire and think-aloud procedure), was used to collect data about the participants’ writing performance (test scores). The results of the post-test are, then, compared to those obtained from the pre-test so as to examine the degree of progress, if any, in the participants’ writing performance. The quantitative analysis of the post-test results consists of descriptive statistics, including the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the total score and sub-scores. The qualitative analysis of the
results is given, later, under the form of criteria, analysed in relation to the participants’ written drafts.

Similar to the pre-test, the evaluation of the post-test results was conducted through a graded rubric that consists of five (05) major criteria, which in turn are divided into sub-criteria. These criteria include: content, organization, language fluency and accuracy, mechanics and the writer’s engagement in the writing process. The evaluation scheme was displayed in table (8), in the previous chapter (three), and the detailed graded rubric and the evaluation scheme of the sub-criteria are given in Appendix V. It is worth noting that the evaluation rubric mentioned, above, is the same rubric used for the evaluation of the pre-test. The following section displays the quantitative analysis of the results of the post-test for the experimental (EG) and control (CG) groups, followed by a comparison between the pre- and post-tests for each group and a comparison between the two groups, by means of a one-sample test.

4.4.1. Quantitative Analysis of the Post-test Results: Students’ Writing Performance

As in the pre-test, the results of the post-test reflect the participants’ level of writing performance for both groups. The total score represents the overall performance of each participant, and the sub-scores refer to the criteria of performance (i.e., content, organization, language, mechanics, and the writer’s engagement in the writing process). These criteria are displayed in the tables of statistics together with the total score.

The following results represent the descriptive statistics, including the mean of the total score and sub-scores (per criterion), the standard deviation, the median, mode, and the maximum and minimum values. The results are followed by a brief interpretation.
4.4.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

The sample selected for the experimental phase of the study is equal to 24 participants in the experimental group and 9 participants in the control group, which makes 33 participants in total. Table 61(a) displays the test scores, including the five criteria (content, organization, language, and mechanics, and the writing process) and the total score (100%).

Table 61 (a)
*Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental Group Post-test Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test Scores Content</th>
<th>Test Scores Organization</th>
<th>Test Scores Language</th>
<th>Test Scores Mechanics</th>
<th>Test Scores W Process</th>
<th>Test Scores Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.0417</td>
<td>17.5575</td>
<td>16.1979</td>
<td>7.3750</td>
<td>9.9967</td>
<td>65.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.61820</td>
<td>.84465</td>
<td>1.09159</td>
<td>.29983</td>
<td>.53222</td>
<td>2.95639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>14.5000</td>
<td>17.8600</td>
<td>17.5000</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>9.3300</td>
<td>65.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.02855</td>
<td>4.13792</td>
<td>5.34768</td>
<td>1.46888</td>
<td>2.60731</td>
<td>14.48331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>421.38</td>
<td>388.75</td>
<td>177.00</td>
<td>239.92</td>
<td>1563.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown*

The results shown in Table 61 (a), above, indicate that the mean of the total score is 65.125, with a standard deviation equal to 14.48. This means that the average score of the experimental group is around 65%. However, and with reference to the evaluation scheme, which is not equally distributed among the sub-criteria, it would be important to consider the maximum and minimum values, which show that the former is equal to 93, while the latter is
equal to 36. It is therefore, possible to consider that the overall level of performance is slightly above the average (median= 65.75), which can be considered as an intermediate level.

In addition to the total score, the results show that the mean score for each criterion varies. Thus, with reference to the evaluation scheme of each criterion, discussed in chapter three (Table 8), it appears that these sub-score means are distributed as follows: content (14.0417 out of 20 %), organization (17.5575 out of 25%), language (16.1979 out of 25%), mechanics (7.3750 out of 10%), and writing process (9.9967 out of 20%).

The above-mentioned score means refer to the post-test scores, which can be compared to the pre-test score means in as far as the experimental group is concerned. The pre-test scores are displayed in Table 61 (b), below.

Table 61 (b)

Descriptive Statistics for the Experimental Group Pre-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Test Scores Content</th>
<th>Test Scores Organization</th>
<th>Test Scores Language</th>
<th>Test Scores Mechanics</th>
<th>Test Scores W Process</th>
<th>Test Scores Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>14.4033</td>
<td>12.8275</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>8.6921</td>
<td>54.7708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.52819</td>
<td>.72278</td>
<td>1.08972</td>
<td>.35098</td>
<td>.46692</td>
<td>2.77002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>11.5000</td>
<td>13.2150</td>
<td>12.5000</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>53.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>7.50a</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>43.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.58760</td>
<td>3.54091</td>
<td>5.33850</td>
<td>1.71945</td>
<td>2.28744</td>
<td>13.57025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>288.00</td>
<td>345.68</td>
<td>307.86</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>208.61</td>
<td>1314.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown
A careful examination of the experimental group pre-test score means show that the total score mean is equal to 54.7708, which, compared to the post-test score mean (65.125), has increased with an interval of 10 points (mean). This indicates that the experimental group participants have experienced progress in their writing performance after the experimental period (strategy training).

Similarly, the experimental group participants’ sub-score means have increased with varied values, compared to the pre-test sub-score means. Table 61 (c), below, displays the difference in total and sub-score means between the pre- and post-test scores.

Table 61 (c)
*Total and Sub-score Means of the Pre- and Post-tests for the Experimental Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>Writing Process</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>14.4033</td>
<td>12.8275</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>8.6921</td>
<td>54.7708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can be observed from the results shown in the above table is that after the experimentation (training period), the experimental group participants have improved significantly in their overall writing performance, and with particular emphasis in certain aspects, mainly content, organization, and language accuracy and fluency.

Unlike the experimental group participants who made significant improvement in their overall writing performance, after the training period, no significant differences have been observed in the control group’s pre- and post-test results. Their post-test total and sub-score means are given in Table 62 (a), followed by their pre-test total and sub-score means in Table 62 (b), below, for comparison.
Table 62 (a)
Descriptive Statistics for the Control Group Post-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>W Process</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.7778</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>1.06429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.35099</td>
<td>2.03058</td>
<td>.40825</td>
<td>.57937</td>
<td>4.50574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.8600</td>
<td>8.7500</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>45.5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>7.00a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>31.50a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.19287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.05298</td>
<td>6.09175</td>
<td>1.22474</td>
<td>1.73810</td>
<td>13.51722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>10.194</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.427</td>
<td>37.109</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>3.021</td>
<td>182.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117.12</td>
<td>108.75</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>62.64</td>
<td>445.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Table 62 (b)
Descriptive Statistics for the Control Group Pre-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>W Process</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.66667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.11770</td>
<td>1.67676</td>
<td>.46481</td>
<td>.62815</td>
<td>3.96230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.8600</td>
<td>11.2500</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>49.5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>10.00a</td>
<td>5.00a</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>35.00a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.35310</td>
<td>5.03029</td>
<td>1.39443</td>
<td>1.88444</td>
<td>11.88691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.243</td>
<td>25.304</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>3.551</td>
<td>141.299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124.99</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>71.98</td>
<td>467.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*b. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown
As it is displayed in Tables 62 (a) and 62 (b), above, a comparison between the control group participants’ pre- and post-test results shows that these participants’ total and sub-scores have slightly decreased in the post-test. This means that there has been no progress in their writing performance level, which can only be explained by the fact that these participants have not attended strategy training, compared to their peers in the experimental group.

Similarly, and as it is explained, below, the one-sample test shows, in a more technical way, the mean difference and statistical significance of the comparison between the pre- and post-test scores for both groups (i.e., experimental and control) in Tables 66 and 67, respectively.

### 4.4.1.2. One-sample Test

The following tables (63 and 64) refer to the *One-sample Test*, which compares the pre- and post-test results of the experimental (EG) and control (CG) groups, respectively. As shown in Table 63, below, the mean difference as well as a 2-tailed statistical significance value of the total score (overall performance) are given. The comparison also includes the sub-scores of the different aspects of the writing performance (i.e., content, organization, language, mechanics, and the writing process).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 63</th>
<th>One-Sample Test: Experimental Group Pre- and Post-test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Value = 10</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores: Content</td>
<td>7.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores: Organization</td>
<td>10.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores: Language</td>
<td>5.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores: W. Process</td>
<td>-1.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores: Total</td>
<td>23.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, and with reference to the results displayed in Tables 62 (a) and 62 (b), above, the One-sample Test was also used to compare the pre- and post-test results of the study control group. The results displayed in Table 64, below, indicate that there is no significant improvement in the participants’ overall writing performance level.

Table 64
One-Sample Test: Control Group Pre- and Post-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scores &quot;Total&quot;</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-16.863</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-49.3333</td>
<td>Lower: -55.5057 Upper: -43.1610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What follows is a qualitative analysis of the results discussed above, including a comparison between the experimental and control groups in as far as their pre- and post-training results are concerned.

4.4.2. Qualitative Analysis of the Post-test and One-sample Test Results

An examination of the above-discussed results, including the pre- and post-test and the One-sample Test results, reveals that compared to the control group, the experimental group participants demonstrate a significant improvement at the level of their overall writing performance.

In more concrete terms, the post-test scores show that the participants in the experimental group have improved in almost every aspect of the writing performance, with an overall mean of 65.13, which, compared to the pre-test score mean (54.77), has increased with an interval of 10
points (mean). This indicates that the experimental group participants have experienced progress in their writing performance after the experimental period (strategy training).

In addition to the increase in the total score, the experimental group participants’ sub-score means have also increased with varied values, compared to the pre-test sub-score means. Table 61 (c), above, displays the difference in total and sub-score means between the pre- and post-test scores. For example, a significant progress was observed at the level of content, organization, language use, and mechanics. The mean difference for each of these aspects is equal to: 3.02, 5.98, 4.51, and 3.31, respectively. As for the difference in the mean value of the participants’ engagement in the writing process, the level of progress was low, with a mean difference of -.65.

In contrast, and with reference to the results displayed in Tables 62 (a) and 62 (b), above, no progress has been observed among the control group participants; rather, the results show that the total as well as the sub-scores have slightly decreased in the post-test. In other words, the writing performance total mean score was 51.89 in the pre-test and decreased to 49.44 in the post-test. Similarly, the sub-scores means decreased slightly, but the decrease was not significant. For example, the pre-test score means of content (11.00), organization (13.89), and the participants’ engagement in the writing process (7.99) deceased to: 10.78, 13.01, and 6.96, respectively, in the post-test. These results indicate that the absence of progress in the writing performance, among the control group participants, was most probably the results of the absence of strategy training.

From the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the results obtained from the post-test and the comparison that has been conducted, by means of a 2-tailed One-sample Test for both the experimental and control groups, the conclusion that can be drawn is that, compared to the
participants in the latter group, their peers in the former (experimental) group have improved significantly in their overall writing performance as a result of the writing strategy training they have received during the experimental phase of the study.

4.5. Analysis of the Post-questionnaire Results: Students’ Affective Factors

The post-questionnaire was the second instrument used for the experimental phase of the present research. It consists of one section, divided into two sub-sections, with an aim to obtain data about the participants’ affect, namely, their writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy levels.

The reason behind including only one section (Students’ Affective Factors) in the post-questionnaire is related to one of the aims of the experimental phase, which sought to investigate the effect of strategy training in enhancing the students’ positive affect, in addition to promoting their writing performance. In order to measure the degree of progress at the level of the writing performance, covering, respectively, the cognitive and linguistic aspects of writing, the post-test was used. Measuring the degree of improvement at the level of affect was, on the other hand, conducted by means of a post-questionnaire. To put it otherwise, affect was one among other (cognitive and linguistic) factors that were found to account for the students’ writing difficulties, according to the results of the exploratory phase of this study.

The sample considered in the experimental phase of this research was limited to the participants who took part in the study as an experimental (EG) and control (CG) groups, the number of whom represent 24 and 9, respectively. The post-questionnaire was, hence, administered to 33 participants.
Similar to the results of the second section of the pre-questionnaire, those obtained from the post-questionnaire are analysed quantitatively, using the Software Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). The same procedures followed in the former are applied in the treatment of the latter, in terms of the scales used, the aim behind each sub-section of the post-questionnaire, the categorization of the set of items used in each sub-section, and the procedure of the analysis of the results, considering mainly the descriptive statistics. However, and as it was mentioned, above, the aim behind the post-questionnaire is to examine the degree of improvement, if any, in the participants' level of affect, which is different from what the pre-questionnaire sought to achieve; i.e., the section related to the students’ affective factors.

The results of the post-questionnaire are displayed, in tables, including descriptive statistics of each of the affective constructs: the participants’ English writing apprehension and their English writing self-efficacy levels. A comparison is established between the pre-questionnaire results (related to affective factors) and those obtained from the post-questionnaire so as to examine the degree of improvement, if any, at the level of the participants’ affect; i.e., their writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy levels.

4.5.1. Analysis of the Students’ English Writing Apprehension Level

English writing apprehension (EWA) is one of the affective factors that were investigated in the experimental phase of the present research, with the aim of decreasing its level among the participants. The EWA scale consists of twelve statements, classified into three categories; each of which has an aim to achieve, as it was described in the previous chapter (chapter three). These categories include: avoidance behaviour, fear of evaluation, and (positive/ negative) attitudes towards writing, the writing situation/ task, or writing in the target language (English).
Table 65, below, displays the three categories mentioned previously with their respective EWA statements. The table is identical to Table 39 used in chapter three for the same purpose.

Table 65
*Categories of the English Writing Apprehension Statements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Avoidance Behaviour</th>
<th>Fear of Evaluation</th>
<th>Negative/Positive Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would rather read than write in English.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not like my English essays to be evaluated.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I like writing in English.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I like discussing my English writing with others.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sub-section displays the statistical analysis of the results related to the respondents’ EWA level. Descriptive statistics, including the *mean, median, mode,* and *standard deviation,* are displayed in Tables 66 (a) and 66 (b) for the experimental group, and 67 (a) and 67 (b) for the control group, followed by a brief interpretation of the results.

4.5.1.1. Statistical Analysis of the Experimental Group Writing Apprehension Level

The total sample of the post-questionnaire is 33, representing the total number of participants who took part in the experimental phase of this study as an experimental group (EG)
and control group (CG) (N = 9). Because this analysis is based on comparison, the results are displayed in separate tables for the respective groups (EG and CG), along with their corresponding pre-questionnaire results for the same sample, i.e., EG and CG participants. Tables 66 (a) and 66 (b), and 67 (a) and 67 (b), below, display the descriptive statistics corresponding, respectively, to the EG and CG participants’ English writing apprehension (EWA) level. The interpretation of the results is undertaken in relation to the categories mentioned in Table 65, above, namely, avoidance behaviour, fear of evaluation and the participants’ (negative/positive) attitudes towards writing.

As far as the experimental group participants’ English writing apprehension (EWA) level is concerned, it is observed from Tables 66 (a) and 66 (b), below, that there is a slight decrease in the total mean values of the post-study EWA level compared to its value in the pre-study phase. Thus, the total mean score of the pre-study EWA level was 2.4931, with a standard deviation of .33416, while the total mean value of the post-study EWA level is equal to 2.2257, with a standard deviation of .55030. This indicates that the scores have a normal distribution. These mean score values demonstrate that the EG participants had a low to average level of apprehension, which decreased after the training period, with a mean difference of about .2674.

With regard to the different categories of the EWA (Table 65, above), the mean values of the individual items are closer to the total mean value of the whole variable (EWA), except for items 2 and 4, which fall, respectively, under the avoidance behaviour and fear of evaluation categories, with mean values of 3.1667 and 3.2500, and standard deviation values of 1.34056 and 1.18872, respectively. The latter show that the scores are not equally distributed, and that the participants’ tend to have an average to high apprehension level, especially concerning item 3 (mode = 4.00).
In the post-study phase, it is observed that the EG participants tend to demonstrate a lower level of apprehension. This can be seen through the mean values of the individual EWA items, which are closer to the total mean of the whole variable (EWA), except for item 4. The latter falls under the *avoidance behaviour* category, with a mean value of 3.0833, which was 3.2500, before training.

These results show that, in general terms, the decrease in the EWA total mean value, as well as the mean values of the individual items, after the training period, is an indication that the latter (i.e., training) has contributed positively in decreasing the level of apprehension among the EG participants, especially in relation to their *fear of evaluation* and *avoidance behaviour*.

Table 66 (a)

*Descriptive Statistics: Experimental Group Pre-study English Writing Apprehension Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather read than write in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1250</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my English essays to be evaluated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4583</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0417</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8333</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9583</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.99909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like discussing my English writing with others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Apprehension</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4931</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown*
Table 66 (b)

**Descriptive Statistics: Experimental Group Post-study English Writing Apprehension Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9167</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.97431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4167</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.34864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>117877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather read than write in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.28255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.83406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my English essays to be evaluated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1250</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.85019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.89988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0833</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.82970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.06322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7917</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.88363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.05552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like discussing my English writing with others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.12932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*English Writing Apprehension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2257</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.55030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown_

**4.5.1.2. Statistical Analysis of the Control Group Writing Apprehension Level**

As far as the control group (CG) participants’ English writing apprehension (EWA) level is concerned, a careful observation at the results displayed in Tables 67 (a) and 67 (b), below, shows that the total mean value of their pre-study EWA is equal to 2.6481, with a standard deviation of .46169, while the mean value of their post-study EWA is 2.5741, with a standard deviation of .49729, which indicates that the scores have a normal distribution. The total mean values of the CG pre- and post-training EWA level show that there is an insignificant increase of
.074. In other words, the CG group’s level of apprehension was fairly average to low in the pre-study phase and remained almost in the same level after the training.

Table 67 (a)
Descriptive Statistics: Control Group Pre-study English Writing Apprehension Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.01379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.23603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather read than write in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.13039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my English essays to be evaluated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.01379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.42400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.97183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.11803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.53659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like discussing my English writing with others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.83333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing Apprehension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.46169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

With regard to the different categories of the EWA, the mean values of the individual items are generally closer to the total mean value of the whole variable (EWA), except for items 2 and 4, 9, and 11. Items 2 and 11 fall under the category of fear of evaluation, while items 4 and 9 fall under the category of avoidance behaviour. The mean values of the former are equal to 3.5556 and 3.0000, with standard deviation values of 1.23603 and .86603, respectively, and the mean values of the latter are 3.4444 and 3.1111, with standard deviation values of 1.13039 and
1.53659, respectively. These values indicate that the scores are not equally distributed, and that the participants’ tend to have an average to a high level of apprehension, especially, in relation to items 2 and 4, which receive a mode value of 4.00.

Similarly, in the post-study phase, it is observed that the CG participants tend to have almost the same level of apprehension as in the pre-study phase; i.e., average to low level.

Table 67 (b)
Descriptive Statistics: Control Group Post-study English Writing Apprehension Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.92796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.42400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather read than write in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.09291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.92796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my English essays to be evaluated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.11803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.45297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.92796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.32288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like discussing my English writing with others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.16667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing Apprehension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5741</td>
<td>2.5833</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.49729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

However, and with consideration to the mean values of the individual EWA items, mainly those under the category of *fear of evaluation* (2, 4, 6, and 12), their level of apprehension has
increased (items 6 and 12), while it slightly decreased at the level of their *avoidance behaviour* (item 9). The mean values of items 2, 4, 6, and 12 are, respectively, equal to 3.3333, 3.2222, 3.0000, and 3.1111, with standard deviation values of: 1.41421, 1.09291, 1.11803, and 1.16667. The mode values of items 2 and 6 are higher than their mean values, which indicate that the level of apprehension at the level of these two items is higher. These results confirm that the CG participants’ apprehension level has increased, with varying degrees, at the post-study phase.

In brief, the above discussed results explain the fact that because the CG participants received no training, their level of apprehension has not decreased; rather, it increased considerably at the level of *fear of evaluation* and slightly at the level of *avoidance behaviour*. In contrast, the EG group participants’ level of apprehension has decreased, both at the level of *avoidance behaviour* and *fear of evaluation*, after the training period. In other words, writing strategy training has enhanced the participants’ positive affect, by decreasing their English writing apprehension level.

### 4.5.2. Analysis of the Students’ English Writing Self-efficacy Level

The second affective factor that was investigated in the experimental phase of this study was English writing self-efficacy (EWSE), which refers to the second sub-section of the post-questionnaire. The aim behind this investigation to enhance the level of this affective construct among the participants or, in other words, increasing their English writing self-efficacy level. The EWSE scale consists of two parts. The first part (EWSE-1) consists of ten (10) items, while the second (EWSE-2) one contains eight (8) statements. EWSE-1 refers to the students’ self-efficacy level in English essay writing, in general, while EWSE-2 refers to their confidence level in using some essay writing skills, such as organization, language, and mechanics.
What follows is a statistical analysis of the results pertaining to the participants’ EWSE level, displayed through tables of descriptive statistics. Because there are two categories (parts) of EWSE, the analysis is conducted accordingly, with reference to the pre- and post-questionnaire results of both the experimental (EG) and control (CG) groups, considered separately. In other words, the analysis is comparative in nature, taking into consideration the pre- and post-study results pertinent to each category (EWSE-1 and EWSE-2) and for each group separately. Tables 68 (a) and 68 (b) and Tables 69 (a) and 69 (b), below, display the descriptive statistics of the pre- and post-study results pertaining to the EG participants’ EWSE-1 and EWSE-2 level, respectively. Later, in this sub-section, Tables 70 (a) and 70 (b), and Tables 71 (a) and 71 (b) will display the descriptive statistics of the CG pre- and post-study results related to their EWSE-1 and EWSE-2 levels, respectively.

4.5.2.1. Statistical Analysis of the Experimental Group Writing Self-efficacy Level

As mentioned above, the first category (part) of the English Writing Self-efficacy scale (EWAE-1) comprises eight (08) statements, with an aim to gain insight on the participants’ level of confidence in relation to English essay writing. The second (EWSE-2) consists of ten (10) items, aiming at obtaining information about the respondents’ confidence level in using different writing skills, such as language use (e.g., appropriate use of vocabulary and grammar), organization (e.g., sentence, paragraph, and essay overall organization), and conventions (e.g., spelling and punctuation). The quantitative analysis of the results covers descriptive statistics, including the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the EWSE-1 variable, as a whole, and its individual statements. Tables 68 (a) and 68 (b) and Tables 69 (a) and 69 (b), below, display the descriptive statistics of the pre- and post-study results pertaining to the EG participants’ EWSE-1 and EWSE-2 levels, respectively.
The results displayed in Tables 68 (a) and 68 (b), below, show that the EG participants’ self-efficacy (EWSE-1) level, in as far their English essay writing is concerned, tends to be relatively low (lower than the average) in the pre- and post-study phases, with a slight decrease in the latter. In other words, the statistics show that the mean value of the EG participants’ EWSE-1 level is equal to 2.8021, with a standard deviation of .73805, which means that the scores have a normal distribution. This implies that the participants’ confidence level in essay writing is relatively low in the pre-study phase.

Table 68 (a)

*Descriptive Statistics: Experimental Group Pre-study English Writing Self-efficacy (1) Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not good at writing in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.02062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7500</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.18872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.24455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.03472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to write good essays in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.89685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1250</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.94696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seem to like what I write in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.82423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.87539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Self-efficacy-1</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8021</td>
<td>2.7500</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.73805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, an observation of the mean values of the different individual items demonstrates that these values tend to be approximate to the EWSE-1 total mean, except for items 4, 5, and 8, which receive the mean values of 3.1250, 3.2500, and 3.3750, with standard
deviation values that are equal to 1.03472, .89685, and .87539, respectively. The mode of each of these values is 3.00, which is close to the mean values of these items, which implies that the participants’ confidence level is slightly above the average in the afore-mentioned aspects of essay writing, which refer, respectively, to the confidence level in their ability to write as well as their peers, write a good essay in English, and write better than their peers. That is to say, these participants tend to have an average confidence level in their ability to write, in comparison to their peers, mainly in relation to essay writing quality and their overall writing performance.

In the post-study phase, the EG participants’ EWSE-1 level tends to be slightly lower than what it was before the training period, with a total mean value of 2.5156 and a standard deviation of .70356.

Table 68 (b)

Descriptive Statistics: Experimental Group Post-study English Writing Self-efficacy (1) Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not good at writing in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.17877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.12932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.1250</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.11560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.97802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to write good essays in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.21509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.89685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seem to like what I write in English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.7083</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.99909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2083</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.93153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing Self-efficacy-1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.5156</td>
<td>2.3125</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.70356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown
Similarly, at the level of the EWSE-1 individual items, the mean values seem to be slightly lower than their counter part values of the pre-study EWSE-1. The only exception appears to be at the level of item 8, which receives a mean value of 3.2083 and a standard deviation value of .93153. This implies that the EG participants’ level of confidence in relation to their ability to write well, compared to their peers, has remained average.

To confirm or infirm the above-discussed results, it is worth considering the participants’ pre- and post-study EWSE-2 level, which can reveal more details about their confidence level in relation to the different aspects of English essay writing (e.g., essay organization, language use, and mechanics). The results are displayed in tables 69 (a) and 69 (b), below.

Table 69 (a)
*Descriptive Statistics: Experimental Group Pre-study English Writing Self-efficacy (2) Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4167</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly punctuate a one page essay</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.14208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.22474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9583</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.16018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.99181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.79741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.10253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7917</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.72106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with a good overall organization (i.e. ideas in order, effective transition, etc.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5417</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.77903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Self-efficacy-2</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4917</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.61568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 69 (b)  
*Descriptive Statistics: Experimental Group Post-study English Writing Self-efficacy (2) Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2917</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.33447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly punctuate a one page essay</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.16718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7917</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.14129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.97802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.91683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9583</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.95458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2917</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.75060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.67566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with a good overall organization (i.e. ideas in order, effective transition, etc.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.64690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Self-efficacy-2</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4958</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.46577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown*

The results displayed in Tables 69 (a) and 69 (b), above, show that the EG participants’ self-efficacy (EWSE-2) level, in as far their English essay writing skills are concerned, tends to be average to high. However, the total mean value of the pre-study EWSE-2 level (mean= 3.4958; SD= .46577) appears to be almost equal to that of the post-study EWSE-2 level (mean= 3.4917; SD= .61568). According to these results, a possible interpretation would be that there has been no progress in the EG participants’ confidence level after their training. Yet, and with consideration to the EWSE-2 individual items, corresponding to English essay writing skills,
there seems to be an increase, of varying degrees, in the mean values of most of the aspects of essay writing, between the pre- and post-training periods.

In more concrete terms, the aspects in which the participants’ confidence level has increased include particularly those related to language use (items 3, 5, 6, and 7), mechanics (item 2) and organization (item 10), with mean values ranging between 2.9583 and 4.0000, and standard deviation values ranging between .97802 and .95458, respectively. The latter (the standard deviation values) indicate that the score values of these items have a normal distribution. The mean values of the rest of items seem to have decreased slightly, but the latter is insignificant.

The above discussed results show that compared to the pre-study phase, the EG participants appear to have made some progress at the level of confidence in some aspects (skills) of essay writing after the training period, mainly those related to language use (e.g., correct grammar use, appropriate vocabulary, and syntactic structures), overall essay organization, and mechanics (correct punctuation of a one-page essay).

In a nutshell, it is possible to claim that compared to their post-study EWSE-1 level in essay writing, which tends to be below the average, the EG participants demonstrate a relatively average to high level of confidence in the use of different English essay writing skills (EWSE-2). This implies that the progress made by these participants at the level of their self-efficacy is more likely to be attributed to the essay writing strategy training they received.

4.5.2.2. Statistical Analysis of the Control Group Writing Self-efficacy (2) Level

Similar to the analysis conducted, above, on the experimental group participants’ writing self-efficacy level, with its two categories, the control group participants receive the same
treatment. Tables 70 (a) and 70 (b), and Tables 71 (a) and 71 (b) display the descriptive statistics of the CG pre- and post-study results related to their EWSE-1 and EWSE-2 levels, respectively.

From the results given in Tables 70 (a) and 70 (b), below, it appears that the CG group participants’ EWSE-1 level, has decreased from a relatively average (above the average), in the pre-study phase, to a relatively low (lower than the average) level in the post-study phase. This can be seen in the total mean values of the EWSE-1 corresponding to the respective study phases. In other words, in the pre-study phase, the EWSE-1 mean value was equal to 3.3056, with a SD= .48858, and it decreased to 2.7917 with an SD = .55551.

Table 70 (a)
Descriptive Statistics: Control Group Pre-study English Writing Self-efficacy (1) Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not good at writing in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.88192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to write good essays in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.83333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.97183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seem to like what I write in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.78174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Self-efficacy-1</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3056</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.48858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown*
Similarly, the mean values of the EWSE-1 individual items was generally average to high in the pre-training period and they decreased, with varying degrees, in the post-training phase. For example, the mean values of items 1, 2, 4, and 5 have decreased from 3.4444 (SD= .88192), 3.3333 (SD= .86603), 3.6667 (SD= 1.00000; mode= 3.00), and 3.7778 (SD= .83333) to 2.8889 (SD= .78174), 2.6667 (SD= .86603), 2.7778 (SD= .97183), and 3.2222 (SD= .66667), respectively. These values correspond, respectively, to the participants’ confidence level in their overall essay performance, essay production, English writing proficiency level compared to their peers, and their ability to write quality English essays. The mean values of the rest of items have also decreased, but with slightly lower degrees.

Table 70 (b)
Descriptive Statistics: Control Group Post-study English Writing Self-efficacy (1) Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not good at writing in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.78174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00a</td>
<td>1.23603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.97183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to write good essays in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.66667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People seem to like what I write in English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.44096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.33333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Writing Self-efficacy-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.55551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.
The above discussed results indicate that the CG participants’ self-efficacy level in essay writing, in general, as well as in its different aspects, some of which (e.g., items 1, 2, 4, and 5) are mentioned above, appears to be lower than what it was before the training period.

In addition to the CG participants’ writing self-efficacy level in their overall essay writing (EWSE-1), the statistical analysis (Tables 71 (a) and 71 (b)) of the results corresponding to their confidence level in English essay writing, with its varying skills, (EWSE-2) shows that the latter tends to be average, in both study phases (pre- and post-training). This can be seen through the total mean values of the EWSE-2 level, which is equal to 3.0556 (SD=.37118) in the pre-training period and 3.0556 (SD=.49526) after the training. The mean value of EWSE shows that there is no difference in the CG participants’ EWSE-2 level in the two study phases.

Table 71 (a)

<p>| Descriptive Statistics: Control Group Pre-study English Writing Self-efficacy (2) Level |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.16667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly punctuate a one page essay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.11803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.26930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.97183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.60093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.52705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with a good overall organization (i.e. ideas in order, effective transition, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.16667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Writing Self-efficacy-2</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0556</td>
<td>2.9000</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.37118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown*
However, a careful observation of the EWSE-2 individual items shows that there is a decrease in the participants’ confidence level in some aspects and an increase (or no difference) in others, between the pre- and post-training periods. For example, a decrease has been observed in the mean values of the participants’ confidence level in some aspects of essay writing, mainly paragraph and essay organization (items 9 and 10), with mean values that are equal to 3.6667 (SD= .86603) and 3.1111 (SD= 1.16667) compared to their counterpart mean values in the post-training phase, which are equal to 3.3333 (SD= .70711) and 3.0000 (SD= .70711), respectively. On the other hand, an increase in the mean values of items 1, 3, and 6, corresponding, respectively, to aspects of mechanics (i.e., spelling a one-page essay) and language use (i.e., correct use of the parts of speech, and vocabulary use) has been observed. These items received the mean values of 2.8889 (SD= 1.16667; Mode= 4.00), 2.8889 (SD= 1.26930; Mode= 2.00), and 2.8889 (SD= .60093), respectively, in the pre-training phase, which increased significantly in the post-study phase, with the mean values of 3.4444 (SD= .52705), 3.3333 (SD= .86603), and 3.1111 (SD= .78174), respectively. No difference has been observed at the level of items 4 and 8, corresponding, respectively, to the participants’ confidence level in their ability to write “simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure” and “a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea”, which tends to be average.

In brief, although the CG participants seem to have made some progress, in the post-study phase, at the level of some aspects of essay writing, such as mechanics and language use, they appear to demonstrate a quite lower level of confidence in essay writing, in general, and organizational skills, in particular.
Table 71 (b)

Descriptive Statistics: Control Group Post-study English Writing Self-efficacy (2) Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.52705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly punctuate a one page essay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.83333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.86603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.32288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.78174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.78174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an essay with a good overall organization (i.e. ideas in order, effective transition, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Writing Self-efficacy-2

9 0 3.0556 3.2000 3.50 .49526

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.

In a nutshell, and compared to the EG, the CG participants’ self-efficacy level tends to be lower in their essay writing, in general, and some of its aspects, mainly in the post-training period. The difference observed among the participants in the two groups can be explained through the fact that, unlike the CG, the EG has received strategy training on various aspects of essay writing, which has enhanced their level of English writing self-efficacy to a certain extent.
4.6. Qualitative Analysis of the Think-aloud Protocols

To achieve triangulation in the design of the present research, a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods is used. The think-aloud procedure, which is conducted qualitatively, was used in this research mainly to back up and confirm the results of the post-test, the results of which are more quantitative than qualitative in nature.

To conduct the think-aloud procedure, four (04) protocols were collected from four (04) participants: Two (02) high-achievers, one (01) average-achiever, and one (01) low-achiever. This categorization was undertaken with reference to the experimental group post-study performance test (i.e., their post-test scores). The aim of these protocols is to uncover the writing processes and strategies used by the four participants in essay writing and examine, qualitatively, the effect of strategy training on their writing performance.

The analysis focuses mainly on the planning, composing (drafting), and revision processes and strategies used by the four study participants. In other words, these participants are compared in terms of the processes and strategies they used while planning, composing, and revising their essays. The analysis is conducted thematically and it covers the major writing processes and strategies, per stage, as well as other behaviours that may go along these processes, such as the length of planning, composing and revising, and the pausing behaviours during these writing processes.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the protocols, it is worth referring to the participants’ profiles, and the topics they selected to write about. As it is shown, below, all the topics selected fall under the category of cause-effect relationships. In writing their essays, the participants were asked to complete all the stages of the process to the best of their knowledge and submit any drafts they used before the final version of their produced essays.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Profile</th>
<th>Selected Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-achiever 1</td>
<td>Employers may fire workers from work for different reasons. Discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-achiever 2</td>
<td>Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average-achiever</td>
<td>People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-achiever</td>
<td>Discuss the causes and effects of smoking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6.1. Planning Processes and Strategies of High-, Average-, and Low-achievers

Planning processes and strategies refer mainly to the pre-writing stage of the writing process and it involves planning or outlining, generating ideas, and organizing them. During this stage, the four multi-level participants used some common strategies but in slightly different ways. The following describes the most common processes and strategies that were used by these participants, and are classified into themes under which a description of one or more planning strategies is given. These include: Goal setting (for planning) based on audience, topic/genre, and purpose of writing, deep (detailed) vs. surface (brief) planning, global vs. local planning, advance vs. recursive planning, length of planning and pausing behaviours. The last two elements are common features that characterised the participants’ writing processes, in general (not only planning), and, therefore, they will be examined at the end of the three stages of the writing process.

**Goal Setting for Planning (based on Audience, Topic/Genre, and Purpose of Writing)**

Goal setting is considered as an important strategy used by expert writers. Setting a goal for audience and purpose of writing is one of the fundamental skills a student writer should possess in dealing with academic writing situations. It determines the writer’s relationship with
the reader as well as her/his level of awareness about the genre, purpose, and knowledge of the topic.

In the participants’ protocols, it was observed that the high-achievers were more skilful and aware about setting goals for their planning processes, taking into consideration their selected topic/genre, purpose of writing and audience expectations. Based on these goals, these writers made decisions related to content, organization, and the language and style of writing. The latter refer to academic register, formal language forms and structures, and objective style. An instance about one of the high-achiever’s reference to the purpose writing and audience (i.e., considering the reader’s feedback and/or reaction towards the text) is given below. Thus, while thinking aloud, he stated:

… Because I think… as much as the writer [sticks] to his topic as much as he attracts the readers’ attentions… at least reading or listening from… from the audience.

He added, as he evaluated and explained the benefits of including a concluding sentence in paragraphs in establishing a connection with the reader, “I think that as [we] write the concluding sentence … [we] direct the understanding of the readers”. The latter demonstrates the level of audience awareness, among the high-achievers, and how they manipulate their knowledge about the topic, genre, and purpose of writing in relation to audience needs and expectations.

Unlike the high-achieving participants, the average- and low-achievers took into consideration some of the above-mentioned aspects and neglected others. Thus, as they thought aloud, they referred to the topic/genre and purpose of writing at the beginning of the stage as they selected the topic, but did not refer to audience throughout the whole process of writing. The average-achiever demonstrated more awareness about the purpose and genre, compared to
the low-achiever, whose writing goals were expressed in a superficial unclear manner. Their ignorance of the reader’s expectations affected, in a way, their decisions about other aspects of writing, mainly in relation to vocabulary choice and the use of academic style of writing. This was observed mainly in the low-achiever’s writing, which showed in some instances the use of the native (Arabic) or foreign (French) language, expressed explicitly or implicitly through meaning. The latter refers to the writer’s inability to retrieve or use academic vocabulary because of a low proficiency level in the latter, or because she ignores that academic writing requires the use of an academic register, specific to the topic, genre, purpose, and audience. An example about her style appears in the following extract, taken from the drafting stage of her verbal protocol (hesitations and some repeated words or interjections are deleted and substituted with ellipsis).

I’m thinking about… the causes … I know that … the person when… he has a lot of problems … he … he go directly to … to smoking … and … in our country especially for men … and … for young … children … they … when… the young children used to smoke …for them … it’s the … it is the… the way of being a man…

**Advanced vs. Recursive Planning**

Regarding the nature of the participants’ planning processes, a combination of advance and recursive planning was used, but in varying degrees and ways. Advance planning refers to the planning processes that writers go through before composing. It is also referred to as the bottom-up processes. Recursive planning refers to planning that occurs throughout the whole process of writing, where student writers plan, compose, then plan again, by making modifications on their previous plans, and the process goes on until they finish writing. It applies also to composing and revision.
According to the protocols, the four participants demonstrated an abundant use of advance planning, regardless of the amount of planning that took place. However, the high achiever participants were observed to have continued planning and organizing their thoughts as they composed. That is to say, they used both advanced and recursive planning. In more concrete terms, and as it was examined in one of the high-achiever’s protocol, during the process of planning, the participant devoted sufficient effort and time to her planning, starting with a general plan, under the form of brainstormed lists of ideas/ sentences, then, she developed them into a detailed outline. By respecting the structure of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion), she provided a structured outline for each separate paragraph (topic sentence, supporting details, concluding sentence). During the process of brainstorming, outlining and organizing ideas, the participant went forward and backward, consulting sometimes her previous brainstormed lists of ideas and, at times, remembering other ideas. For example, she was developing further ideas for her outline, she remembered other details that she had to include in a previous paragraph. Thus, she thought aloud:

... Supporting details... for example, one who lives in Canada can see and talk to his family... not family... to his relatives in Algeria through internet... through using facebook and skype... I remembered another detail... I should put it in the first paragraph... it... it offers courses in many domains, example, cooking ... yes, I return to... my paragraph... through skype... yes... I’ll try to add another detail... concluding sentence... restating... the topic sentence... now conclusion... I will write three paragraphs... summarizing the effects... ok, I finished planning.

Similarly, the average achiever devoted sufficient time and effort to planning and focused more on advance planning, following almost the same steps and strategies as the high-achievers, but in a slow, steady and linear manner, and with long pauses, at times. The low-achiever, however, devoted very little effort and time for advance planning, with very rare instances of
recursive processes. Although she went through brainstorming and outlining as the other participants, her planning was brief, with a few details.

**Deep vs. Surface Planning**

As far as the nature and depth of planning, the verbal protocols revealed that the two high-achieving participants demonstrated a mastery of a variety of skills and strategies while planning their essays, focusing more on the *deep level analysis* of the topic and the ideas while generating them. Thus, before deciding on which topic to write about, they analysed the topics carefully. The decision was based, not on their personal preference only, but was much more on the organizational pattern and the amount of information and knowledge they had about the selected topic. The average- and low-achievers, on the other hand, went briefly through surface levels of idea generation and outlining, devoting almost no importance to the analysis of the topics suggested, which is an important aspect in *goal-setting* and *decision-making* in writing.

In the process of outlining, the average- and low-achievers used the *listing* and *mapping* strategies while *brainstorming* ideas for their selected topics. The former (average-achiever) used both strategies (listing and mapping), repeating the same process twice, with minor modifications at the level of organization of ideas, while the latter went very briefly through mapping scattered key words, with a few details. In contrast, the high-achievers used the *listing* strategy, taking into consideration the pattern of organization (e.g., cause-effect), and explaining the purpose behind each choice or decision they made. *Decision-making* was rarely considered by the average and low-achievers. The following is an extract from one of the high-achiever’s analysis/ description of the *brainstorming* strategy he used and the purpose behind his decision. Thus, he explains:
... It helps me [so] much in... planning… in generating the ideas… I can tick the ideas and the phrases and even the expressions or the words that I think… are appropriate… it helps me [so] much in [the] planning and… organization of ideas as well.

Likewise, the second high-achiever participant showed an awareness of goal setting related to the topic and genre of writing, as it is shown in the following extract.

I think that I will choose the second topic… discuss the effects of the internet on your civilization. It will be … yes a cause and effect essay… it will focus on the causes [and] the effects of the internet… I think I have information … also it will be focused on the effects… it will be easy… easier I mean… also internet is a very known topic and it has many effects… on all the civilizations, not only mine… so, I will choose the topic…

The two extracts explain the level of awareness of both high-achievers in selecting the topics, identifying the genre and deciding on the essay organizational pattern (e.g., cause-effect relationship), as well as selecting the most appropriate strategies that fit into a given purpose. Decision making for them appears to be an important strategy that guides them throughout the planning processes.

The third extract is quoted from the low-achiever’s protocol about the selection of the topic. Unlike the high-achievers, this participant was very brief in referring to the selected topic and genre, and she seemed to have picked a common, easy-to-develop topic.

... I have chosen the... the topic eh which is about ... cause (ing) and effect… about smoking… I will try to find some … some ideas about it… I will eh start eh brainstorming … and I will choose … the method of eh… of mapping because it’s very easy…

In addition, in the process of generating ideas, the high-achievers were analytical and good manipulators of the knowledge they had about the topics. Their deep analysis of the generated ideas was based on a close understanding and mastery of the selected topic. Despite the fact that the participants developed two different topics, they both tried to assess the
importance and strength of their ideas as they generated them. Moreover, they made an effective use of their short-term memory as they proceeded throughout the pre-writing stage of writing. In doing so, they often referred to the previously generated ideas and connected them cohesively with those they were thinking about as they thought aloud.

The average- and low-achievers, on the other hand, generated interesting ideas about the selected topics, but had insufficient and low-order analytical skills. This was observed through the long pauses and hesitations they made while thinking, and questioning about information, structure, or the way to express the intended meaning in the target language. The following is an extract from the brainstorming and planning stage of the average-achiever.

To practise eh… another … eh different… practise … practise different… different skills, such as having eh… eh… practise sport or… having eh… how to say? Having… examinations… and … eh… having… How to say it? That… eh… many schools… do… do… eh… do… How to say it? How? I want to say eh having school eh… make an opportunity to have … to have eh… How to say it … in English? How to say it in English?

The above-quoted extract shows that during the generation of ideas, the participant made hesitations frequently and was often questioning about the way to express an idea, expression, or word. This was often the case during the whole stage of planning.

To sum up, although the four participant writers used a few common planning strategies, such as brainstorming, goal-setting (in differing ways), and advance planning, the way they manipulated the different strategies and the way they proceeded throughout the planning stage differed considerably, mainly at the level of analysis, thinking, and the evaluation of ideas. They also demonstrated differences at the level of strategy awareness.
**General vs. Local Planning**

This dichotomy of planning strategies is very common among expert writers. General planning refers to the organization of thoughts and the decisions a student writer makes to proceed to the next idea, step, task, or stage. Local planning, on the other hand, refers to the decisions s/he makes about what to write or do next. Local planning is also known as goal setting. Examples about the latter include, but are not limited to: goal setting related to content (generation of ideas), structure, word choice, strategy use, and pattern of organization.

According to their verbal protocols, the four participants planned in slightly different ways. The high-achieving writers planned more strategically at both local and general levels and were more aware of how to proceed to the next step (s), using appropriate strategies. They also demonstrated awareness of the benefits of each strategy they used. For instance, in referring to the next step through which one of the high-achievers proceeded, he explained clearly the purpose as well as the benefits of the listing strategy in brainstorming as he stated:

So I would like to mention here the listing technique in the brainstorming… since it helps me [so] much in … planning … generating the ideas and … organization of ideas...

Similarly, the other high-achiever used both global and local planning as she started the planning process. In doing so, she referred, first, to the general plan (starting from an introduction) that she was going to follow in writing a detailed outline of her essay, and, then, she proceeded to mention the next steps (e.g., introductory sentences), then she stopped at the step where she was going to start at the moment of verbalizing, i.e., writing the thesis statement of her essay (local planning). Thus, she stated:

So, I will start planning… introduction… I should start with introductory sentences… I should write two or three sentences about… technology… to introdu [ce] …technology and its role. … in society… in life… then I should hint to the internet… then, I should write my
thesis statement… I will say that Internet has many effects on people … no… I will say…. say that the internet …. internet has affected many fields in our life … such as learning… such as learning our social habits and… and it … it gave a solution to many troubles that could face us… of course I may ma[ke] changes…

The above extract demonstrate that the participant is aware of every step she was going to proceed to, including the possibility to incorporate modifications on the thesis statement at a later stage, because she considered it as an important part of her essay. She combined both general and local planning (goal setting), in a systematic, logical, and smooth way.

In comparison to the high-achieving participants, the average- and low-achievers also used local and general planning, but they demonstrated a limited level of awareness about the strategies they used. In more concrete terms, these participants proceeded through the different steps of planning smoothly, but in a slow manner and with a lot of hesitations and long pauses. They set goals for content generation and strategy use, but they rarely did for word choice, structure, and organization (e.g., sentence, paragraph, or overall essay organization). The following is an extract of an average-achiever's local planning. She referred to the brainstorming strategy (i.e., composing a list of complete sentences) that she used previously, then, proceeded to rereading the generated sentences, followed by composing a thesis statement for the introduction and, at the end, she referred to essay structure (number of paragraphs) and the pattern of organization (cause-effect relationship), including the focus of her essay (causes). In doing so, she thought aloud:

I wrote my brainstorming as sentences… I will reread them… people go to school for several reasons for many years all over the world… first, what I’m going to say in my introduction and … I will choose a thesis statement… then… in the body… I’m going to write… three paragraphs… three paragraphs are going to be about the causes … the reasons why people attending school… So, I’m going to focus on the causes…
The student writer referred to the overall organization of the essay in the sense that she planned to devote ‘three paragraphs’ for the body of the essay, with a focus on the ‘causes’ or ‘reasons’ in a cause-effect essay genre. She referred to paragraph division in a logical way, whereby she would discuss one main reason in each single paragraph. Likewise, the low-achiever used local planning, referring, or rather hinting, to essay structure and the pattern of organization, but in an unclear way. Thus, she stated:

I will start … planning my … my topic… I will start with … introduction… (long pause) … I want to say that … the smoking cigarette is really harmful to health… it can never … it can never be good for … for the persons… I will … start with … thesis statement… I want to say that … the main purpose … of my essay is the … to … to discuss about three … I know… that cigarette … contains a lot of … a lot of … dangerous … effects… but I will … discuss about three dangerous … effects and … which are …

A careful examination of the above protocol suggests that although the participant hinted to the purpose of her essay, its structure and organizational pattern, as well as the thesis statement, none of these were stated clearly. The verbalizer made a lot of hesitations, interjections (deleted), and long pauses, which imply that she had a lack of focus while thinking or writing.

In brief, although the four participants demonstrated differences in the use of strategies at the local level of planning, they seemed to have proceeded through the major steps and set goals for the overall paragraph and essay organization in quite similar ways (at the global level).

4.6.2. **Composing Processes and Strategies of High-, Average-, and Low-achievers**

During this stage of the writing process, expert writers usually go through a number of processes and use a variety of strategies to elaborate on their previously generated ideas and, then, organize them into coherent, logical, and meaningful sentences and paragraphs. The
following is a description of some of the processes and strategies that were used by the four participants, and the differences and similarities they displayed.

**Goal Setting (based on Content, Organization, and Purpose of Writing)**

Goal setting is a strategy used in almost every single step, activity and stage during the writing process. As in planning, the participants set goals for composing, generating ideas, organizing them, and deciding on a given structure of a sentence, paragraph, or essay. Setting goals is also related to strategy use, word choice, and other aspects of writing that involve decision making during the composing process (e.g., grammar use, use of cohesive devices, and marking punctuation).

In their protocols, the four participants displayed different skills and ways in which they set goals for particular tasks or strategy use. The following extract shows an example of goal setting and decision making regarding some what steps the writer will follow right at the beginning of drafting (composing), such as consulting the plan again to check her previously generated ideas and the order she would follow to organize her ideas. Thus, she explained:

The next step is drafting… I will write the first draft after planning and brainstorming… I’ll try to follow my plan, but of course I will make some changes… I will start with the introduction… I have planned that I will in the introductory sentences talk about technology and its role in life and … so, I will say that technology… I will say nowadays, technology has… has influenced many… influenced our lives…

In setting goals for the drafting stage, the participant referred to some of the steps she would follow next and she set goals for content; i.e., what she would include in the introductory sentences of the essay (introduction). Another example from the other high-achieving participant, in as far as goal setting for composing is concerned, is quoted below. The participant used goal setting throughout the composing processes, where he explained explicitly the next
steps that he was going to proceed through as well as his decisions related to content (i.e., what to include in each sentence, paragraph, or part of the essay), organization (e.g., essay/paragraph/sentence structure, organizational patterns, and cohesive ties), and language use (decisions related to what grammatical structure/form to use, vocabulary choice, and syntactic structures).

So, I would like to… I’m going to start … to write the first draft of the essay… so before starting writing the introduction, I think [I] should find something that attracts the attention of the reader … I think that… expression or… it is as if it is ambiguous or it’s … it’s a proverb… or an example or a quotation… or something that attracts the reader … So I’d like to start with something like this… work preserves dignity… Then I would like to have a link or a bridge with my topic and then after introducing the topic … I would like to write down the thesis statement …

The above extract reveals that the participant was clearly aware of what he was going to write (content) and how he was going to proceed through each step during his composing processes. For example, he explained every step he was going to go through before he started writing an introduction to his essay. In doing so, he mentioned the importance of attracting the attention of the reader, using an attention grabber, and linking it to the topic of the essay. He also considered writing a thesis statement before proceeding to write introductory sentences to his essay. These strategic steps and explanatory procedures demonstrate a high level of skilfulness of the writer in setting clear goals for his writing, in general, and composing, in particular.

Like the two high-achievers, the average-achiever also set goals for composing, based on content and structure. However, her goals were sometimes unclear, or misleading because she engaged in a particular behaviour, such as writing a sentence (s), and then she suddenly referred to another goal, without specifying whether it referred to a previous or following step or task. The following protocol illustrates the fact.
The fourth step is drafting… so, I’m going to start with my introduction… so… I may say that… since … How to say that? … knowledge and wisdom are becoming more and more important… so… knowledge and wisdom … are becoming more and more… more important and … vital … to develop and sustain … sustain society… full stop. The most common way to learn is to go to school… go to school… comma…

The protocol reveals how the participant set a goal for drafting, starting with an introduction; then, she immediately started drafting (writing) her ideas. After that, she set another goal for writing a thesis statement, as it appears, below, in the second part of the protocol; however, and without composing or, at least, reading aloud the thesis statement, she made a judgement (assessment) about it, and then she stated that she often had difficulties in writing a thesis statement, and finally she carried on composing. Thus, she thought aloud:

I’m going to write my thesis statement….I find it… somehow long, but I… I … think to write… I think it’s so good the thesis statement … I usually have … difficulties writing my thesis statement[s]… yes… school… no… full stop is better…

Thus, although the average-achiever seemed to have set goals for her composing processes, in general, she demonstrated a sense of ambiguity and an unorganized shift from one step/ task to another, which is probably related to a limited level of awareness and experience in writing. The latter can be seen in her statement: “I usually have … difficulties writing my thesis statement[s]”.

The low-achiever, also, demonstrated a limited level of awareness in setting goals for her writing processes in general, and composing, in particular.

… Then I will … start … my first draft… I … have done … I have done … my brainstorming… with the method of mapping and … I have done also my plan … I will … I will … I don’t know how to… (long pause) … I will start … drafting… (pause)… I will follow … the… the same … order… (pause) … which I done it before in my plan… so I will start with … with … introduction…
… I will talk about … the smokers themselves and … the effect of smokers on non-smokers person and … and … the … effect of smokers on finance of the family… and … also… I will … I will deal with … some causes …. (long pause)… and … smoking cigarettes is very dangerous and very … harmful …

Thus, like the average achiever, the low-achieving participant displayed a lot of hesitations while setting goals for her composing processes, some of which were unclear and others were interrupted with other behaviours. In the first extract, she seemed to have set a goal for drafting (I will start my first draft) and then, she interrupted it by mentioning what she did before; i.e., the steps/ tasks she had gone through before starting drafting, … then, she carried on listing the previous steps/ tasks (e.g., planning), and, finally, decided to carry on, but not knowing how to proceed (I don’t know how to… ), followed by a long pause … after that, she started over, by referring to the next step that she mentioned earlier, i.e., starting drafting.

In short, goal setting was used by the four participants, during their composing processes; yet, the high-achievers used it more abundantly and, most importantly, in a more effective way, compared to the average- and low-achievers. The latter were sometimes confused and unaware of their writing goals, mainly in relation to audience needs, content generation, and strategy use.

**Organization and Awareness about Organizational Skills**

Although organization is an important aspect of planning, it is included under this sub-heading (composing processes and strategies) because most of the organizational skills are used during the composing stage of the writing process. In other words, as writers compose and generate content, they use different skills and strategies to combine their ideas into coherent sentences, paragraphs and essays. They also decide on particular patterns that are based on the topic, genre, and purpose of writing. For example, a cause-effect genre of academic writing may
take different organizational patterns, such as the block and chain methods. Therefore, it is worth discussing these aspects of organization within the process of composing.

Various aspects of similarity at the level of organization were observed among the four participants, but with varying ways of approaching and manipulating the tasks. In more concrete terms, the protocols revealed that, in general, the four participants have respected the layout of the essay, with its different parts (introduction, body, and conclusion) and the structure and components of each paragraph, but they demonstrated differences at the level of awareness, the depth of content analysis, and the manipulation of the strategies they used while composing and organizing their ideas. In this regard, the two high-achievers showed a higher level of awareness and master of organizational skills. This was observed in the ways in which they selected appropriate organizational patterns, suitable to their respective topics, purposes and genre (s) of writing. This was expressed explicitly in one of the high-achiever’s protocol as he showed concern about the structure and content of the thesis statement, which is an important part of the introduction that constitutes the purpose of writing. The participant was referring to the pattern of organization that, he thought, should be embedded in the thesis statement, where the purpose is expressed clearly and with focus.

So I think I would like to say… even inside the thesis statement I should have a link between the causes and effects.

In addition, despite the fact that the four participants had some aspects in common related to the overall organization, mainly essay and paragraph structure, the high-achievers demonstrated more knowledge and awareness about the deeper aspects of organization. The latter is observed in the way one of the participant writers explained the focus of his topic in
terms of the plan or pattern of organization that is appropriate to the topic and purpose of the essay. To quote the writer:

So I would like to develop it by starting... by focusing much more ... using block method ... where I’m going to focus on on the causes rather than the effects since the effects... seem to me less than the causes...

The other high-achiever, also, referred to the purpose and pattern/ genre of organization (cause-effect essay) in such a way that she explained the overall organization of the essay, including the number of paragraphs, before she started generating (composing) more details for her topic. She also referred to the use of transitions to express the cause-effect relationship, which is an important aspect of organization. Thus, she states:

So ... this essay will be a cause and effect essay... so I will discuss [on] the effects... I will discuss [each effect] in a paragraph... my essay should contain an introduction, a body ... of two or three paragraphs ... three or more... [and a] conclusion. I should use transitions ... that express effects to organize my essay...

Another instance, from the same participant, about internal organization is given in the following extract:

Now, the second paragraph... I will use which conjunction... I will use moreover ... moreover or furthermore... or therefore... I will use moreover... no... as another effect, yes... as another effect... the internet changed many social habits in societies... societies not the civilizations...

An examination of the above example shows how carefully the high-achiever selected the appropriate transition as she moves from one paragraph to another, depending on the meaning/idea she intended to add. In addition, she demonstrated a high academic level of vocabulary choice, despite the hesitation she made while trying to make her decision/choice.
The average- and low-achievers, on the other hand, did not refer to the deep level aspects of organization; rather, they focused on the general organization that they followed in relation to the topics of their essays. This indicates that although these participants seem to possess prior knowledge about essay organization, they demonstrated a lower level of awareness about the patterns (e.g., block, chain, or point by point pattern) of essay organization and their appropriateness in relation to the selected topic. This feature was particularly observed in the low-achiever’s protocol, which shows that the participant used their organizational skills in a rather unconscious way, without explicitly referring to them.

In brief, unlike the high-achieving participants, the average- and low-achievers displayed a limited capacity of analysis and awareness of the different organizational aspects related to paragraph and sentence levels, as well as the cohesive relationships among and between sentences and paragraphs.

*Depth of Analysis: Analysis of Ideas and Use of Appropriate Language of Analysis*

During the process of composing, the main aspects that student writers have to consider are the analysis and organization of ideas. The latter is discussed, above, with reference to essay organizational patterns, which are mainly related to the purpose and genre of writing. As for the depth of analysis, it refers to the writer’s skills in explaining, analysing, and presenting ideas in a logical convincing manner, using a language that is appropriate to the topic, genre, and purpose of writing and that responds to audience expectations. Analysing ideas entail elaborating on the main ideas or topic with more details, examples, and other illustrations such as graphs or statistics. Likewise, analysis requires a convincing style that is objective and formal; yet it has to reflect the writer’s voice.
An examination of the think-aloud protocols revealed that the participants possess different analytical skills and used them in varying ways. Some of them went deeper in analysing their topics/ ideas, while others were in a way superficial and/or displayed low ability analytical skills. In more concrete terms, an observation of the average- and low-achievers’ protocols showed that the composing process, for them, was in a way brief, during which they connected the ideas or sentences they generated previously, during the planning (pre-writing) stage, and organized them into paragraphs, taking into consideration essay and paragraph structure, but they did not elaborate sufficiently on their previously brainstormed ideas or evaluate the content they generated.

Thus, although some differences were observed between the average- and low-achievers, most of which consisted of the choice of vocabulary and organizational skills, mainly the use of appropriate cohesive ties, both of them demonstrated limited analytical skills. There were very few instances where they evaluated content, explained or interpreted the meaning of words, expressions, or sentences. They also used very few or no illustrations and other skills to make an idea clear and convincing. Some of the few instances where both participants analysed content or questioned about meaning or explained a word or an idea are given below, for illustration. For example, the average-achiever explained her choice of a term in relation to the topic as follows:

The fourth step is drafting … so, I’m going to start with my introduction… so… I may say that…since … How to say that? … knowledge and wisdom are becoming more and more important (utterance repeated over four times) … vital to develop… to develop and sustain … sustain society… sustain society… full stop. The most common way to learn is to go to school… go to school… comma… I’m going to write my thesis statement…. I find its… somehow long, but I… I think it’s so good the thesis statement … School is the basic… foundation… It gives the chance to children… why I said the children… because … since are… since our young… young age, we go… we must go to school. …
The average-achiever used goal setting for drafting, referring to the main component of an introduction, the thesis statement, and she started generating ideas, but it was more about reading the previously generated ideas, in the pre-writing stage. She made hesitations and pauses in a repeated manner, which explains her limited skills in elaboration and analysis of ideas. Thus, she rarely analysed content, rather she relied on the ideas she generated in the previous stage (pre-writing). Thus, according to the above protocol, her analysis appears as she questioned about the use of a particular term, then she explained her choice, as in: “School is the basic... foundation... it gives the chance to children... why I said the children... because ... since our young... young age, we go... to school”. Another example about content analysis is when the participant started writing a topic sentence for her first paragraph.

I’m going to write ... my topic sentence ... firstly, attending... comma... attending school gives people the chance to meet new friends... full stop... (long pause) meeting new people and socialization... socialization also broadens ... broadens... human parameters of knowledge... it means that people when ... they learn together, they have... they will acquire knowledge in a better ah way....

As for the low-achiever, her protocol reveals that she was merely rewriting the previously generated ideas (in the pre-writing stage), rather than elaborating with more details. Her repeated hesitations (eh... em...) and unfinished utterances (words, phrases) is an indication of her limited knowledge about the topic, or a lack of details and analytical skills. The following example illustrates the fact.

I’m thinking about eh the causes ... eh ... I know that eh the person when eh he has a lot of problems ... he eh ... he go eh directly to ... to eh ... to smoking ... and eh ... and eh in our country especially for men ... eh and eh for young em children eh ... they em ... when eh when eh the young eh...the young eh children used to smoke eh... for them eh... it’s the ... it is the ... it is the...the way of being ... (long pause) ....
Unlike the average- and low-achievers, the high-achieving participants displayed good analytical skills as they composed, and they elaborated with more details on their previous ideas. In addition, they evaluated content in relation to the topic, purpose of writing, and audience needs. An instance from one high-achiever’s protocol shows that despite the repetitions he made, he made good use of his analytical skills and showed a high level of awareness in vocabulary choice that fits the context and purpose.

The underground of the economy in some countries because of… I’m I’m not going to generalize … not all countries are suffering from the underground of the economy… and then even the use of the verb … because I’m … I’m talking about the underground … one single thing… makes their companies … their companies incapable … incapable… because … I can’t say that … because capability… capability isn’t an … an inside … because… someone able is talk about … an inside ability… because there is two kind … internal ability and there is external ability but here capability is a mixture of both of them….

As he continued elaborating, he explained his ideas with a purpose of making them clear for the reader. He also evaluated his ideas in relation to length, which he thought was acceptable as long as it was clear for the reader.

… so … I’m going to explain in order to make the idea much … clear… so… in some countries… using new… machines reduces… in some countries using new machines… free factories from taxes and increases production … this idea it seems to me as if it’s too long, but I think it would be much clear and much better to say it in order to make the reader understand …

Similarly, the other high-achiever used various analytical skills related to vocabulary choice (e.g., choice of a transition to start a new paragraph), explaining content (ideas) and exemplifying so as to make the ideas clear. The following is an example of her protocol as she composed her first draft.
Therefore… moreover… I will use moreover… as another effect, … the internet changed many social habits in societies… societies not the civilizations… The internet shows … the traditions and the habits of… some nations… which may… influence the beliefs and customs … of other nations… for example, it shows the…. the practices….

In brief, the protocols of the four participants revealed important details about their composing skills, mainly in relation to their use of analytical skills while generating and evaluating the content generated, as well as in displaying organizational skills that fit into the intended purpose, topic and genre. The protocols also showed that although the four participants used different composing skills, the high-achievers demonstrated more effectiveness in using a variety of strategies, mainly those related to goal setting, organizational skills, and generating, analysing and evaluating ideas before, finally, deciding which ones to write.

4.6.3. Revision Processes and Strategies of High-, Average-, and Low-achievers

During this stage of writing, students often revise what they have written so far, in terms of content, organization, language use, and mechanics and form. The two last two elements are generally considered, by expert writers, as part of editing. Some student writers revise at the end of drafting, while others revise recursively. The latter category often revises while composing, and they edit once they finish their first drafts. Struggling writers, on the other hand, tend to leave revision until the end, but they often revise superficially, focusing more on editing for form and mechanics and neglecting substance.

As far as the study participants’ protocols are concerned, different styles of revision were observed among them. The following is a qualitative analysis of some major aspects that are considered important in the revision process. The focus of the analysis is on whether the four participants:

- Set goals for revision,
- Focused on substance or form,
- Are aware of the revision strategies and the importance of revision, and
- Made revision or simply improved the form of their drafts (rewriting).

**Goal Setting based on Revision**

In revision, as it is the case in other stages of writing, goal setting is an important and effective strategy that guides the student writers throughout the revision process. An absence of goal setting can lead to confusion and ineffective revision. Expert writers often set goals for revision by deciding on what aspects to revise, where to start, and how to proceed through. They also set goals for individual revision tasks and what revision strategies to use in order to facilitate the process of revision and make it more effectively.

An observation of the participants’ protocols showed that the four participants demonstrated some level of awareness about revision and they set goals based on different aspects. However, and unlike the average- and low-achievers, the high-achieving participants went deep in their revision processes, by setting goals to revise for content, organization, language use, and other aspects. Their revision was more strategic and effective, focusing on substance rather than form. In addition, they often referred to the purpose of writing, the topic, genre, as well as audience needs, which are among the major aspects of goal setting. The following protocol illustrates the goal setting strategy used by a high-achiever as he started the revision process.

… I think that generally speaking in that developing causes and effects either [we] choose … either [we] focus on the causes or on the effects … when [we] follow the block method as I am doing here, I am following the block method... I try to focus on the causes rather than on the effects... And even the nature of the topic requires that thing … and even while developing the cause and effect, [in] my opinion, I think that it should contain more than
two paragraphs at least… I can’t mention one paragraph for the causes and one paragraph for the effects… and even when developing point by point [essay], I should be more clear.

Compared to the high-achievers, the average and low-achieving participants also set goals for revision, but, in general, they focused on form rather than the deeper levels of revision. Their goals were limited to some aspects of language, such as, word choice and grammatical forms, and mechanics.

Revision based on Substance vs. Form (Editing)

In the revision process, student writers may focus on substance (e.g., content, organization, and language use) or on form (e.g., mechanics and format) or both. Skilled writers generally focus on the former and give the latter a lesser degree of importance as it does not affect the essence of the piece of writing. They rather consider formal aspects at the editing stage of writing.

As far as the high-, average-, and low-achievers of this study are concerned, it was observed from their protocols that the former focused more on substance than on form, especially at the initial stage of revision. Both high-achievers revised recursively and continued revision after they finished drafting. In other words, during their composing process, these two participants made changes at the level of content, organization, structure and language use. Later, they revised (edited) minor aspects, such as word choice, grammatical forms, and mechanics.

Unlike the high-achievers, the average- and low-achieving participants revised briefly, paying more attention to the surface aspects of writing, such as mechanics, grammatical forms and format. Their revision was more of a rewriting activity than an actual revision. The following example is an extract, from the average-achiever’s protocol, illustrates the fact.
.... my introduction... I find it that... ah... this is a good ... I'm not going to add or edit something.... so... Knowledge and wisdom are becoming more and more important... important and vital to develop... to develop and sustain.... and sustain society... full stop... The most common way to learn is to go to ... school... full stop... I usually didn't... ah... didn't... I usually didn't add or... add or omit in my revisions... so, I will write... I will write it ... the same... in the same way... school is the basic foundation of knowledge...

Awareness about Revision Strategies/ Importance of Revision

Revision is considered as an important stage in the writing process, even more important than the writing itself, as some experts pointed out. This is because they consider writing as revision. In other words, they believe that most writing takes place during the revision stage of the writing process. This implies that the first produced drafts are generally incomplete and imperfect and that real writing starts as the writer revises.

In observing the participants’ protocols, it was observed that the high-achievers demonstrated a higher level of awareness about the importance of revision in improving their drafts. They also showed an effective use of the revision strategies, in general, which indicates that they have a good knowledge about the effect of these strategies in facilitating the revision processes. An example about one of the high-achiever’s use of the revision strategies and his level of awareness about their use and importance is given below.

It’s the stage revision... what I’d prefer to write ... in the second draft ... I think it would be ... much better and to avoid some mistakes ... before starting writing the second draft, I would prefer to reread again what is written and look first at the shape... are paragraph much long... are they less long... the way of writing, and the vocabulary, and the grammar, the arrange... I am sure ... somehow sure about the arrangement of ideas but some irrelevant sentences and ... they might be here, so in fact I start reading again the introduction ...
Revision vs. Rewriting (Improving Handwriting and Format)

Revision is a process of modifying, adding, deleting content and improving organization, language and style, as well as formal aspects of a piece of writing. Skilled student writers go through major revisions to improve the quality of their writing and polish it until it becomes error free and up to the expectations of the intended reader. Struggling writers, however, often think that revision is improving the form of a piece of writing, or for some of them, improving handwriting and format.

What has been observed in the participants’ protocols regarding this aspect is that the high-achievers devoted sufficient time and effort to the act of revision, while the average- and low-achievers, focused on superficial aspects like editing for grammar and spelling. Their revision process was brief, especially the low-achiever, and it was mainly based on improving the form and handwriting (i.e., rewriting), rather than engaging in actual revision. For example, the following extract, quoted from the low-achiever’s protocol as she revised, shows that the verbalizer set a general goal for revision; then, she immediately started reading the first draft of her essay and rewriting it as a second draft. While reading, she referred to her inability to express an idea or word. She also referred to the focus of her essay, which was to discuss the effects of smoking. This was the only instance where the low-achiever mentioned the purpose of writing.

I will do my second draft … I will revise it … so smoking … smoking cigarette… (long pause) … smoking cigarette is harmful … smoking cigarette is harmful to health … that is … (pause) … that is warning … sentence which show I lack … cigarette … therefore … the effect of smoking on human’s life are serious … the main purpose is to discuss … three main effects of smoking … (pause) on human’s life … smokers’ health … non-smokers … living together … smokers’ and family finance … (pause) …

To sum up, the revision processes and strategies of the four participants varied in quality and use; therefore, in effectiveness. Thus, unlike the average- and low-achievers, the high-
achieving participants demonstrated a good mastery of the revision processes and used various strategies effectively, including, but not limited to, goal setting based on revision (for content, organization, language use, vocabulary choice, cohesion, coherence), goal setting based on purpose, audience needs, and strategy use, as well as other strategies related to the evaluation of content, addition, deletion, substitution of words, expressions, or full sentences (ideas), analysis of content, editing for mechanics and rewriting. Some of these strategies were also used by the average- and low-achievers, but in a less effective way.

4.6.4. Other Writing Behaviours: Length of Writing Processes and Pausing Behaviours

Length: Short vs. Long Periods of Planning, Composing, and Revision

Length of planning, composing, or revision refers to the amount of time spent in these stages of writing, which denotes whether the student writers have devoted sufficient effort and time for the latter, given that they have considerable benefits in the writing process.

The four participants’ protocols demonstrated some differences in terms of how much time and effort each of them devoted for the planning and revision processes as well as the speed of thinking aloud and writing that each writer demonstrated. The latter are aspects that can reveal the depth of thinking and analysis, use of planning and revision processes and strategies, as well as the level of awareness, among the participants, in relation to meta-knowledge (topic), strategies use, as well as the analytical and organizational skills pertinent to the intended writing purpose and genre.

A comparison between the high- and low-achieving participants has revealed important differences. Thus, compared to the low-achiever, the two high-achievers spent almost the double amount of time (30-40 minutes by HAs vs. 15-20 minutes by AA and LA) and effort in generating, outlining and organizing their essays, taking into account the analysis and assessment
of the generated content, the purpose and genre of writing, audience considerations (needs), as well as the strategies they used while they were engaged in the planning processes. Despite the fact that they treated two different topics and demonstrated some differences in the way (s) in which they processed their planning activities, the two high-achieving participants devoted sufficient time and effort for every step they made, including their choice and benefits of the strategies they used in completing the multi-tasks of mental and behavioural processes they went through during the planning stage of writing.

As far as revision is concerned, the two high-achievers devoted more time and effort to revise for substance, including revising for content and organization, and a lesser amount of effort for language and mechanics. This was observed as they revised during and after their composing processes. They revised more recursively, especially as far as content, vocabulary choice, and organization are concerned.

In contrast, the low-achiever spent a shorter time and a lesser amount of effort (mental and behavioural) in generating, outlining and organizing her ideas. Almost no instances were observed in relation to the analysis and evaluation of content, vocabulary choice, or the benefits of the strategies she used. According to her protocol, her ideas were, generally, generated and written immediately, without analysis or evaluation. She also appeared to make a lot of short and long pauses and hesitations, which is not valuable time spent on planning and generating ideas. This could only be interpreted as a lack of planning skills and a limited knowledge about the topic, which caused her long pauses and hesitations.

During her revision processes, she focused more on editing for mechanics and grammatical forms. Her post-composing processes were based on rewriting to improve the form
and mechanics rather than revising for content and organization. She relied on linear rather than recursive revision, but she barely she spent about ten (10) minutes editing and rewriting.

The average-achiever, on the other hand, demonstrated more commitment for planning than for revision (20-30 minutes vs. 10 minutes), and unlike the low-achiever, she demonstrated more awareness about her planning processes and goal-setting, giving sufficient time and effort for generating ideas, outlining and organizing her ideas. However, unlike the high-achievers, she performed her planning processes in a slow pace, making long pauses and hesitations. She also demonstrated lower skills in content analysis and goal setting compared to them, focusing more on generating ideas and local planning.

Similar to the low-achieving participant, the average-achiever’s revision was more linear than recursive and she devoted less time and effort for the revision processes, focusing more on editing for mechanics and rewriting than revising for substance. She made a lot of hesitations and long pauses, which may have affected the length of revision. She was like the low-achiever in her revision processes, in terms of length, effort, and nature of revision (i.e., linear vs. recursive).

In addition to the length of planning and revision, an important behaviour was observed in the think-aloud processes of the four participants: the speed of thinking, verbalized talk, and writing. The high-achievers were faster than the average- and low-achievers in many ways, despite the length of time spent in planning. The difference was not observed only in how fast the verbalizers were, but in the skills the former showed in manipulating the writing processes and strategies. In other words, unlike the average- and low-achievers, the high-achieving participants used high cognitive processes in generating, analysing, and assessing the information related to their respective topics, manipulating the organizational skills that are required in expository essay writing, and using the linguistic skills pertinent to the intended
purpose, genre, and audience (e.g., the choice of vocabulary, sentence structure, and grammar). They demonstrated a high level of meta-knowledge, related to their respective topics, the required analytical thinking skills, especially in relation to the topic, purpose and genre, and a good mastery over planning and organizational skills and strategies. During the process of performing these cognitive and behavioural tasks, their high speed level, though with varying degrees among both high-achievers, did not limit the time they devoted to every step, strategy, or task; rather, they displayed a deep level of thinking, analysis, and skill in manipulating the different writing (particularly, planning and revision) processes and strategies.

However, and unlike the high-achievers, the average- and low-achieving participants devoted less time and effort for the planning and revision processes, as mentioned above, and they demonstrated lower level skills of analysis and manipulation of the planning and revision strategies, despite the fact that they went through the major steps of planning and performed most of the tasks required in the planning stage of writing. Their slow performance did not hinder the completion of their writing activities, but it showed, through the protocols, that they often struggled with the generation and analysis of information related to their respective topics. They also showed a limited use and manipulation of the planning and revision strategies, mainly at the local level of planning, and they sometimes lost focus while thinking or writing. This was observed more often in the low-achiever’s protocols.

**Pausing Behaviours: Long vs. Short Pauses**

Pausing in thinking, verbalizing, or writing in think-aloud procedure is a natural behaviour that student writers, regardless of their level of performance, may use or experience as part of their writing processes. However, the frequency and length of pauses may differ among
individual student writers, depending on their writing skills and mastery of content and strategies.

By examining the verbal protocols of the four participants, it was observed that the average- and low-achieving participants used long pauses (of more than 10 seconds) and hesitations more frequently and at various levels during the planning and composing processes. These pauses were mainly the result of confusion, lack of information or lack of focus, rather than silent thinking. In contrast, both high-achievers demonstrated a more active thinking-aloud rather than silent thinking. This was mainly observed in the reading and rereading of previous ideas/ parts of a sentence while thinking and trying to connect new ideas to the pre-generated pieces of information. They sometimes made short pauses that did not exceed five (05) seconds, except for very rare instances where they paused longer for thinking.

In other words, the long pauses that were observed among the average- and low-achievers took place mainly during the process of generating ideas, which indicates that these pauses were due to either a lack of information about the topic (meta-knowledge) or a lack of analytical skills, focus, or again an ignorance of what to do next. For example, unlike the high-achievers, the average- and low-achieving participants demonstrated lower levels of awareness, mastery, and use of different skills and strategies, such as analysing and assessing previous information, linking (between ideas), goal-setting strategies (e.g., reference to vocabulary choice, sentence structure/ meaning, or cohesion; reference to topic, genre, or audience). They also showed a lower ability to generate more details in a limited amount of time. The high-achievers, on the other hand, showed a higher level of awareness about and manipulation of the information as well as the writing strategies and skills throughout the processes of thinking, analysis, organization, and revision.
4.7. Analysis of the Research Hypotheses in Relation to the Experimental Study Results

The hypotheses that were set for the experimental phase of this research were intended to test the effect of strategy training in enhancing students’ writing performance and their positive affect. To achieve this two-fold aim, three hypotheses were designed, numbered as H₄, H₅, and H₆, as a continuation to the three hypotheses that were set for the exploratory study of this research (i.e., H₁, H₂, and H₃). The following is a brief description of each hypothesis, followed by their respective null hypotheses, and an analysis in light of the results reached through the three instruments (post-test, post-questionnaire, and think-aloud procedure) of this phase of research.

Hypothesis Four (H₄): Students with trained strategy use perform better than those with no trained strategy use.

Null hypothesis (NH₄): There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with trained and those with no trained strategy use.

This hypothesis sought to examine the difference between the experimental group participants’ writing performance and that of the control group. To test this hypothesis, the results obtained from the post-test will be considered. In doing so, a comparison between the experimental and control group participants’ pre- and post-test results (scores) will be required. The comparison is conducted through the one-sample test, followed by a qualitative interpretation of the results.

According to the results obtained from the pre- and post-test results, important aspects of the participants’ writing performance were observed, both at the level of their overall performance (total scores) and its different aspects (sub-scores based on different criteria). The latter included the participants’ writing ability to write an academic essay (of an introduction, three body-paragraphs, and a conclusion), with a good mastery of its major aspects:
- Content development and variety of ideas and analytical skills,
- Overall paragraph and essay organization (including internal organization) and organizational skills based on the topic, purpose, and pattern of organization/genre,
- Language accuracy and fluency (grammar correctness, academic vocabulary use, and syntactic structures),
- Mechanics (correct use of punctuation and spelling), and
- The student’s engagement in the writing process; i.e., use of planning and revision strategies.

The analysis of the pre- and post-test results of each of the experimental (EG) and control (CG) groups has yielded important facts about their performance level. Unlike the CG, the EG participants have improved significantly after the training period, at the level of their overall writing performance and its different aspects. In other words, the degree of improvement was observed mainly at the level of content, organization, and language use (accuracy and fluency), and moderately average at the level of mechanics and the students’ engagement in the writing process.

In contrast, the CG participants, who received no writing strategy training, have not had any significant improvement, neither at the level of their overall writing performance nor at the level of its varying aspects. To explain this more concretely, it is worth referring to the statistical analysis of the results displayed below. Tables 72 and 73, below, display the total and sub-score means of the pre- and post-test results (i.e., writing performance) for the experimental and control groups, respectively.
Table 72
*Total and Sub-score Means of the Pre- and Post-tests for the Experimental Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>Writing Process</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>14.4033</td>
<td>12.8275</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>8.6921</td>
<td>54.7708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 73
*Total and Sub-score Means of the Pre- and Post-tests for the Control Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>Writing Process</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>13.8878</td>
<td>12.2222</td>
<td>6.777</td>
<td>7.9978</td>
<td>51.8889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the results displayed in both tables that there is a significant difference between the EG and CG participants’ writing performance level after the training period. For example, the total mean score of the EG performance has increased with almost 10 points in the post-training period (i.e., from 54.77 to 65.12), while the total mean score of the CG performance has decreased with 2 points (i.e., from 51.88 to 49.44). The same thing applies to the individual aspects of the writing performance.

It is therefore, possible to claim that the fourth hypothesis is confirmed, and its null counterpart (NH₄) is rejected. In other words, the students with trained strategy use (the experimental group) have achieved a better performance level, after training, than did those who received no strategy training (control group).

**Hypothesis Five (H₅): Students with positive affect perform better than those with negative affect.**

**Null hypothesis (NH₅): There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with positive affect and those with negative affect.**
This hypothesis aimed at examining the difference that may exist between the participants’ level of writing performance in comparison to their affect (writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy levels); it involves both EG and CG participants at the different study phases (pre- and post-training). Because this research investigated two affective factors (students’ English writing apprehension and their English writing self-efficacy levels), this hypothesis can be divided into two sub-hypotheses, $H_5 (a)$ and $H_5 (b)$, which can be stated as follows:

$H_5 (a)$: Students with low writing apprehension level perform better than those with high writing apprehension level.

$NH_5 (a)$: There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with low and those with high writing apprehension levels.

$H_5 (b)$: Students with high writing self-efficacy level perform better than those with low writing self-efficacy level.

$NH_5 (b)$: There is no difference at the level of writing performance between students with high and those with low writing self-efficacy levels.

To test this hypothesis ($H_5$), the results obtained from the pre- and post-tests as well as those obtained from the pre- and post-questionnaires will be considered. The procedure of comparison is conducted through *percentile analysis*, whereby the participants from both groups (EG and CG) are categorised into high-, average-, and low-achievers according to their writing performance level. Because the hypothesis refers mainly to the high- and low-achievers, the category of average-achievers will not be included here.

The following tables display the percentile analysis of the results, taking into consideration the high- and low-achievers from the experimental (EG), in both study phases (pre- and post-training). Each table displays the total mean value of the *test scores* (writing
performance) (pre- and post-training), the English writing apprehension (EWA) (pre- and post-training), and the English writing Self-efficacy (pre- and post-training), with its two categories (EWSE-1 and EWSE-2). Thus, Tables 74 (a) and 74 (b) display the results of the experimental group (EG) low- and high-achieving students’ pre-study results, respectively, referring to the total mean values of their writing performance level (test scores), their EWA level, and their EWSE-1 and EWSE-2 levels. Similarly, Tables 75 (a) and 75 (b) display the results of the EG low- and high-achieving students’ post-study results, respectively, referring to the total mean values of their writing performance level (test scores), their EWA level, and their EWSE-1 and EWSE-2 levels.

Table 74 (a)
Experimental Group Low-achieving Students’ Pre-study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Test Scores Total</th>
<th>Mean of EWA</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-1</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.1429</td>
<td>2.5952</td>
<td>2.6607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.1429</td>
<td>2.5952</td>
<td>2.6607</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.63678</td>
<td>.41786</td>
<td>.60257</td>
<td>.66261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 74 (b)
Experimental Group High-achieving Students’ Pre-study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Test Scores Total</th>
<th>Mean of EWA</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-1</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68.8889</td>
<td>2.5185</td>
<td>2.6528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>68.8889</td>
<td>2.5185</td>
<td>2.6528</td>
<td>3.6111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>9.47291</td>
<td>.32483</td>
<td>.51074</td>
<td>.560001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 75 (a)
*Experimental Group Low-achieving Students’ Post-study Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
<th>Mean of EWA</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-1</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>49.5625</td>
<td>1.8854</td>
<td>2.1563</td>
<td>3.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Deviation</strong></td>
<td>7.56136</td>
<td>.39825</td>
<td>.49439</td>
<td>.43095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 75 (b)
*Experimental Group High-achieving Students’ Post-study Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
<th>Mean of EWA</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-1</th>
<th>Mean of EWSE-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>80.8125</td>
<td>2.4583</td>
<td>2.7500</td>
<td>3.3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Deviation</strong></td>
<td>7.60609</td>
<td>.56519</td>
<td>.80456</td>
<td>.55016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the results displayed in the above tables indicates that, in the pre-study phase, both EG high- and low-achievers displayed a similar level of confidence in their English essay writing, which is relatively low in their EWSE-1 and above the average in their EWSE-2. However, in the post-training period, the former group (high-achievers), unlike their low-achieving peers, have demonstrated a relatively higher level of English writing self-efficacy, mainly in relation to their confidence level in English essay writing, in general, (EWSE-1).

As for the participants’ writing apprehension level, similar findings were found between the high- and low-achievers. Thus, in the pre-study period, both group categories had a relatively low-to-average level of apprehension, while after the training period, the high-achievers demonstrated a lower level of apprehension compared to the low-achievers. It is worth clarifying, here, that the EWA scale was reversed, as mentioned earlier in this chapter.
Therefore, the mean values tend to move in the opposite direction, i.e., from high (5=apprehensive) to low (1= not apprehensive).

To conclude, the high-achieving students’ affect level is higher (more positive), at the post-training period, compared to that of the low-achieving ones. This can be attributed to the positive effect of strategy training on the students’ affect level.

These results show that the fifth hypothesis (H₅), with its two categories, is confirmed to a moderate extent, mainly at the post-training phase. In other words, students with low writing apprehension level perform better than those with high apprehension level or, in other words, high-achievers are less apprehensive than low-achievers. Similarly, students with high writing self-efficacy level perform better than those with low writing self-efficacy level.

**Hypothesis six (H₆):** High-achieving students use writing strategies more effectively compared to low-achieving ones.

**Null hypothesis (NH₆):** There is no difference between high-achieving and low-achieving students in as far as their use of writing strategies is concerned.

The third hypothesis (H₆) of this phase of research sought to examine the differences in strategy use among the high- and low-achieving students. The latter correspond particularly to the experimental group participants. To explain this comparison, the results of the think-aloud protocol analysis will be considered. In this study, only four (04) verbal protocols were collected from two high-achievers, one average-achiever, and one low-achiever.

The analysis of the participants’ verbal protocols was conducted qualitatively, treating the different processes and strategies used, per stage (planning, composing and revising). In other words, the analysis considered the major processes and the most common strategies used by the
different participants. The focus was more on how effectively these strategies were used rather than on their amount and frequency.

Thus, from the detailed analysis conducted on the participants’ use of the writing processes and strategies, it was observed that there was a wide range of planning, composing and revision, including editing, strategies that were used by the four participants (high-, average, and low-achievers), but they differed in type and the way in which they were employed. The strategies used by the high-achievers were more purposeful and self-regulated, which was reflected through their awareness and skills they used in selecting appropriate strategies for a specific purpose/genre and at a specific stage of writing. However, the average- and, particularly, the low-achieving participants demonstrated a limited awareness and use of the writing strategies, mainly at the level of planning and revision. They also displayed a lack of analytical skills related, mainly, to content generation, evaluation, and organization.

In more concrete terms, the high-achievers devoted more time and effort to the deep level processes and used a combination of global and local planning strategies, deep analytical skills while composing, and a focus on the deep level revision, while the low-achiever focused more on the surface level processes and showed a limited level of awareness about the local planning strategies, analytical and evaluation skills. By way of illustration, the following protocol extract shows some instances where a high-achiever demonstrated an effective use of planning strategies, compared to the low-achiever.

So I think that I start from the focus then to the least important… then here the third idea… it would be about … about … bankrupt and banning… and banning economical crisis and the industry… So I always go back to the brainstorming phase in order to look and to get … and to get … and to get some ideas that gives me the hint to start … carry on…
Like the high-achiever, the low-achieving participant’s protocol shows that the latter set goals for planning based on the topic and purpose of writing. However, she appears to have limited skills in monitoring the knowledge about her topic as well as using the planning strategies more effectively.

I will eh start with eh thesis statement… ment … I want to say that eh … eh the main purpose eh…eh of my essay is the … to …to discuss about three … I know eh that cigarette eh contains a lot of a lot of eh…eh… a lot of em… dangerous eh… effects… but eh… but I will eh… I will eh discuss about three dangerous eh effects and …

The above example shows that the high-achiever highlighted the need to start from the most to the least important idea or sentence while planning. He also used recursive planning where he expressed the need to check his previously brainstormed ideas so as to carry on with the planning process. Thus, evaluating ideas, setting goals for organization, and using recursive planning were among the strategies used by the high-achiever, which shows his level of awareness about and ability to monitor the planning strategies effectively and purposefully.

In addition, the following extract shows a good example of how the high-achiever displayed a good use of analytical skills, compared to the low-achiever, whose composing processes consisted merely of combining the previously generated sentences or ideas and writing them down, rather than analysing and elaborating on them. The protocol shows that the high-achiever started composing his introduction, focusing most importantly on organization, based on the purpose and genre of writing, as well as on the quality of ideas generated during the planning stage of the writing process.

I think that the introduction gives me general ideas … about what I’m going to talk about in the body paragraphs… and here I think that the focus was much more on the causes rather than on the effects… I think… so I’d like to start to write the body paragraphs … so I think
the … the topic sentences I leave them as they are since they are going to introduce for me … but the concluding sentences in some cases I’ll restate them again…

Compared to the high-achiever, the low-achieving participant demonstrated a low level in as far as her composing processes are concerned, with a limited ability to use meta-knowledge and analytical skills. This shows through her protocol where she struggled with generating ideas, not knowing how to develop and analyse content related to her topic. This can be confirmed through her repeated use of short and long pauses, as it is shown in the following extract.

I will talk about eh … and also … (pause) … (pause) … the last eh … significant effect … effect is that eh … is that eh it affect eh their families finance … I will talk eh in general… eh because I don’t know what are eh the effect of economy … especially in our country … I will eh talk only about eh … eh the finance of the family… eh (pause)… (pause) eh…

Finally, an in relation to the participants’ revision processes, it is worth providing an example of a high-achiever’s revision strategy use as he set goals based on revision for substance (mainly content and organization) rather than form, and how he used critical skills in evaluating the previously generated content, in order to finally decide what to keep and what to change or modify. In the first extract, the student focused on revision based on essay and paragraph organization, with reference to the pattern of organization and the nature of the topic, while in the second protocol, he set a revision goal based on content, whereby he decided to rewrite a sentence because it was ambiguous.

… I think that generally speaking in that developing causes and effects either [we] choose … either [we] focus on the causes or on the effects … when [we] follow the block method as I am doing here, I am following the block method... I try to focus on the causes rather than on the effects... And even the nature of the topic requires that thing … and even while developing the cause and effect, [in] my opinion, I think that it should contain more than two paragraphs at least… I can’t mention one paragraph for the causes and
one paragraph for the effects… and even when developing point by point [essay], I should be more clear …

And then finally I think that [the] last idea talking about causes… working situations and problem between employers and employees increase dismissing of workers … and because … strikes and working conditions are difficult, working problems affect … it seems like… as if it’s not clear… so I’d like to rewrite it again… something ambiguous in the ideas … so I rewrite it again …

The average- and low-achievers focused on a few superficial aspects of revision, based on form rather than substance, and in most cases, they were simply rewriting their ideas, without adopting any revisions. The following is a sample from the average-achiever’s revision protocol, where she simply rewrites what she has produced in her previous draft, without adding or deleting anything, as she stated.

My introduction… I find it that… ah…this is a good… I’m not going to add or edit something…. so… knowledge and wisdom are becoming more and more important… important and vital to develop… to develop and sustain….and sustain society… full stop… The most common way to learn is to go to … school… full stop… I usually… don’t… I usually didn’t… ah…. didn’t… I usually didn’t add or… add or omit in my revisions…. so, I will write… I will write it … the same… in the same way…

Based on the protocol analysis, which highlighted the significant differences that exist between the high- and low-achieving participants in their use of the writing processes and strategies, whereby the former demonstrated a more effective use of strategies at the various stages of the writing process, the sixth research hypothesis is confirmed, and its null counterpart is rejected. In other words, it is confirmed through protocol analysis that high-achieving students use writing strategies more effectively compared to low-achieving ones.

In a nutshell, the results obtained in the experimental phase of the present research have confirmed, to a large extent, the three afore-mentioned hypotheses. Thus, the results obtained
from the post-test confirmed that (H₄) students with trained strategy use perform better than those with no strained strategy use. Similarly, the results obtained from the pre- and post-tests and the pre- and post-questionnaires confirmed, to a moderate extent, that (H₅) students with positive affect perform better than those with negative affect. Finally, the results of the think-aloud protocol analysis confirmed that (H₆) high-achieving students use the writing strategies more effectively than their low-achieving peers.

Conclusion

The analysis of the post-test, the post-questionnaire, and the think-aloud protocols has provided important findings about the present research. The post-test results demonstrated that the degree of improvement at the level of writing performance among the experimental group participants, compared to their peers in the control group, explains the effect of strategy training on the former. In addition, the post-questionnaire results have shown that writing strategy training has had a positive effect in decreasing the experimental group participants’ writing apprehension and increasing their writing self-efficacy levels, with varying degrees. Finally, the think-aloud protocol analysis has yielded important findings about the participants’ writing processes and strategy use and highlighted the differences, in strategy use, that exist among high-, average-, and low-achieving participants. These findings show proof of the positive effect of strategy training on their writing processes and strategy use.
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**Introduction**

Every research work has an aspect or more that contributes to the body of research in its particular field of specialty. The present research, which is both exploratory and experimental, has humbly reached significant findings, discussed in depth in the previous chapters. The first phase of the study was an exploration of the factors that were attributed to the students’ writing difficulties, which were found to be of a (meta-) cognitive nature, to a greater extent, and linguistic and affective, to a lesser degree. The second phase of the study, the design of which was based on the results of the former, has brought important findings about the effect of strategy training on enhancing the students’ writing performance and their positive affect.

This chapter highlights the major implications, which are much more based on the results of the experimental phase of this research, in relation to EFL writing instruction from different perspectives. In other words, it discusses the major practical aspects that are recommended for the teaching of writing in EFL settings. These include, but are not limited to, aspects related to instructional approaches, assessment methods, and aspects related to the learner and the learning environment. In addition to pedagogical implications, this chapter sheds light on some of the limitations that were partly found challenging, mainly at the level of methodology, and suggests some recommendations for further research.

**5.1. Writing Instruction in the EFL Context**

Teaching writing is one of the most challenging situations for any EFL instructor, especially in academic university settings. Thus, in addition to the complex nature of the writing skill, writing instructors have to carefully consider a number of important elements: the nature and components of the writing course (syllabus), the method (s) that is (are) effective and suitable to a given context, level, and learners’ needs, as well as the teaching of the writing
strategies, which depends on various other aspects, including, but not limited to, the learners’ writing ability level, their needs, as well as the writing task, skill (s), or stage of the process.

In this respect, it is believed that understanding the learners’ needs is a key element, upon which major decisions are based, in designing a writing course. Graham and Harris (2005), two experts in writing instruction and research, suggest that teaching writing, particularly to learners with difficulties, should be explicit and based on specific criteria, among which the learners’ needs are the focus of the course.

What follows is a description of some key aspects that are considered to be of paramount importance in the teaching of writing, mainly in an EFL setting, which is the context of the present research. Thus, adopting an appropriate approach to teaching writing, using effective methods of writing assessment and creating an encouraging atmosphere that values students’ learning differences are the most important aspects that are highlighted in this section.

5.1.1. Writing Strategy Instruction within the Process Approach Framework

There is no right or wrong strategy instruction method; yet, some methods can be more effective than others. In this research, the basic method that was adopted by the researcher (instructor) was partly based on the Graham and Harris (2005)’s Self-regulated Strategy Development Model (SRSD) that focuses on an explicit teaching of the writing strategies, mainly to learners with writing difficulties. In this study, the researcher adopted the model to an EFL setting, with consideration to the aims of the research, the participants’ profile (writing background level and their individual needs), as well as the nature of the writing course, i.e., one that responds to the requirement of university academic writing.
In doing so, the researcher designed each lesson, throughout the whole training period, following these basic stages; each of which with a given goal to achieve, a timeline to accomplish specific activities, and scaffolding practice. The writing process approach was considered to be the most appropriate for strategy training. In other words, the major stages (planning, composing, and revising) of the writing process were followed, whereby students proceeded through the various stages, using specific strategies. The major stages that were followed in strategy training are described below.

**Introducing the strategy & building strategy awareness**

The first stage consists of introducing the strategy to the students, taking into consideration the aim of the strategy, its benefits, and the way it is used effectively to achieve the goal set for it. In doing so, a writing instructor should highlight the importance of the given strategy, its nature, and how to monitor it during its execution. Building strategy awareness comes on top of instruction, because without it, the student writer may not use it effectively. Developing strategy awareness among the students may take time, particularly among struggling students. Therefore, it is important for the instructor to go through simple and explicit steps, while the students are learning to use the strategy.

**Modelling the strategy**

Modelling a strategy is the second step after building strategy awareness among the students. It may involve a few steps; however, in order to grasp it, repetition can be helpful for reluctant students. Modelling refers to explaining how a strategy works, followed by guidance and practice, as it is mentioned below in the third step. For example, many students are at a loss not knowing how to apply some revision strategies. An effective way to teach them is by modelling the strategy. Modelling the CDO revision strategy, which stands for compare,
diagnose, and operate (Graham & Harris, 2005), would be more effective if applied at the sentence level, by showing the student how to identify a problem, decide what to do to solve the problem or correct an error (s), and then operate or execute the revision, through deleting, substituting, reformulating, or modifying the written word, phrase, or sentence.

**Strategy use through practice**

After modelling the strategy, students can be guided by the instructor to use it. For an effective use of the strategy, practice should be based on the students’ needs, because the latter learn in different ways and at different paces. Practice can also take different forms. Thus, collaborative writing activities or pair-work can be more effective than individual work, for students with cognitive and/or affective difficulties. It may also include various types of activities, considering different writing genres and purposes.

**Assessing strategy use and its effectiveness**

Assessing strategy use and its effectiveness usually comes after some practice. It involves assigning individual work, whereby students are given writing tasks and are asked to use the strategy they have already learned and practiced before. This means that for a strategy to be assessed, it has to be practiced individually so as to observe and make sure that there is progress and an effective use of the strategy at the individual level. Assessment may take different forms and may be repeated if needed, especially, for the purpose of enhancing the strategy and developing autonomy among the student writers.

**Strategy transfer and further practice**

Once the students have mastered the strategy, the final stage is to guide them through other activities, stages of the writing process, as well as trying other genres so as to make an effective use of the strategy in different contexts and for different purposes. At this stage, the writing
instructor would make sure that the individual students are able to use the strategy effectively and for different purposes and genres.

This approach to teaching writing strategies is considered as an effective way to help students develop strategic competence. It is by teaching them explicitly that students can develop awareness about the importance and use of the writing strategies.

5.1.2. Explicit Instruction of the Planning and Revision Strategies

During the training sessions of the experimental phase of this research, the researcher followed the above five (5) stages, by integrating some within others, especially in as far as the planning and revision strategies are concerned.

Writing experts recommend that an explicit teaching of the planning and revision strategies to students, particularly the struggling ones, is very rewarding and beneficial (Graham and Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013; Yousun, 2008). In other words, an effective use of the planning and revision strategies help students considerably in the creation and organization of coherent writing, which suggests that the planning and revision processes that students engage in may affect positively on their writing. Thus, planning processes facilitate not only the mental and behavioural multi-tasks that students engage in, but also improve their written product at the level of organization and text quality.

Teaching planning and revision strategies enhances the writing quality and fluency in a considerable way, mainly at the level of text organization and fluency. Hence, planning and revision can affect positively on the process as well as the product of writing. When students plan and revise strategically, they develop organized and coherent pieces. In other words, an
effective use of the planning and revision strategies facilitates the processing and organization of ideas, which in turn, results in better writing quality.

5.2. Writing Assessment and Writing Progress: Focus on Formative Assessment

Assessing writing is an important part of an effective writing program. It ensures the learners’ progress through time. It is a dynamic process that takes place within learning. In assessing writing, different methods can be used; however, in order to integrate students’ assessment within the learning process, it is important to focus on formative assessment. The latter has been adopted with the development of the process approach and is described as an assessment that goes along instruction (Graham, MacArthur & Fitzgerald, 2013). This implies that this type of assessment does not only assess the learners’ writing skills at a given time of an academic year, but it tracks their progress and guides writing instructors to evaluate their teaching. The process is, then, two-fold, in that the learners’ writing progress is guided through regular assessment and the instruction is evaluated alongside through inquiry and self-evaluation.

In the process of writing instruction, formative assessment may consume a considerable amount of time and effort; however, it is considerably effective in promoting the students’ writing progress. It is generally monitored by the instructor with a focus on the process rather than the product. That is to say, emphasis is given to constructing meaning in writing, where purpose and audience are given importance, and that the final product of writing reflects the student’s personal as well as his/her academic value (Graham et al., 2013).

5.2.1. Encouraging Writing Portfolios

Under the umbrella of formative assessment, writing portfolios are among the most effective assessment tools that writing instructors can use to guide student writers throughout a given course of study. Considerable benefits can be gained if portfolios are encouraged in an
EFL writing class. Based on the experience of the study participants, i.e., during the experimental phase, using writing portfolios has enabled them to observe their own progress during the whole period of study. This strategy is based on a personal dialogue between the instructor and her/ his student writer, which highlights the areas of strength and weakness among the latter. The instructor’s role is to guide and monitor the individual students to achieve progress through time, by revising previous drafts and reflecting on their own experiences. Encouraging writing portfolios does not only help students develop their writing; it also helps them enhance their confidence level in writing and develop a positive motivation to write and take risks.

5.2.2. Conducting One-on-one Conferencing, Self- and Peer-evaluation

Like writing portfolios, one-on-one conferencing is a dialogue between a writing instructor and her/ his student writer. The dialogue can take different forms, but it is usually an oral conversation whereby a student can express her/ his concerns about writing and the teacher acts as a facilitator, guide, and advisor. S/ he offers constructive feedback on a regular basis, whenever it is required. Teacher conferencing can sometimes be a group work, and it may be effective for many students; however, many others find it more comfortable to discuss their writing problems with their instructor on an individual basis.

Similarly, self- and peer-evaluation are ways to help students develop their writing autonomy through time. It takes effort and guidance from both the instructor and the student writer, whereby the former acts as a facilitator and the latter learns to develop skills and strategies to achieve progress and develop their confidence level.

5.3. Students’ Affect: Dealing with Negative Affect in the Classroom

Based on the results of this research, mainly the experimental phase, which took students’ affective factors as an integral part of their progress in writing, it is important to consider this
aspect within the teaching-learning atmosphere, whereby students learn to write with enjoyment and motivation to develop their awareness of the writing skills and strategies.

In this respect, it was argued that motivation and strategy behaviour are closely associated with each other. It (motivation) also determines the amount of effort a student devotes to a given writing or academic task. It is then, a predictor of academic achievement (Graham, Macarthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013).

On the other hand, it is believed that one of the major sources of students’ negative affect is negative feedback (Abdellatif, 2007). This was one of the major aspects of writing apprehension that was found to account for a considerable number of the participants, in the present study. In other words, fear of (negative) evaluation was one major type of apprehension among students, which accounted for their writing difficulties. In order to enhance these students’ positive affect (i.e., increase their motivation, confidence, positive attitudes, and decrease their level of apprehension), it is important to teach them in a stress-free atmosphere and provide them with guidance and constructive formative feedback that would help them develop their autonomy and enhance their writing performance and positive affect.

5.4. Limitations of the study

Like any experimental or quasi-experimental research, which generally involves an intervention over a period of time, this study has encountered some challenges the results of which have created some limitations. The latter concern a few methodological issues, mainly in relation to the sample size and the sampling procedure in the experimental study phase.

As a matter of fact, at some point during the experimental phase of the study, an important issue was raised as a result of some participants’ withdrawal. The latter took place at the end of
the training period by some control group participants, who, despite their voluntary willingness to participate in the study, they withdrew at a critical period. In other words, these participants, together with the rest of the experimental study participants’, had enthusiastically taken the pre-training test and answered the pre-training questionnaire, and they expressed their commitment to complete the rest of the assigned tasks, by signing a consent form; however, some of them did not return the post-training questionnaire and a few others did not take the post-test, which has created a misbalance in the group, compared to the experimental group participants who completed all the tasks.

In more concrete terms, the number of participants (24) in the control group (CG) was, originally, equal to that of the experimental group (EG). They took part in the exploratory phase of the study with the rest of the sample. In other words, they were among the seventy three (73) students who sat the pre-training test and among those (127) who answered the pre-training questionnaire. However, only fourteen (14) among twenty four (24) have sat the post-training test, and only nine (09) of them have answered the post-training questionnaire. As a result, only nine (09) participants were considered, as a control group, for the experimental phase of the study, and the rest (withdrawals) were disregarded. This is because the CG was set for comparison purposes (i.e., comparison of the CG pre- and post-training results and those of the CG and EG in the same periods). Therefore, the participants’ withdrawal has minimized the sample size, which is considered as a limitation in this study.

It is worth noting, here, that the experimental phase of the study lasted for more than three months (twelve (12) weeks of training (with two sessions per week), excluding the tests and questionnaires’ intervals and the exams’ and holiday’s periods. This period may be considered to
be moderately long for some participants to lose interest, mainly those who did not take part in the training sessions; i.e., the control group participants.

Another limitation that was related to the methodology design consists of the sample type, which was selected for the experimental phase of the study. Thus, a random sample was selected for both groups (EG and CG), the reason for which was mainly based on the purpose of the experimentation. In other terms, the aim of training was to alleviate the participants’ writing difficulties and enhance their writing performance and positive affect; their difficulties were varied and were major for many of them. So, a random sample was more appropriate if considered from the participants’ perspective, in the sense that their varying needs required both collaborative activities and individual attention (in terms of feedback) throughout the different stages of training, which brought satisfactory results. From a technical perspective, however, a purposive sample would have facilitated the statistical analysis and the comparisons made between the pre-and post-training test results as well as the pre-and post-training questionnaire results for both groups (EG and CG). In addition, using a purposive sample would probably have revealed different results. In more concrete terms, a purposive sample would consist of a more homogeneous group (experimental), selected carefully with a purpose of meeting very specific needs of, for example, a low-achieving group of participants, instead of a randomized sample, which often displays different kinds and varying levels of writing difficulties.

5.5. Recommendations for further research

Based on the results reached in this research work and its implications for EFL writing instruction, a number of recommendations can be considered for further research, either as a
continuation to some of the aspects covered in this research or as a suggestion to treat them from different perspectives.

One major aspect that was investigated in the present research was the effect of strategy training on enhancing the writing performance and positive affect among EFL student writers. The focus of strategy training was mainly on teaching, explicitly, effective strategies, mainly of the (meta-) cognitive type(s) to facilitate, for them, the complex cognitive processes involved in planning, composing and revising their writing. The latter (i.e., strategy training) brought positive results in the sense that it enabled the participants to achieve more progress in their writing performance, at the process and the product levels. At the level of affect, on the other hand, the progress was fairly good for an average number of participants, who managed to gain more confidence in their writing and write with no fear of evaluation, which shows that strategy training had a positive effect on the participants’ affect level, though to a moderate extent. It is, however, important to clarify that there was no particular strategies that addressed the affective domain in an explicit straightforward manner except through collaborative writing activities, peer-assessment, and other types of assessment (such as one-on-one conferencing). The latter were strategies used, indirectly, to create a socio-affective atmosphere that would enhance positive affect among the participants; i.e., decrease their apprehension and increase their self-efficacy levels as well as develop positive attitudes and motivation to write in English.

In this regard, researchers (e.g., Abdellatif, 2007; Hurd, 2008; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Pajares & Johnson, 1994; Pajares & Valiante, 2002) who have investigated the learners’ affective domain, mainly within the context of ESL/ EFL writing, have emphasised that paying more attention to the learners’ affect would lead to more positive results on their learning achievement,
in general, and writing performance, in particular. Hence, if affective strategies are integrated within the process of writing (and other learning situations), more progress will be achieved at the level of the writing performance (process as well as product) and at the level of affect. The relationship between these variables (affective strategy training/use, writing performance, and affect level) is that of cause and effect.

Therefore, and for further research in this area, it is recommended to, empirically, investigate the effect (s) of implementing affective strategies on alleviating the students’ writing (and other learning) constraints, on the one hand, and promoting their awareness about the importance of using these (affective) strategies to enhance their writing performance and a higher level of positive affect, on the other. Affective strategies involve strategies that learners can use consciously and purposefully to ease an affective constraint (s) which they think would (or may have) inhibit (ed) their ability to perform a given task or overcome a situation. By integrating affective strategies in EFL writing programs, students would not only overcome the affective constraints (e.g., avoidance behaviour, fear of negative evaluation, and/ or low self-efficacy beliefs about their writing abilities) that they may encounter during their writing processes, they would also achieve a higher degree of progress and confidence in their writing, particularly at the level of strategy use, which would, in turn, develop in them a sense of autonomy in writing as well as other learning skills and situations.

In addition to the above recommendations, other suggestions can be insightful for further investigation, mainly through using the think-aloud procedure, with different (or larger) samples and by employing different analytical procedures. In the present study, the think-aloud procedure was a further instrument used, with a purposive sample, to confirm the results of the post-test and
(to) examine the effect of strategy training on the participants’ use of the writing strategies, in a qualitative way. In doing so, a comparison was conducted between four (04) participants, categorised as high-, average-, and low-achievers, with an aim to uncover the major differences between them in terms of strategy use. The qualitative analysis of the think-aloud protocols focused mainly on identifying the types of strategies the participants used and the way (s) in which they used them. If, on the other hand, the protocols are to be treated quantitatively, by integrating new variables such as the frequency (occurrence) of particular strategy (ies) use among the three categories of participants, the results would reveal other differences among them, especially if the analysis covers the different stages of the writing process (planning, composing, and revising).

Moreover, using a stratified sample, for example, with a larger size (e.g., three (or more) participants from each category) and combining a quantitative and qualitative analyses, would, most probably, reveal more satisfactory results, and provide data for a closer understanding of the underlying individual differences among participants of different writing performance levels and, most importantly, different users of the writing strategies. On the other hand, if a similar treatment is used with the control group, the comparison between the latter and the experimental group would provide more details on the differences, in terms of strategy use, between the participants from both groups (e.g., trained versus untrained) and among different writing performance levels (e.g., high- versus low-achievers).

**Conclusion**

This research has brought attention to some important instructional implications for EFL writing and research, the most important of which include setting clear goals to respond to
learners’ needs in a writing classroom, with an aim to enhance their performance and positive affect. The latter would be crucial in the absence of teacher training and development, needs analysis and a favourable atmosphere, where learners are aware of the learning outcomes of a given course of study and of the importance of developing writing autonomy and progress.

Although writing instruction is a challenging mission for most, if not all, EFL instructors, the real challenge is related to responding to the learners’ individual needs and finding more appropriate instructional methods to teach effective writing strategies that are specific to certain learners’ needs and differences. Achieving progress in writing is, hence, a process that goes through various stages, rather than an end goal of a writing instructor. It is a joint mission between the instructor and the learners, which can take place effectively if based on the latter’s needs and the formers’ proper guidance.
CONCLUSION

Writing for academic purposes in English as a foreign language is challenging to many undergraduate students, particularly to those who experience major writing difficulties. The latter tend to be related to academic essay writing development and organization, as well as to the inadequate use of the writing processes and strategies. These difficulties can be due to some factors, among many, which stand as obstacles against the progress of the students. These factors can be multi-faceted, including, but not limited to, the complex nature of the writing skills and processes, the inadequate writing instruction methods, and student-related factors. The latter was the focus of this research, the aim of which was: to explore the factors accounting for undergraduate students’ writing difficulties, and to investigate the effect of writing strategy training in enhancing their writing performance and positive affect. The study was, hence, both exploratory and experimental, and it was conducted at the level of the Setif 2 University English Department.

Based on the aims set for each phase of this study, two sets of hypotheses were designed. Thus, it was hypothesised that students’ writing difficulties can be attributed to cognitive, linguistic, and/or affective factors. It was also hypothesised that strategy training can have positive effects on these students’ writing performance and their affect; i.e.; decreasing their writing apprehension level and increasing their writing self-efficacy level.

To test these sets of hypotheses, a triangulation of methods was used, including a combination of instruments for the exploratory and the experimental phases of the study. The data collected were treated quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative and qualitative analysis revealed significant findings about the participants’ writing performance and affect levels prior to and at the end of the training period, the comparison of which showed significant differences.
between the experimental and control group participants’ in the mentioned variables, mainly at the level of their writing performance. In more concrete terms, the first set of hypotheses, which sought to prove whether the students’ writing difficulties were attributed to one/ or a combination of (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and/ or affective factors, was confirmed to a certain extent, and to a greater extent as far as the first sub-hypothesis is concerned; i.e., the one relating the students’ writing difficulties to (meta-) cognitive factors. The second set of hypotheses, investigating the effect of strategy training in promoting the participants’ writing performance and their affect, was also confirmed to a large extent. Thus, the comparison of the pre- and post-tests results of both the experimental and control groups has shown that the participants in the former group have improved considerably and with varying levels in their writing performance and affect, compared to the latter (hypothesis four). Moreover, the comparison between the high-achieving students’ and the low-achieving ones has shown that the former experienced more positive affect than did the latter (hypothesis five). That is to say, the high-achieving students experienced a lower level of writing apprehension and a higher level of writing self-efficacy compared to the low-achievers. Finally, the comparison between high- and low-achievers among the experimental group participants, through a think-aloud protocol analysis, has yielded that the former used the writing strategies more effectively than did the latter (hypothesis six). These findings reached in both the exploratory and experimental phases of the present research have led to the conclusion that explicit writing strategy training contributes more positively to the students’ writing development and progress if applied effectively and at a long-term level.

The findings of the exploratory phase of the present study have uncovered the major factors that accounted for the undergraduate students’ writing difficulties and set the grounds for the experimental phase, which had as an aim training the students through a course of study on
English essay writing. The focus of the latter was to explicitly teach these students to effectively use a variety of writing strategies in the process of planning, composing and revising their essays. The results of this training course and those obtained from the exploratory phase have yielded important implications for the teaching of EFL writing, mainly in university settings. These implications suggest that for an effective writing course to take place effectively, a combination of elements should be taken into consideration by EFL instructors.

First and foremost, it is important to take the learners’ needs and their individual differences seriously in the design of a writing syllabus and method(s) of instruction. In other words, understanding the learners’ needs is a key element upon which major decisions will be based on in designing a writing course (syllabus). In addition to their needs, students learn in different ways and paces, depending on their personality types. Therefore, it is important for writing instructors to take into consideration their individual differences and interests, which is a very important aspect that many writing instructors neglect. Thus, for learning to take place successfully, students need to be motivated and confident enough to juggle the multi-tasks required in the process of writing academic essays.

Second, and from a methodological perspective, it is recommended that teaching the writing skills and strategies explicitly is more rewarding to students in general, and those with writing difficulties, in particular. Thus, by taking into consideration the complexity of the writing skills and processes, which have a complex cognitive nature, a special course or program is required to cover the multi-faceted (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and methodological skills and strategies to make the intended writing course effective. In addition, it is important to adopt a
variety of genres, types, and academic topics and activities that fit a variety of interests among students.

In a nutshell, teaching academic writing is a challenging mission, in general, and it is even more challenging for EFL instructors, especially when they are dealing with students with serious writing difficulties. The difficulty does not lie only in the complexity of the writing skills and processes; rather, it is more related to the needs of the learners, which require special instructional methods and the ability of the instructor to adopt strategies specific to certain learners’ needs and differences.
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APPENDIX I.1: THE PRE-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions
Below are some questions about your writing in English. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Please circle the appropriate letter(s) that indicates the option(s) that applies to you, and write a complete answer to the rest of questions. In answering the questions, try to be as honest and as appropriate as possible.

Section One: Students’ Background in Writing

Students’ Writing Difficulties
1. Do you find writing in English:
   a. An easy task?
   b. Neither an easy nor a difficult task?
   c. A difficult task?

2. At which level of English writing performance do you place yourself?
   a. Advanced level?
   b. Intermediate level?
   c. Low level?

3. If your answer is ‘c’, is it because:
   a. You have difficulties in using the English language?
   b. The writing skill is difficult?
   c. You have little writing practice inside and outside the classroom?
   d. You are not motivated to write?
   e. The teacher is not helpful?
   f. Other (please, specify)........................................................................................…

4. At your current level of writing performance, do you find difficulties when writing essays in English at the level of:

   a. Mechanics and language use, e.g. grammar usage, punctuation, spelling,
   b. Vocabulary use (amount, choice, and appropriate use)
   c. Development and organization of ideas,
   d. Knowledge related to the topic,
   e. Writing strategies, e.g. generating ideas, planning, drafting, and revising,
   f. Expressing ideas.
5. If you ticked one or more options in the above question, do you think that your writing difficulty (ies) is (are) related to:
   a. Your (low) motivation to learn the English language?
   b. Your (low) motivation to write?
   c. Your attitude about your writing teacher?
   d. Your ability to use the English language?
   e. Your ability to write?
   f. Your writing habits are very limited (i.e., you never/ rarely write in English; you write only when you’re asked to, e.g. in the exams)?

Students’ Writing Processes and Strategies

6. Before you start writing, do you:
   a. Brainstorm (generate) ideas for your topic?
   b. Outline (write a plan for) your piece of writing?
   c. Start drafting (write your ideas) directly?

7. While writing, which among the following stages do you go through?
   a. Pre-writing (generating ideas).
   b. Drafting (putting ideas down into form (paragraph, essay, etc.).
   c. Revising (rethinking and rewriting).
   d. Editing and proofreading (giving reader feedback).

8. Before you come up with your final writing product, how many drafts do you generally write?
   a. One draft.
   b. Two drafts.
   c. Three drafts.
   d. More (please, specify the number of drafts) ..............................................

9. Do you find that revising your piece of writing is:
   a. Extremely important?
   b. Important?
   c. Somehow important?
   d. Not important?
   e. I don’t know?
10. When revising your piece of writing (whether inside or outside the classroom), do you:
   a. Do it yourself (self-evaluation)?
   b. Do it with your peer(s)?
   c. Ask for the teacher’s help?
   d. Other (please, specify) .................................................................

11. Which aspects of revision does the corrector (you, your peer(s), your teacher, or other person (s)) emphasize?
   a. The mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and grammar)
   b. The development and organization of ideas in the piece of writing (content and arrangement of ideas)
   c. The originality of ideas in the piece of writing.
   d. The style of your writing (type of sentences, cohesion and coherence)
   e. Other (please, specify) ........................................................................

Section Two: Students’ Affective Factors

A. The English Writing Apprehension Scale

**Instructions:** Below are some statements about your writing in English. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by ticking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are uncertain, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the statement. While some of the statements may seem repetitious, just take your time and try to be as honest as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I like writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. The English Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

Part One

Instructions: Below are some statements about your English writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by ticking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are uncertain, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the statement. Try to be as honest as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not good at writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is easy for me to write good essays in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People seem to like what I write in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two

**Instructions:** On a scale from 1 (very unconfident) to 5 (very confident), how confident are you that you can perform each of the following English writing skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>Neither confident nor unconfident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Very unconfident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Correctly punctuate a one page essay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Write an essay with a good overall organization (i.e. ideas in order, effective transition, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I.2: THE POST-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear student,

Below are some questions about your writing experience. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Please circle the appropriate letter(s) that indicates the option(s) that applies to your case, and write a complete answer to the rest of questions. In answering the questions, try to be as sincere and as appropriate as possible.

A. The English Writing Apprehension Scale

Instructions: Below are some statements about your writing in English. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by ticking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are uncertain, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the statement. While some of the statements may seem repetitious, just take your time and try to be as honest as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I usually do my best to avoid writing English essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am afraid of writing essays in English when I know they will be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whenever possible, I would use English to write essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I like writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have no fear of my English writing being evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not like English writing classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like discussing my English writing with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would rather read than write in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I usually do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I do not like my English essays to be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. The English Writing Self-Efficacy Scale: Part One

Instructions: Below are some statements about your English writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by ticking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are uncertain, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the statement. Try to be as honest as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not good at writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is easy for me to write good essays in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I hand in an English essay, I know I am going to do poorly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect to do poorly in English writing classes even before I enter them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People seem to like what I write in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not think I write in English as well as my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When my class is asked to write an essay, mine is one of the best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Two

Instructions: On a scale from 1 (very unconfident) to 5 (very confident), how confident are you that you can perform each of the following English writing skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Very Unconfident</td>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>Neither confident nor unconfident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Very unconfident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Correctly spell all the words in a one page essay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Correctly punctuate a one page essay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Write an essay with appropriate vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express theme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Write an essay with a good overall organization (ideas in order, effective transition, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II.1: THE PRE-TEST

Academic Writing Pre-test

Student’s Full Name …………………………………………………………………………………

Dear student,

You are hereby asked to take this test because you have agreed to the terms and conditions of the Student’s Contract of Agreement. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher and the study group to which you belong, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

**Test Instructions**: The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cell phone for any reason, because it is destructive.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer / rough sheets as you wish.

**Test Topics**

- *Topic One*: The importance of learning a foreign language.
- *Topic Two*: Explain how the internet has changed your life as a student / person and your environment.
- *Topic Three*: It has been said, "Not all learning takes place in the classroom."

Compare and contrast knowledge gained from personal experience with knowledge gained from classroom instruction. In your opinion, which source is more important? Why?
APPENDIX II.2: THE POST-TEST

Academic Writing Post-test

Student’s Full Name …………………………………………………………………………

Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cell phone for any reason.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer / rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.
APPENDIX III: STUDENT’S CONSENT FORM

Student’s Contract of Agreement

I am Ms / Mrs / Mr. …..........................................................undergraduate student at the Setif University English Department. I hereby certify that I am enrolled in this research study, conducted by Ms. Samira Moussaoui, with my complete consent and willingness to take part without any kind of pressure exercised by the researcher. By signing this consent contract, I agree to the terms and conditions of my participation as a subject, and I assume the responsibility of performing all the tasks assigned to me throughout the whole period of training, including the pre- and post-study tests and questionnaires.

Student’s Name and Signature

..........................................................
# APPENDIX IV: ESSAY EVALUATION GRADED RUBRIC

PARTICIPANT’S NAME: ………………………………………… CODE: ……. TOTAL GRADE: …. /100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The ideas are fully and logically developed with respect to the genre and topic/ thesis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.../20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a clear discussion and analysis of the topic/ thesis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All the information is relevant to the topic/ thesis.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The essay follows an outline and it has an introduction, a body, and a conclusion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a clear thesis statement with a clear sense of purpose.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Each paragraph reflects the thesis statement and has a clear topic sentence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Each sentence in each paragraph supports the respective topic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The ideas are logically organized with an appropriate pattern (topic and genre based)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support examples are given with smooth transitions, with respect to the topic and genre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The topic is controlled and there is care for coherence and unity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conclusion ties in with introduction and restates thesis in a way, avoiding repetition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Fluency &amp; Accuracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Grammar structures are used accurately and appropriately</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The language of analysis is used clearly and appropriately</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A variety of structures are used appropriately</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The sentences are complete and syntactically correct.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is good range of vocabulary for academic purposes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.../25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics &amp; Format</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a correct use of punctuation and capitalization.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spelling forms are used appropriately.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The essay is formatted appropriately with clear indentations, spacing, and margins.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.../10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement in the Writing Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a clear plan, with a clear organization of the essay.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goal is set based on audience, topic, and genre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More than one draft is written</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Revision is done based on organization and content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Editing and proofreading is done (style and mechanics)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rewriting (revision based on format)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>../20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**: 100 /100
APPENDIX V: LIST OF THE WRITING STRATEGIES PER STAGE

Planning Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Assessing/ analysing vocabulary, content, or strategy</td>
<td>Judging one’s writing either positively or negatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General planning</td>
<td>Organizing thoughts and deciding how to proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting/ decision making based on purpose/ genre or topic</td>
<td>Making decisions related to the purpose/ genre, or the topic of writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea generation</td>
<td>Generating a new/ completing an idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local planning/ goal setting</td>
<td>Deciding what to write next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periods of silence (pause)</td>
<td>No action (writing/ thinking aloud) is taking place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning about content/ structure/ other aspects of writing</td>
<td>Asking questions related to content/ structure/ or other aspects of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading/ rereading/ repetition</td>
<td>Reading, rereading, repeating (a generated) word or sentence (s) while writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to audience, purpose/ genre, or topic</td>
<td>Relating audience, purpose, or genre/ topic to the activity of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to cohesion/ coherence</td>
<td>Establishing a link between sentences/ paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to strategy use</td>
<td>Mentioning the strategy used/ its importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Expressing an unclear or meaningless word, expression or comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem recognition or identification</td>
<td>Writing while verbalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem assessment</td>
<td>Writing without making any sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making an unintelligible remark</td>
<td>Recognizing or identifying a problem while thinking or writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examining and solving the problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Drafting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General planning</td>
<td>Organizing thoughts and deciding how to proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generating ideas (details)</td>
<td>Creating more content (details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing an idea</td>
<td>Completing a previously generated idea/content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressing preference (of word/ expression/ idea, structure, etc.)</td>
<td>Making choices related to vocabulary, ideas or structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to cohesion/ coherence</td>
<td>Making decisions or commenting about cohesion or coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to grammar</td>
<td>Making decisions related to grammar use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to structure/ pattern of organization</td>
<td>Mentioning sentence/ paragraph/ essay structure or pattern of essay organization (cause-effect/ block or point by point method)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>Deciding what to write next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing /explaining a word/expression/ idea</td>
<td>Explaining the meaning/ choice/use of a word or expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading/ repeating a word/ sentence/ paragraph</td>
<td>Reading or repeating a word, a sentence or a full paragraph while generating ideas or writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreting</td>
<td>Interpreting meaning or words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing/ evaluating content (what has been said or written) or a strategy</td>
<td>Judging (positively or negatively)/ or one’s ideas/writing/ or a strategy (in terms of importance or use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning about an idea, sentence structure, word choice, etc.</td>
<td>Asking questions (self-questioning or wondering an idea, word meaning, structure or other aspects of writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking (verbalizing thoughts) leading to writing</td>
<td>Verbalizing thoughts, followed by writing (writing aloud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing silently</td>
<td>Writing without verbalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>Making comment(s) that is (are) not related to the activity of thinking or writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word choice/ appropriateness</td>
<td>Expressing concern for the choice/appropriateness of a word/expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Deciding what to write/include/use (e.g., content, structure, form, or grammar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making an unintelligible remark</td>
<td>Expressing an unclear or meaningless word, expression or comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing (drafting) and revising ideas/ structure</td>
<td>Writing and making deep/major level changes (content and organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing (drafting) and editing</td>
<td>Writing and making surface level changes (at the level of grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Revision Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface level editing</td>
<td>Making changes (editing) like grammar, punctuation, spelling, and word form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Adding grammatical markers, words, phrases or clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Deleting grammatical markers, words, phrases or clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Indicating concern for a grammatical rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Adding, deleting or considering the use of punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Considering or changing spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Changing the sentence structure through embedding coordination or subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb form or tense</td>
<td>Considering or changing verb form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word form</td>
<td>Indicating concern for appropriate vocabulary (word choice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising</td>
<td>Revising changes affecting meaning and major aspects of organization</td>
<td>Making changes (revision) based on content and organization (sentence, paragraph, essay/pattern of organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition and/or modification</td>
<td>Adding and/or modifying content (words, phrases, sentences or clauses, full ideas/paragraphs), modifying sentence/paragraph/essay organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Deleting content (words, phrases, or sentences), modifying sentence/paragraph/essay structure…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Substituting words, ideas, sentences or clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>Expressing concern/making decisions about word choice/appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>Self-questioning about a word/sentence, structure, or other aspects of writing while revising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading the whole paragraph/draft</td>
<td>Reading what has been written so far (for the sake of/prior to revising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rescanning</td>
<td>Reading a sentence or part of a sentence with focus (for the purpose of revising it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to cohesion, coherence, or unity</td>
<td>Revising, checking, or commenting about cohesion, coherence, or unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to audience, purpose, genre, or topic</td>
<td>Revising or commenting about audience, purpose, genre, or topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to strategy (used)</td>
<td>Mentioning the strategy used or analyzing its importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewriting without revision</td>
<td>Rewriting what has been written (whole paragraph/draft) without making any revision or editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>Making comment(s) that is (are) not related to the activity of thinking or writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysing/explaining content, strategy or structure</td>
<td>Judging positively or negatively on one’s own writing (ideas, strategy, or structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting/Decision making</td>
<td>Deciding what to write/do (next)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI.1: IN-TRAINING SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE 1

Participant’s Name…………………………………………………………………Section / Group………..

Dear student,

Below are a number of questions for you to answer on your academic writing training sessions. The questions consist of a self-evaluation of the five/ six training sessions you have had during the last few weeks. Please circle the option that applies to you in each question and use the space provided for you to answer the rest of the questions as sincerely as possible.

1. What did you learn during the five/ six sessions of training?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2. Do you feel that you are able to brainstorm any topic of your choice or that is given to you by the instructor?

a. Yes.                 b. No.                c. I am not sure?

3. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, explain why?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

4. Which among the following brainstorming techniques are you able to use easily to generate ideas for your topic (s)?

a. Mind-mapping,
b. Clustering,
c. Listing,
d. Questioning (with answers).

5. Which of the above-mentioned techniques do you prefer to use and why?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

6. Do you feel that you are able to outline/ plan a cause and effect essay without the help of the instructor?

a. Yes.                 b. No.            c. I don’t know.
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7. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please explain why?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Describe briefly the process you follow in outlining a cause and effect essay?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Do you have a special outlining pattern that you follow in general, or do you try various planning strategies (e.g., list, classification, pyramid) when planning your essay?

a. I follow a special pattern (describe it)

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

b. I use one/ more than one of the above-mentioned planning strategies (mention it/them, and describe it/them).

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Explain briefly the technique you prefer most and say why?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Do you feel that you need more training on brainstorming and planning techniques? Explain the areas where you need more practice.

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
APPENDIX VI.2: IN-TRAINING SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE 2

Participant’s Name………………………………………………………………….Section / Group……….

Dear student,

Below are a number of questions for you to answer on your academic writing training sessions. The questions consist of a self-evaluation of the three / four last sessions you have had during the last two weeks. Please circle the option that applies to you in each question and use the space provided for you to answer the rest of the questions as sincerely as possible.

12. Do you feel that you are able to brainstorm any topic of the type comparison/ contrast?
   a. Yes.             b. No.            c. I am not sure?

13. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please, explain why.
   ........................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................

14. i. Which among the following brainstorming techniques do you use to generate ideas for a comparison/ contrast essay? Why?
   a. Mind-mapping        b. Clustering        c. Listing      d. Questioning
   ii. Justify your answer.
   ........................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................

15. i. Do you feel that you are able to plan a comparison/ contrast essay without the help of the instructor?
   a. Yes.             b. No.            c. I don’t know.
   ii. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please, explain why?
   ........................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................

16. Describe briefly the process that you follow in outlining a comparison/ contrast essay?
   ........................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................
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17. Do you prefer to use the Block or the Point by Point method of organization in writing a comparison/contrast essay? Why?

a. I prefer the Blok method because .................................................................
..............................................................................................................................

b. I prefer the Point by Point method because ...................................................
..............................................................................................................................

b. I have no preference between these two methods (i.e., I can use both methods) because
..............................................................................................................................

18. Do you use the above methods interchangeably or do you have specific cases where you use one method instead of the other? Justify your answer in both cases.
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................

19. Do you feel that you need more training in brainstorming and planning a cause/effect or a comparison/contrast essay (or both of them)? Explain the areas where you need more practice.

a. I need more training in brainstorming and planning a cause/effect essay, (explain).
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................

b. I need more training in brainstorming and planning a comparison/contrast essay, (explain). ........................................................
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
c. I need more training in brainstorming and planning both types of essays (explain).
..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................
20. How do the pre-writing activities (brainstorming and planning) help you in writing (drafting) your essay (cause/ effect or comparison/ contrast)?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

21. i. Do you find difficulties in writing the introductions and conclusions of your (cause/ effect or comparison/ contrast) essay?


   ii. If your answer is ‘a’ or ‘b’, please explain which part of the essay (introduction or conclusion) and which kind of difficulties you find in writing either type of essay (cause/ effect or comparison/ contrast)

   a. I generally/ sometimes find difficulties in writing the introduction/ conclusion of a cause/ effect essay, especially at the level of: …………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

   b. I generally/ sometimes find difficulties in writing the introduction/ conclusion of a comparison/ contrast essay, especially at the level of: …………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

22. i. Do you feel that you are able to write a clear thesis statement for any topic (of your choice) and for both types of essays (cause/ effect and comparison/ contrast)?

   a. Yes             b. No            c. I am not sure

   ii. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please explain in which cases you find it difficult to write a thesis statement (mention the type of essay).
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

23. i. Do you feel that you are able to write rich (well developed) supporting paragraphs for your essay (both types of essays)?

   a. Yes             b. No            c. I am not sure
ii. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please mention the cases in which you find difficulties in developing your ideas (finding supporting details for body paragraphs).

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

24. i. Do you feel that you are able to write clear and correct topic sentences, supporting details, and concluding sentences for the body paragraphs?

   a. Yes   b. No   c. I am not sure

ii. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please mention the areas of difficulty that you face and explain whether it is the case with both types of essays.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

25. i. Do you find difficulties in achieving unity, cohesion and coherence in writing your essay?

   a. Yes   b. No   c. I am not sure

ii. If your answer is ‘b’ or ‘c’, please mention the areas of difficulty that you face and explain whether it is the case with both types of essays.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

26. What are the aspects of writing do you generally revise after you finish writing your 1st draft?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

27. How many drafts do you write, in general? Do you think that writing several drafts (more than two) helps you improve the early drafts of your essay(s)?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

28. Do you consider the last draft (2nd, 3rd, etc.) you write to be perfect, i.e., well organized, developed, coherent and free of mechanical errors? Explain with details.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

29. Explain briefly the aspects of writing that you want to reinforce in this training and provide suggestions if you have any.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
APPENDIX VII.1: SCRIPT OF THE THINK-ALOUD PROTOCOLS

STUDENT 01: (S. M.)
LOW-ACHIEVER

Topic: The Causes and Effects of Smoking

The pre-writing stage of the writing process

Brainstorming

Em ... I have chosen the... the topic eh which is about eh...cause (ing) and effect... about smoking... eh...I will try to find some ... some ideas about it...I will eh start eh brainstorming...eh...and I will choose eh...the ... I will choose the... the... the ... the method of eh...of mapping because it’s very eh... it’s very easy... (Long pause)... and I ... (Long pause)... eh...we all know that smoking cigarette is eh harm...harmful...smoking ... harmful to health... harmful to health... (Long pause) ... eh... (Longer pause)... eh... I know that eh...eh...eh...the...the...the... mte (?) ... how we... how we can say it ...eh...we all know that eh... eh... the considerable effect of smoking cigarette is eh eh...that eh... its can make eh... its can make...its can make eh ...it can make smokers eh. ... how eh... how we can say it...her health... smokers’ health get worse... health eh get worse... eh... (long pause) ... it can eh lead eh...to eh something worse...eh for example eh...eh...for example lung cancer...or eh...it comes from smoking... eh... (longer pause)...eh we all know that smoking cigarette not only affects eh smokers...but also affect people eh who are living around eh them...and eh for example when eh when eh the father eh eh start smoking and their children are beside him, eh they will eh affect ...affect them also ... eh... as they are smoking... em... (long pause)...and eh the smokers eh have eh ...eh te... usually have te... typical signs such as yellow teeth eh...eh yellow figures...eh especially eh smelling... clothes ...eh which... people living around them very... (Whisper) ... (long pause)... and eh... there’s an... another significant effect of smoking cigarette... it is that eh it affect eh... affect their eh ... families eh (feelings?)...and eh countries’ economy... (Sigh... long pause)...

It is always...it is always eh better to ... to stop smoking... (long pause)... and eh (long pause)... not only affect eh smokers, affect smokers, but also affect people ... but also affect
people… eh… who are living … around them… (Long pause)... em… to make… to make the finance of the family becoming …became bad… (sigh)... eh… smoking cigarette … (much longer pause)... (sigh)... em… em… eh… eh … (student is speaking in French: [comment dire je sais pas = how to say, I do not know])... eh… it’s very eh… just not consider it… it’s very harmful to health…eh…it can lead to… to death… it can lead to death… (pause) … it can lead to death (whispered)... em … eh… eh (speaking in French) [je ne sais pas comment dire en Anglais = I don’t know how to say it in English]) ... eh...eh ... (speaking in dialectal Arabic) [la cigarette eh 3omerhaa we la yaani taa... 3omerha we la taa... tanfa3 yaani al3abd ... em ...
(breathing) 3omerha wela tefeed al3abd = the cigarette never benefits a person / human… never benefits a person/ human… never benefits a person/ human]) … it’s eh … it’s lead the person to death… and eh to have a lot of diseases… eh… I will eh… normally I have eh finished … with the …with mapping…I have eh…I have done eh… I have brainstorming and eh… eh and I have eh…eh I have wrote eh some ideas about eh… smoking cigarettes…then I will eh … start eh planning…eh …. I will start the introduction… introduction… eh…eh… this is a statement… (long pause) ... eh… we have eh…eh… we all know that cigarette is harmful… to the person… it has a lot of nega… negatives… and eh… eh… the main eh… the main… the main eh…the main main jo?…..the em…(breath)... I know eh a lot of negatives but I will talk about eh three of them eh which eh…which are very very dangerous…for example… the first one smokes health… of course… non-smokers because they affect the… the smokers affect the non-smokers… affect living together because they are living together… and the… the last thing smokers and economy of family and country…. 

This is for me the … for me the the the… how we can eh… this for me the three main danger eh…dangerous eh affects about eh…about cigarettes… and eh… I will eh… I will also talk about eh… I will also talk about eh… causes… I will eh talk about it eh in the body… eh… for me and eh… we all know that eh smokers are affected by the cigarette but what are the causes behind the smokers and how and why the the person became a smoking eh person…why… there is eh a lot of causes… eh and for me the problems of the person lived him to to… to became a smo… a smoking person of course and eh… (pause) … I will eh… problem eh … I don’t know what are the problems… eh … they are eh… they are … all all eh… all the persons now became
eh… became eh a smoking persons… I don’t know but eh… even eh he is eh … he is poor or even he is rich… eh he is a student or he is em… eh … or he is eh … eh… whether he is young or old…eh… all persons beca… became a smoking persons…so problems can lead the person to became eh a smoking person… (breath/ sigh) … I will eh talk about eh the causes in one paragraph then I will eh discuss about eh the fe… the effects of course ... (pause) …

The Planning Stage of the Writing Process

I will start eh planning my eh … my topic… eh… I will start with eh introduction… (pause) … eh… eh… I want to say that eh… eh the smoking cigarette is really harmful to health… eh… it can never eh… it can never be good for eh… for the persons… eh…

I will eh start with eh thesis statement… ment… eh… I want to say that eh… eh… eh the main purpose eh…eh of my essay is the … to …to discuss about three … I know eh that cigarette eh contains a lot of a lot of eh…eh… a lot of em… dangerous eh… effects… but eh… but I will eh… I will eh discuss about three dangerous eh effects and eh … which are em… I will talk about eh… (breath) … the smokers ....the … themselves and I will eh … I will eh… I will eh… I will talk about eh… eh… the … the effect of smokers eh… on non eh smokers people … eh because em… the smokers… eh…eh (pause) … eh how eh… smokers affect eh the non-smokers because they are living eh… living together and eh… the the smokers are eh being all the time with eh those people who are eh … who are not eh… eh… they don’t have the the habit of smoking… and eh… I will eh…I will talk about eh… the finance of the family eh… because eh its become eh… when the the person are eh…the persons are smoking the finance of the family became bad… eh … and eh the economy of eh countries also…

So, I will start with eh … thes… thesis statement … and eh… (soft cough) …start about thesis statement… I will eh…. eh (long pause)…

The main purpose of my … of eh this essay… eh … is eh … is to … is to discuss… discuss… eh three… three dangerous effects ... dangerous effects... three dangerous effects ... and eh… some eh causes… eh three dangerous effects which are … which are eh… which are eh … eh… the smokers themselves… the smokers themselves… eh… eh… the the effect of smokers… eh…
the effects of smokers on ... on eh ... the non eh... non-smokers... eh because eh they are living together.... no I eh ... I won’t write it... I will let it eh... and eh finally... eh ... eh the effect eh... smokers affect... affect (soft cough)... the ... smokers affect the finance of... of the family ... family ... and eh... (pause) of the family... the finance of the family... (long pause) ... and eh the econmic eh... economy of eh country... country... (sigh) ... (long pause)...

And eh ... I will eh... I will start with the body ... eh... I will start with the causes ... the first paragraph... the first paragraph ... em... I will talk about the causes eh... as I said before in my eh method of mapping... eh problems... eh...what (?) ... (pause) ... eh the causes of smoking i... are very ...are very eh... (pause) are lot of... a lot of... are a lot of... but eh... (pause) ... and I will eh talk about eh... (pause)... the cause of smoking are a lot of... eh... and eh... I will choose one of them... eh... a lot of... it can be eh... it can be... (Murmuring)... can eh... can lead the person... can lead the p... can lead the... can lead people... can lead people... can lead people to became... to became eh ... smoking persons... and eh the second paragraph... I will talk about eh ... the causes and eh... one em... one (murmuring) effect eh of smoking... (pause) ... is that eh it can eh... it can be eh... harmful to health and eh... it can be eh... it can make eh... it ma ... it can make eh the health get worse... and eh worse... (pause)... is that... is that ... it can eh...it can eh ... it can make eh the health... health worse and worse ... (sigh)... and eh... people eh... people who... who smoking eh is easy to... to get diseases such as eh ... such as eh... em ... taking eh lung cancer ... and eh... etcetera... (breath)... people ... I will talk about eh... eh the health and eh... so (???) people... eh people who eh... who smoking ... smoking ...eh ...is easy ...is easy eh... (pause)... to get eh diseases... (murmering)... (long pause)... The number b ... the number eh... the number of eh mor-ta-li-ties because... because eh of diseases connected with smoking became ... (pause) ... smoking cigarette eh affect not only smokers but also... people living around eh them... a [ei] b [bi] it eh... because it’s also make non-smokers’ health get worse... non-smokers... and non-smokers feel eh ... annoyed about the (appearance ... rance) (appearance???) of smoking .... (the) last eh... significant ... (long pause) ... the last significant effect is that eh its affect... its affect eh... its affect... its affect... eh their eh family’s finance ... (pause)... finance... eh family’s and eh... economy of the country.... and
the economy of the country... (pause)... and eh... and eh... I will eh talk about eh... I will start with the conclusion... I will eh... I will eh... I will rewrite the... my eh conclude sentence... eh... as I said before... eh... smoking cigarettes... cigarette... smoking cigarette is very dangerous... and very harmful to health... and it is better to stop... to stop... stop... to stop smoking... eh... in a fast... (pause)... fast way (whispered).

The drafting stage of the writing process

Eh... then I will eh start eh my first draft... eh... I... have done... I have done eh my brainstorming... eh with the method of mapping and eh... I have done also my plan... eh... I... I... I... I don't know how to... (long pause)... I will start eh drafting... (pause)... I will follow eh... the... the same eh... I will follow the sa... the same eh... eh... how eh... order... eh... (pause)... which I done it before in my plan... so I will start with eh with eh introduction...

Smoking cigarettes is harmful for health... eh... smoking cigarettes... (sigh) smoking cigarettes can... cigarette... (pause)... cigarette... is very... very... dangerous... and very... harmful... and... (much longer pause)... very harmful... I will eh said eh... it can lead to death and make the person eh... health get worse... (long pause)... eh... eh... (pause)... I will talk about eh... the smokers themselves and eh the effect of smokers on non-smokers person and eh... and eh... eh the the effect of smokers on finance of the family... and eh also... eh... I will eh... I will eh... I will deal with eh... some causes... (long pause)... and em... sm... smoking cigarettes is very dangerous and very eh... em... and it can lead... it can lead [whispering] a person to death... eh... eh... and it has... it has eh a lot of... a lot of (whispering) effect and causes... (breath)... the... the main major... the main major eh... effect eh... are about the smokers themselves eh... themselves and eh... the effect of eh smokers... the smokers... on... on non-smokers... smokers (whispering) eh... the non-smokers persons... and also... its affect... (sigh)... the finance of the family... the economy of the country... (long pause)... (breath)... (long pause)... I'm thinking about eh... the causes... eh... I know that eh... person... eh... he has a lot of problems... he eh... he go eh directly to... to eh... to smoking... and eh... and eh in our country especially for men... eh... and eh for young em children eh...
they em ... when eh when eh the young eh...the young eh children used to smoke eh...for them eh... it’s the ... it is the...the way of being a man... and (soft laughter) ... (long pause) ... 

I will start with the body... eh the first eh paragraph... eh (erasing) ... (pause) ... eh ... (pause) ... any person has his em ... has his own reason to became a smoking person ... its can be ... its can be eh ... (soft breath) problems in his family or in eh ... in his life in general... in general ... which (sigh)... which (whispered) can eh lead him to became a smoking person ... and eh ... in our ... in our country... eh when the child ... starts smoking eh ... it is a sign that he became a man ... (long pause) and eh one ... I will talk about eh the effect of smoking... one ... one ... of the most terrible effect of smoking (breath) ... cigarette is that its can eh make smokers’ health get worse ... firstly people who smoke is easy to get diseases such as lung (which ???) cancer ... besides the greater danger ... the greater dan is that eh it may eh deterior into something worse ... (pause) ... danger is that eh ... (sigh) ... it may lead eh ... it may lead to something worse like eh ... cancer ... (pause) from smoking is caused by the (unclear word) in tobacco smoke... (long pause) ... smoking cigarette ... not only affect smokers but non-smokers ... health also get worse because... because they are living around them ... and smokers eh smokers eh...smokers eh usually... usually have ... (breath) typical signs such as eh the yellow teeth ... yellow fingers ... especially smelling clothes which make ... which make people living eh around very annoyed ... which make eh people ... which make people eh... which make people eh... em ... eh... eh... eh getting away from eh them ... away from them ... (breath) ... (pause) ... 

And I will eh ... I will talk about eh ... and also eh ... eh ... (pause) ...eh... (pause) ... the last eh ... significant effect ... effect is that eh ... is that eh it affect eh their families finance ... (breath)... I will eh talk eh in general... eh because I don’t know what are eh the effect of economy ... especially in our country ... I will eh talk only about eh ... eh the finance of the family... eh (pause)... eh ... (pause) eh... they are eh some persons who used to eh smoke eh... who... with eh a lot of cigarettes ... par eh... per... day... it can be eh ... eh ... it can be eh twelve or fifteen cigarettes in the day and eh ....this is ... this is not eh logical ... it’s too eh ... too hard... and eh ... it can lead them to waste a lot of money... especially eh when the cigarette
is eh … is eh expensive… (pause) … is that eh it affects … it affect … so the last significant … is that eh it affect eh their eh… their family… ly’s finance … and the economy of the country also … (sigh)… (long pause)…

So I will eh… eh I will eh write down my conclusion … (pause) … in conclusion…. to all eh that… this… eh… as I said before the smoking cigarette is very… very dangerous … and eh very harmful … to health and eh … (breath) … and eh (whispered) … it has eh three … it has eh three main … main eh… it has three main eh negative effects … effects … eh … on human life … on human’s life … eh that can be seen in smokers’ health … on human’s … human’s life … (pause) … that can be seen … that can be…. that can be seen eh in smokers’ health… smokers’ health … non-smokers … non-smokers living together … together (whispered) … (breath) … (pause)… living together with smokers and also… and family … (pause) … family finance … so it’s… it is better to stop … smoking … it’s better to stop smoking … (pause)… stop smoking and do not starting again … in a … (pause) in a … I don’t know how to eh … (laughter) … to call it in English … fast way … (much longer pause) … em … I don’t know if I can eh … if I can eh … if I can eh write in a speed way or fast way … (long pause) … so eh I will let it down … so eh it is better to stop smoking and not start again … not starting again … never and never … and eh … never (whispered) … and never start … and never starting again starting again … breath … I have eh replaced do not by never … it is eh… it is better … (breath)… so I have finished my first draft.

The revision stage of the writing process
I will eh … (whisper) (pause) … I will eh do my second draft … I will revise it and eh I will deal with it … so smoking eh … so smoking cigarette … (long pause) … smoking cigarette eh is harmful … smoking cigarette is harmful to health … that is … (pause) … that is eh warning … sentence which show I lack … cigarette … there … therefore … the effect of smoking on human’s life are serious … the main purpose is to discuss … three main effects of smoking … (soft cough) … (pause) on human’s life … smokers’ health … non-smokers … living together … smokers’ and family finance … (pause) … any person has his own reason to have becoming smoker person … its can be problems in his life … (pause) …??? effect of smoking cigarette is
that it can make smokers’ health get worse … firstly become a smoker? is easy to get diseases such as can (whispered) … eh lung cancer … besides the great danger is may lead to something worse like to … ??? (long pause)

I will move …??? became diseases … only with smoking became incredible thing according to a … ??? also affects people living around them… actually it’s also lead non-smokers feel annoyed about the appearance of smokers (pause) … also smokers have typical signs such as yellow teeth … yellow fingers … especially smelling clothes which make people living around them … living around them … the last significant … effect is that its affects and …feelings and … of … also … (pause) … con … conclusion … smoking cigarettes is very… very dangerous and very harmful … very harmful to health … and it has very many negatives … (sigh) like …??? that can be seen in smokers’ health … non-smokers living together with smokers … and also family … finance … so it is better to stop smoking and never starting again … full stop.

**APPENDIX VII.2: SCRIPT OF THE THINK-ALOUD PROTOCOLS**

**STUDENT 02: (M. A. N.)**

**AVERAGE-ACHIEVER**

**Topic:** People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answers.

**The pre-writing (planning) stage of the writing process**

Well… I’m doing the post-test on writing the essay, expository essay…well I have ah the topic which is … which is that…which I found it very interesting to talk about it…I will…I will talk …pause…talk (whispered)…well, I am in the post-test. I’m going to write my…my essay…it is an expository essay which I found it very interesting topic to talk about it…it is about that [p]eople attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reason[s] and examples to support your answers (reading the topic suggested for the test). Well, this topic talk about the importance of school and why people are going to school.
So, I usually write…I usually write my essay…my essay in ter…according to specific steps…I usually follow certain steps to write my essay in a good way. Well, the first… the first step that I’m going to write it is…first step is brain…brain storming…brainstorming is put …put by writings in sentences or in…into .as a sentences…ok…I think that ah… people attend school to have a good language, and to or […] to …to have a good information and knowledge. So, I may write that people… people go to school …go to school for…for several reasons for many years…for many years…for many years all over the world…all over the world…the world. It means that from the beginning of human…people are interesting to go to school since…since their……since their early age…

So, the second idea is…is that (pause) school…school enable people … enable people to go more… to go more… positi… to get…to get more possibilities… possibilities… possibilities… possibilities through… through education…education…through education…this ah…this topic is ah almost talking about the causes…the causes of ah attending school, so, the most …the most reason why go to school…the most reason that people attend school… attend school…attend school to have…to have an academic… an academic… ah…an academic… how to say it?…yes…to have an academic…academic…demic…academic qualification…qualification…its means that people must go to school to have academic qualification to have ah.. jobs…or something…yes…to get a job…to get …to get more ah…how to say it?…to get more ah…to get more …ah…how to say it?…to get more…I’m going to say that…yes…to get more jobs…the most reason that people attend school is to have an academic qualification to get better jobs…ok.

The fourth one…the fourth idea that I’m thinking about it is …is that (pause) school make the most …the most…then…(hesitation) I want to say that school….aaaaaaaah, school…school teach children…children socialization…cialization…it means that when a child goes to school, he is young and he is learning thin…ah new things, and he is with his classmates, so he…he get known with new friends… so he is going to build a social interaction with his friends and teachers…so…he will grow up with a good social inter…interaction…this is the fourth…where is that I’m going to talk about it.
Then … young people or children or learners that are…that…that are goin…that they are going to school…that…[mta (expressing anger…changing mind)]…I’m going to say that young people…young people…young people are exposed…exposed…are exposed to wide variety…variety…a wide variety of subjects…I want to say that school is a rich …is a rich source of getting information… or knowledge… getting knowledge…about …about the world…about the world…the world…about the world…ah…

the fif…sixth idea that school…school…no, I’m going to say that children…children can also gain…also gain more practical skills…more practical skills…such as…or take advantages of opportunities…ah…yes… practical skills…or take …[what I said] or take advantages…tages… of the opportunities…opportunities…unities…opportunity to practise, for example, sports…to practise…to practise …practise sports… sports or any kind of…of entertainment…entertainment skills .. entertainment … ..entert-ain-ment…. entertainment …(pause)…ah…em…(pause)

The second….I wrote my brainstorming as sentences…I will read…I will reread them…
People go to school for several reasons for many years all over the world…this is obvious
The second one: school enable people to get more possibilities through education
The third one is the most reason that people attend school to have qualification to get better jobs
The fourth one is school teach children socialization
The fifth one is young people are exposed to wide variety of subjects, so school is a rich source of getting knowledge about the world
The sixth one is children can also gain more practical skills or take advantages of opportunity to practice sport or another entertainment…entertainment practices…

So, this is my first step….usually…I… I add my.., I add another techni…another method to have a clear ideas..eas..em… the second, second …step… is… mapping… mapping is a method that make…make my ideas clear…is just like I’m write [I’m going to write] key words, then I… in my essay I will develop them…[I’m growing so cool]…I’m going to write the importance of school…tance of school, because …because here is…the topic is going…ah…is
speak about...is... the topic is speaks about...is...speak about...em... people choose to go to school so they are interested in going...in goi...to attending school...and they found that...ah...it's important for them to go...to attend school.

So, the first idea is building socialization...the second one is...ah...ah...ahaaa... (pause)...I will say that.. School shape...shape the personality of... of a person... the second one is... (pause)...ah that...(pause)... having...an academic...academic...aam... how to say it? academic...ah...qualification...to get job...jobs...this is the third idea;

The fourth one is (cough) ah...how to say it? I’m going...I...I am going to say that...ah...school...ah how to say it? School...school enable children to have...to have more...to have more practical skills...skills...practical skills...em... (pause)... acquire...acquire good knowledge...acquire a good knowledge...acquire a good knowledge...em...acquire a good knowledge... I want to say that... (pause)...ah...yes...the most reason that people attend school is that children...children...meet new friends and make new friendship...So, I finished with mapping...this is what I usually use...ah the first step is brainstorming...ah...as a...I wrote them as a sentences, ah....then I add the mapping method to cleari...to have a clear idea...then,

The third step is planning...the third...the third...the third step is planning...this is the most important step...that see are dealing with this...this step is going to...to make my essay clear...ah

First, what I’m going to say in my introduction, and I will choose a thesis statement...Introduction...I want to say in my thesis statement that...ah...ah in my introduction....School is...is the basic...is the basic foundation...is the basic foundation of knowledge...foundation of knowledge...of knowledge, being imparted to a child...being imparted to a child....to a child...it gives the chance to send him to acquire knowledge and various field...fields of education...it gives the chance...it gives the chance to children...children to acquire...to acquire knowledge...to acquire knowledge and...to acquire knowledge on various...on virus...[mta]...on various...various fields...ah...[lds] for education...this is my thesis statement...I find it [mta]...I found it good thesis statement. It[s] talk about the most important reason why people attend school...[unclear word/utterance] do people make them...their children go...go attending
school...[as other] a good knowledge or acquire knowledge .... My thesis statement is school is the basic foundation of knowledge, being imparted to a child... Full stop...it gives the chance to... it gives the chance to children to acquire knowledge on various fields of education.

Then in my body...in the body....I’m going to write ...I’m ...I’m...how to say... three paragraphs...three paragraphs are going to be about the causes ... the reasons why people attending school, so, I’m going to focus on the causes....so, I will mention three causes of...three causes of why people attend school...

First paragraph... ah... I’m going to write the topic sentence that...in my essay I will develop it with my ideas...ah...facts... So... (pause) attending school... attending school gives...attending school gives people... gives people a chance to meet new friends... so, this is my...my...my topic sentence that I’m going to talk about it in the first paragraph...that...attending school gives people a chance to meet new friends...In my develop ...how to say development sentences? ... the sentences that I’m going to develop it... [no/ learn] ... Socialization ... [No/learn]...socialization and...I may ...wr... I may talk that shape the personality of people...of the child...yes

The second paragraph is ....the second paragraph is going to be about...ah...is going to be about ah...(pause)...ah...I think that I’m going to take...ah to talk in my second paragraph that ah a school...ah...a school ...a school... ok (whispered) ...em ... (pause) ... In my second paragraph, I say that...I may say that ...ah...ah...peop...people...I’m think about my topic ah sentence, I ...I want to write in a good way...in a clear words...ah...clear words...I check in my brainstorming....to have academic qualification...so I’m exposed […] a wide variety of subjects...No...I may say that... school...my topic sentence is...school is a rich source ...a rich source...a rich source of getting knowledge...of getting knowledge...of getting knowledge...and also have the opportunity...and also have the opportunity to have...ah...to [hesitation] to practise several... no... to practise ah ...another ski... ah different ... practise ... practise different... different skills, such as having ah...ah...practise sport...or...having ah...how to say...having... examinations...and ...ah...having... how to say it that...ah... many schools...ah
em...do... do...ah... how to say it?...how? ...I want to say ...ah... having school ...ah...make an opportunity to have ...to have ah...how to say it [F...em in English?... (getting anxious)...how to say it in English?...I didn’t find the word...that talks about...challenges...yes...or kind of this word...so, when people attending school, they will have the...they will have the...they will have the... how to say it? The habits ...to have ...to have ah...ah...to challen...to have the challenge between ...between schools...so this is ah..this is something good which make people ah having ...having knowledge and make them curious and make them [switch/search] to ...[an]...to knowledge.

So, my third paragraph is going to be about... people attend school to have academic... academic... academic... [ mergency / how to/ want to] say... ah...I always forgot this word...academic qualification...yes...academic qualification...ication.. to get better jobs...

So, this is the ...the three main ideas that I’m going to ha...to develop them in my paragraphs...I have three paragraphs, so I have to...to ... to develop these topic sentences...ah I will make...I will ha...I will develop them with new ideas and...ah...I will talk about it in [po...(unclear word/ utterance)].

So, conclusion...I’m going to write my concluding sentence... my concluding sentence is going to be that...school gives better chance...school gives better chance to people...chance to people...to get more... to get more...to get more knowledge...to get more...to get more knowledge and persuade... per...pursue... this is the ...the verb...pursue their interest... their interest and...their interest and learn socialization and [then] get a better academic... academic qualification. This is my...I finished with ah planning.

I wrote the thesis statement then, in the body, I have three paragraphs... I’m going to develop them, then... my concluding sentence is ...is...ah...li...is like ah summarize the...th...the ideas that I’m...I talked about them in my body...in my essay...in the body.

**The drafting stage of the writing process**

So, the fourth one...the fourth step is **drafting**...the fourth step is drafting...so, I’m going to start with my introduction...so...I may say that...since ...since ah...ah...[unclear
utterance/noise] How to say that? Ah...knowledge and wisdom are becoming more and more important...so...knowledge is...no...knowledge and wisdom...and wisdom...are becoming...are becoming more and more...more and more important...more and more important and vi [vai]...and vital [vital]...vital to develop...to develop and sustain...sustain society...sustain society...full stop. The most common way to learn is to go to school...go to school...comma...I'm going to write my thesis statement...I find it...somehow long, but I...this is...what I [m] think to write...I think it's so good the thesis statement...I usually have [the] difficulties writing my thesis statement[s]...yes...School...no...full stop is better...School is the basic...foundation...of...knowledge,...being imparted to a child. It gives the chance to children...why I said the children[s]...because ah [...] because...ah...since are...since our young...young age, we go...we must go to school. So, school is ah about ah...is about...from childhood until [the it will]...until we'[ll] be...until we will be adult.....School is the basic foundation of education, being imparted to a child. It gives the chance to children to acquire knowledge...to acquire knowledge on virus...on various fields of education. full stop...I'm going to...to [go/get] to the body. The first paragraph is...

I’m going to write my concluding...ah my topic sentence ......firstly, firstly, attending...ah comma...attending school gives people the chance to meet new friends...full stop....(pause) meeting new people and socialization...meeting new people and socialization...socialization also broadens...broadens human parameters...human parameters of knowledge...it means that people when...ah...they learn together, they have...they will acquire knowledge in a better ah way...in a better way...Thus, if a person wants to learn in...a good social life...ah...thus, ah... thus school...thus...I want to say when...ah...when people ah learn together, there is interaction between them...so...it will be a good way to learn...Besides...I want to say that...ah...ah...(murmuring)...I will say that ah...ah...ah school teaches socialization and also...also it shape a [the] personality of the person...fo...ah...comma...some people become...some people become famous or...famous...become famous...or get...or get a great thin[k]...to get a grant...so em...[.] ah to get a grant...thanks to school...to school’s help and support...help and support...this is my first paragraph...I talked about ah two ideas...ah ah main idea the topic sentence is...ah...is about socialization...the two ideas that I...ah I talked
about it…the [new]…ah the first one is… interaction and socialization…how to learn better…. [and/in] the second one ah…thanks to school, ah some people are becoming famous and…ah becoming famous and ah … becoming famous in the world. So, I’m going to write my …ah my second paragraph…

Secondly…secondly…I said that I’m going to say…s… ah… em to…to speak about that …yes I’m going to write my topic sentence…School is a rich…is a rich source…source…is a rich source of getting …of getting knowledge …of getting knowledge and also… and also… have opportunities…ties…to practise different skills or several skills…full stop…I will develop them…So… since… since children… since… children….no…since… I will say that since…I will say that since ah….a young age…since a young age, children…spend a lot of time in school rather than home…so…ah… (pause)… so, I will say that ah…ah school a rich source to get knowledge[… so they learn…comma…so they learn a lot of subjects…lot of subjects in a good … in a good way… ah full stop … (cough) … (pause) … young ah … some people may become famous … [ah]…(murmuring)…I put a full stop then, I…I [will/may] say that so much of the school…of the school […] day ….. is devoted to competitions…to competitions and examinations…examinations… examinations that there is a time…examinations…this…ah comma…this helps children to build… build…build their future or personality…personality development…This is my second paragraph…

Then, I will write my third paragraph is going to be about the most reason why people go to school…is that having academic [acquir..]…academic…academic ah qualification to have jobs or to have a place in society…so, I’m going to write my topic sentence is people…people attend school (pause) [/noise…door being knocked…opened then closed]…people attend school to have…academic… qualification… academic qualification to get better jobs…this is my i…my topic sentence…I will develop it…so, I will say that…most people or… the main reason why people choose to go to school is to have …as […] we my [mai]…as we…we may say……is to have a diplomas…diplomas…and …and high classification …and high classification in education to…to gain a good job…full stop…and some people attend school to have …to have…to have ah… a good statue in society. So, this is my third paragraph…was…as
I…[…] written… I think that my paragraphs are too short but this is my ideas…and…this what ah I wrote my ideas.

Conclusion… To conclude with…conclude with…comma… I am going to write the three main ideas…school gives better chance to people…people to get more knowledge…to get more knowledge…to get more knowledge…and learn socialization and get academic qualification…qualification to have…to get better jobs. I finished with…with the drafting…so, I’m going to revise… I’m going to revise my essay in terms of spelling mistakes or punctuation….and if I will add or…

The revision stage of the writing process
So, the fif…the fifth step is revising…my introduction…I find it that…ah…this is a good…in this is my […] introduction…I’m not going to add or edit something…..so…Knowledge and wisdom are becoming more and more important…important and vital to develop… to develop and sustain….and sustain society…full stop…The most common way to learn is to go to [the] school…full stop…I usually di… don’t…I usually didn’t…ah….didn’t…I usually didn’t add or…add or omit in my revisions….so, I will write…I will write it [in/of] the same…in the same way…[common way… if] …ah yes…School is the basic foundation of knowledge….of knowledge, being imparted to a child…full ah…comma…it gives …it gives…it gives the chance…it gives the chance to children…it gives the chance to children to acquire…to acquire knowledge… on vi[ai]rious fields of education…this is my thesis statement…think of [unclear utterance] the body.

Firstly, attending school gives people a chance to meet…to meet new friends…full stop … Meeting [a] new people and socialization … socialization … socialization also broaden … broadens human … human parameter[s] of knowledge … parameter of knowledge… Full stop…Thus…comma when people are learn together, there is interaction…there is interaction between them…between them; so, it will be a good way…a good way to acquire knowledge…full stop…It[s] also shape the personality of…of children because the child is white…a white board…board…we can write…no…this is a personal …a personal ah…so, I will
omitted and say because a child is a white…a white board, anyone can write whatever he wants… whatever he wants…and…and some people become famous thanks to school…school’s help…this is my second paragraph…I’m going…ah…first paragraph.

Secondly, school is a …is a rich source of getting knowledge…of getting knowledge and also have opportunities…opportunities to practise …practice several…to practise several skills…this is ah…(cough)… As a young age, people learn a lot things …a lot of things in different subjects…in different subjects…so, school…so, school is ah… a better place to have [a] good information…to have a good information. Moreover, school enable people…children to have several activities…several activities, such as competitions…competition…competitions and examinations… and examination[s] and …this …. [unclear utterance/sound] child shape his personality.

The third paragraph…Thirdly, the main reason why people attend school is to have academic …academic …academic …academic qualification…so, people go to school to have…to graduate and have their diploma to gain better job and also to …to have a high level in society…in society. So, this is my third paragraph…I will go to write [a third / unclear] to conclusion. To sum up, school gave better chance to people to get more knowledge and learn socialization, and get academic qualification…to get [a] better job. I finished with my all…all ah…all the steps, from brainstorming to planning to drafting and also revising.

APPENDIX VII.3: SCRIPT OF THE THINK-ALOUD PROTOCOLS

STUDENT 03: (A. M.)
HIGH-ACHIEVER 1
Topic: Firing people from their office/ job

The pre-writing stage of the writing process
So…ah…I’d like to start by having three topics here: people getting fired from their office… and drug…second topic is about drug addiction…drug addiction…and third one is (cough) … and the third one is about divorce….I think that ah the first topic is more appropriate to be developed
by cause and effect…and even the second topic which is about drug addiction, it’s about…it would be better to be developed from for cause and effect…and divorce…it’s also…but I think that divorce is a subject which is more social…and…and even the data or some information we can get is not only reliable information or reliable data here…..in order to put (eh) those data…and even to mention the causes and effects…I think that for divorce here…so…which is the third topic (cough)…I think… I will develop it by the way of point by point method…since the real…the causes are both…eh… are… are the.. are both…are similar….or I think that…I think the…are the…there are causes and at the same time there are effects… so I would like to develop it by point by point ….in fact that I think…I did not like the way to develop by point by point method…and even drug addiction …drug addiction is…is…is eh… somehow has more effects …is how.. is somehow has more effects than its causes …since causes they are so less and no more…but I think that the (eh) …the subject of people fired from their fo … their office is something which is pleased me….which is pleased me…so I would like to develop it by starting…by focusing much more eh…using block method whe…where I’m going to focus on (cough) on the causes rather than the effects….since the effects I think that they… they are …they seem to me less than the causes, so I would like to focus much more to get much more importance to the causes rather than the effects.

So the first step… the first step I would like to start with…I would like to st.. to start with brainstorming…in general in brainstorming…I will divide my…my paper into two sides…so the first side is for causes and another one for the effects …another one for the effects…and any idea.. any idea that comes to my mind, I would like to mention it…and, but … by giving much focus on the causes rather than than on… rather than the effects… so I would like to mention here the listing technique in the brainstorming since it helps me too much in I think in … in planning also in generating the ideas … and even I can tick the ideas and the phrases and even the expressions or the words that I think they are appropriate and even it helps me too much in planning and in the organization of ideas as well.

So, I think that the first cause is economical so I can say that economical crisis …crisis…the industrial revolution…the industrial…the industrial…the industrial revolution…revolution…
using much machines... using... using much machines... much machines... much machines in... in factories... yes... it's also in factories... in factories (eh) strikes also... when... when the administration did not accept eh strikes... and also... and even the age of the... age of people... and even the a... even the age... even the age of the workers or the employees...

It’s also about competencies... competence... it’s about... I think that eh it’s eh it’s about also competencies... when... when... (soft cough) when... competencies... new... new competent people... it’s... it’s also new competent people... people and fresh... and fresh experiences... and fresh experiences... and fresh experiences... experience... experiences... and fresh experiences... competitiveness... new competent people and fresh experiences... using much machines in factories... strikes, ages, ... so, economical crisis... the industrial revolution... using machines in factories...

I think that and even and even to bankrupt... and even even to to bankrupt... it’s also bankrupting... it’s also bankrupt... to ban... bankrupting and banning... and banning and eh some... some some companies... companies... companies... (soft cough) companies that that lost... that lo... that lost its... its... its money... its money and suffers from the underground of the economy... and suffers... suffers from the underground... the underground... also... underground... and eh... even the effects... the first and I think the major effect... the major effect is joblessness... joblessness... the first major effect that it causes joblessness... em... I think that unethical practices... unethical practices... unethical practices since people... since people who got fired they did not find the office money...

Poverty also... poverty... we can mention to say that poverty... I think that I have given I have given much focus to... to the causes rather than to the effects... this is something... is of course... it’s... it’s dependent on the way I would like to develop my essay here... and then unethical practices, joblessness, poverty... and also... (soft cough) and also the economy... the economy of countries... the economy suffers from the underground... the underground of the economy... the economy... and also the this something that remembers me about transparency...
I think that I can find out the causes...since I...I think that this should much...and so...and eh...and interrelated to the other side...so lead me to say that this is about bribery... corruption in the causes... bribery, corruption and lack of ethics...and lack of ethics...and here the underground of the economy joblessness it's from the side of the effects.

So, I would like to start my plan...then to say tha...I would like to start to start to begin with making the plan which is about ... focusing on the causes rather than on the effects...so I start to make the plan...the plan... First of all I...first of all I would like to say that ...that in the plan...to...the first thing that I would like to mention is...to mention the thes... the introduction first and then I can write the...and ...within the introduction...it’s about my plan where I’m going to use (soft cough)... In the plan...in the plan I would like to talk about the thesis statement...I think I I would prefer to...to write such kind of plans...it’s not a detailed plan... it’s a simple plan...because as if it gives me the push or some hints to start with ...ev...even s ...even some even ideas are not clear and complete in this... and main ideas are not complete in the plan or something...in in the plan ...but I think they would give me the hint to be developed....and as ...as long as I write the drafts I can carry on and give much imp...and give much details about what I’m going to write...So the thesis statement ... thesis statement I think that it would state what is sa...what will be said and will be discussed in the whole essay...I think it makes as if it is an...an...an open door to what I’m going to say along...to I’m going to say in this...I’m goin...I’m going to...I’m going to write in my whole essay...so, here, I would like to say...to say...

Among the problems...this...eh...the...I think that this sentence should be put in the introduction....but...but...but I I would like to say that to get people ... in the thesis statement here... to get people fired... fired from their office... office... getting people...so I ....it it’s better to say getting people fired...yes....it’s better to say...it’s...to mention the name rather than to start with ...because I think that in the...in the...even in the thesis statement itself, it should be ....it should be like a sentence which i... which is clear...containing a verb and some principles...I think that I I would prefer to call what we call principles as if to discuss the main
causes and the main effect...to to...as if to give some hints or some phrases or words that are...tha...that will be discussed in the body paragraphs..

So, so getting people fired from their office... getting people fired from their office...as...from their...fro eh from their office is due to many...many...I would like to mention many because the focus is much more ...is much more on the causes rather than the effects...so I would like is due to many ... (soft cough) ... many... economical...economical... economical...then comma...I thin (k)...this this what we can call principles is not when...I’m going to list some aspects that will be discussed in the whole paragraph... so ... some economical and then individual...i can’t say human beings because individual the the eh there are people who are involved in...in job and working...so individual ...so...to many economical, individual... individual and ethical... yes individual and ethical... ethical factors ... and ethical factors which... so I think I would like to say... which ...because I should have find ...and and even inside the thesis statement I should have a link between the causes and effects and here is the problem or here is the question...how can I find the link between...how can I find the link between the causes and the effects in the thesis statement itself...so...so eh... so using using the person...relative pronoun I repeat again ... people getting fired from their office is due to many to many economical and individual and ethical factors which lead...which lead so I would like to say lead because it’s about three principles...I can call them principles here yes economical individual and factor which lead ...which lead to effects...which lead to effects on...which lead to effects on people...on people and society...so I’m going to talk about social problems causes after behind this...yes...I think that...so getting people fired from their office is due to many economical individual and ethical factors which leads to effects on people and society....which leads to effects on society.

Then I start first with with planning ...so after before before going to the plan, I would like to reread again the causes and as if I would divide them into sections in order to... in order to ...in order they ....I will divide them into some main ideas to discuss them in the essay ...in the...in the essay or in the in the body paragraphs of the essay since the cause will be discussed and the effects as well.
So I would like to give... so economical crisis, the industrial revolution, using machines in factories... using machines... and that lost money and suffers from the underground of the economy... bribery corruption and competencies... new competent people... people and fresh experiences... the industrial revolution... yes... so (unclear word/phrase) So the first paragraph... so the first paragraph in the body... the first paragraph I would like to make it... its topic sentence... its topic sentence would be... so I would like to say that economical factors cause firing people from their office... so here... from their office... I think that the topic of the paragraph here is economical factors and the main verb is cause and what is the controlling idea here is hiring people from their office... yes it’s about firing people from their office ...

So I’d like to start with the first main idea... the... the first main idea... so I think that the underground... the underground... the underground of the economy... of the economy... the underground of the economy in some countries... countries lead their companies... lead their companies or I ca... I can say that... I... I can say that make... makes (unclear word/phrase) underground of the economy... makes their companies incapable or incapable to afford... to afford... that is... that is meaning by... to afford... to afford the salars... they are salaries... salars... to afford... to afford money to its employees... employees... so actually they fire them... actually they fire them... ok... it’s...

So so about the brainstorming for me is of paramount importance... so I think it gives me the hints... so how can I... how can I get this idea without looking at at companies that lost its money and suffer from the underground... from this... from brainstorming stage here I got these idea which is about... which is about... which is about en... eh... to make companies incapable of affording money to the workers.

So then second... so then second... then so then second... I think that companies... companies could not carry on working because... could not carry on working... could not carry on... could not carry on working... could not carry on working because of loses... loses and taxes
increasment… increasement… and taxes increasement. Then I think… I... I would… I would write
the main idea…the third main idea which is I think here…here and… and even insi…and within
the plan itself and in this paragraph…I started from the most important to the least important
idea…so I think that the…as much m…as much more I get some… some new… eh much…eh
so, I... So I think that I start from the focus then to the least important,…then here the third
idea… it would be about …about loss and could not bankrupt and banning… and banning
economical crisis and the industr… So I always go back to the brainstorming phase in order to
look and to get … and to get the…and to get some ideas that gives me the hint to start carry
on…carry on working … so… em … so countries… ah I think that governments… yes
governments… governments … governments imposes …imposes the use of new materials…
materials in order to reduce… in order to reduce… (soft cough) imposes… imposes the use
of…of new materials and machines…of new … of new materials and machines … in order
to reduce taxes…so actually and then…so I always re… relate them with getting fired people …I
think that without ge…without getting outside from the topic and from the idea of the topic
because I think as much as …as much as the writer is much sticked to his topic as much as he
attracts the readers’ attentions and to get fluency from the readers and and eh and at least reading
or listening from…from the audience. Yes, ok…to reduce taxes actually…actually…actually…
(soft cough) actually new… modern I can say new … modern machines do not require much
employees…do not require much employees … and so here I would like to write a concluding
sentence… I think that a concluding sentence would be as if it is a recapitulation about…about
what was said from the be…in the whole of the paragraph and what I’m going to write down
here….so I think that… so even some… some people neglect the topic sentence and concluding
sentence… but I think that as much more as you write the concluding sentence as if you give the
points of view or your understanding or you direct the understanding of the readers even though
their minds went outside something …but I think that concluding sentence go back and gives the
meaning and the understanding of the topic and what is the topic itself.

So, here the concluding sentence… the concluding sentence… I would like to reread again the
ideas and even the topic sentence in order to give the concluding sentence…so economical
factors cause firing people from their office. The underground of economy in some countries
make their companies incapable to afford money to its employees. So actually they fire them. They fire them... companies could not carry on working because of loses and taxes increasement... increasement. Governments imposes the use of new machines in order to reduce taxes. Actually modern machines do not require much employees. Ok, it’s about here. So here the underground of the economy... the underground of economy... financial crisis... financial crisis... financial crisis... financial crisis loses... loses and modernization... I think that I can say it... modernization... modernization of material... material... get people out from their job... so here financial crisis we talked about the underground of the economy... the underground of the economy what is the underground of the economy... that leads to financial crisis... and even it's... I think it... it has both functions in the main and the first main idea and the second main idea... that is the underground of the economy causes incapable to afford money and also companies which lose money and cannot carry on... carry on producing... then governments imposes the use of new machines in order to reduce taxes. Actually modern machines do not require much employees.

Ok, then... I would like to start... then I’d like to... to go... to go ahead to the second... in the second paragraph... so I write its topic sentence... then I come back again to the brainstorming phase in order to get... because I have already done the arrangement... I have already done the arrangement... I have already done the arrangement of the ideas... so I think that (soft cough) that I... I... I would talk about the... I... I would like... I... I would like to talk about the individual factors or the individual... individual elements... so, I think that I would like to talk... to talk... talk about the circumstances... the circumstances... so I... I... I would like to say the circumstances... circumstances... circumstances... circumstances... so... I think that in order... in order to talk about bribery... corruption... and competencies... competent people and the eh... about the... about the industrial revolution... and even... and even experiences, strikes and ages... is also... is also involved in this fact...

So, the circumstances surrounding... surrounding... surrounding the working... surrounding working situations... surrounding working situations... working... circumstances surrounding working situations is involved... is involved in getting people outside their jobs...
It seems to me as if it’s long but I think as much as it is… it’s…it’s it seems to … since it’s the
controlling idea is involved in getting people outside their jobs… Okay… so… I would like…I
think that…as if it would gather all those ideas… strikes, the age… the age of the workers…
competencies… and …and also… (soft cough) … and… and also about bribery and
corruption… lack of ethics…lack …lack of ethics… so I think that eh … I think that … (soft
cough) … so circumstances surrounding … sur … circumstances sur… so main … I think the
main…m the first main idea … the first main idea…the first main idea…some societies suffers
… some societies suffer from ... suffer from …from bribery … bribery and nepotism … yes it’s
about bribery and nepotism… so here some societies suffers…suffer from bribery and nepotism… so it’s more … it’s more
related to this…then later on I would like to dis…to explain this idea… it seems as if it’s not
clear… but we should… but I should write it down in order to not wor … and keep it in my
mind…then competences… new competent…eh as in ….as in… the changes… here… and
he…the changes in … the changes in the world… the world requires… requires … in the world
requires the change … the change in the employees themselves … in the employees themselves
… so [me invite … many] (unclear utterance) invite … to bring new workers and new k … and
new people here [unclear word]… working there. And then here change workers’ circumstances
surrounding working situations [unclear] in getting people outside their jobs…
And I go back here to…so I’d like to talk about strikes and the age…I think that the working…
working situations … situations and problems… problems between… between employers…
employers …employers and employees … and employee… and employers … and employees… I
think that it’s here I would like to write the concluding sentence about this second … second
paragraph which is the circumstances surrounding the working situations is involved in getting
people outside their jobs… some societies suffer from bribery and nepotism…the change in the
work requires change in the employees themselves … working situations and problems between
employers and employees …

And then I’d like to…to finish this second paragraph by writing a concluding sentence… as I
said before the concluding sentence is of paramount importance since it directs meaning and it
provides some ideas about what is… about … about what was discussed here… I have to make a
reading again… the circumstances surrounding the working situations is involved in getting people outside their jobs… some societies suffer from bribery and nepotism… the change in the world requires change in the employees themselves… working situations and problems between … and problems between employers and employees… and I would like to have to have a look again … a look again here… about eh… so … what … what … what I’m going to say here that… (soft cough) that also… that also… that… that… I… I want to say working problems… yes I think it… it would be better… working problems… work… working problems… work… working problems affects… affects the standing… standing of workers… of workers in then … in their office… in their office… yes it would be better to say [unclear word]…

I think that it’s… I think that… it’s enough … I think that it would be … it would be enough here …. I think it… it would be enough to talk about causes here then let’s move on to the effects here… the effects I think they are not so much much much much… but I would… it’s preferable to mention them… so the effects after having a look again on brainstorming phase… so I… I think there is joblessness… poverty… unethical practices… the economy suffers from the underground of the economy… the economy suffers from the underground of the economy … I think that it’s irrelevant… I would like to [unclear expression] to omit this one… and… and leave just joblessness… poverty… unethical practices… and then also people would have a dissatisfied attitude… a dissatisfied attitude… attitude towards their… their government… towards the policy of the country… policy of the country… of the country… okay… then I’d like to write… down the effects… so [unclear utterance/word] I think that it’s the third paragraph in the body… so third one… I would like to write the topic sentence… topic sentence… this topic sentence I think it would be much more general rather than specific… since it is… as it’s… will collect the whole… the whole effect of… [noise]… (pause)… and and here… so I would like to say that firing people… people from their office has several effects… it’s it’s more general since t’s going to… to talk about the major effects and not just specific one so… so that

I… I think in… in this plan I have mentioned two paragraphs for the causes because they are di… I think that they are divided into two sections or… I think that they are so… that they divided into two sections … I think that they are divided into two sections here… so I
would like to ca… just to mention them so … I would like to say the main idea one… the main idea one…one… people… so I would like to say people getting fired from their office became … became jobless… jobless and certainly… and certainly … and certainly poor… and certainly poor… yes… and the main idea … the main idea number two (soft cough) … number two… yes…eh they are also…so I would like to say they instead of people getting fired from their office… they will be involved … they will be involved …involved in unethical … unethical practices… in unethical practices …they will be involved in unethical practices …so the third one … the third one which is…I… I … I would prefer that…since … I think as if those causes are th… they are interrelated so that I’d like to mention this third one… people would… people would have a dissatisfied because… so… to to be poor in your country… and to to be involved in in unethical practices… what will you have …what … what …what would people here have then … people here would have a dissatisfied attitude towards their… the policy of their … of their… towards the policy of their countries … yes … so that I write it down third main idea … people would have … would have… would have a dissatisfied … dissatisfied attitude… attitude … towards the policy … the policy… the policy of their countries… of their countries. I think they are the major effects that …that that that does exist… in addition to lot of them… but these are since I’m I’m going to focus on the causes rather than on the effects so I think it is…this is…I think it is this one…

So here I would like to write the concluding sentence…the concluding sentence… the concluding sentence… the conclusion… in the concluding sentence I’m going to say that… that firing people… firing people … firing people from their office… from their …from their office has negative… negative effects on… on people and nations as well. I think it’s this one …concerning the conclusion… I think I… I’d prefer to… to leave it until the end… I think that the conclusion it will be the recapitulation and both make a summary of the introduction and what was discussed in the body… so after having the first draft in … after writing and … and after writing the first draft, an introduction and the body paragraphs then it would be easier and much easier to write the conclusion there… so I think it is … it’s preferable to leave it until I finish the first draft and [unclear utterance] …
The drafting stage of the writing process

So, I would like to… so, I’m going to start … I’m going to start to write the first draft of the essay… the first draft of the essay… so before starting writing the introduction I think we should find something that attracts the attention of the reader … I… so… I think that… expression or… it is as if it is ambiguous or it’s … it’s a proverb… or an example or a quotation… or something that attracts the reader and that push the reader to stick to the my written matter… so I’d like to start with something like this… work preserves dignity… preserves dignity… that is I would like to… so and … and after giving a robber here … such expression which is called a robber…

Then I would like to have a link or a bridge with my topic and then after introducing the topic … after introducing the topic … and after introducing the topic I would like to write down the thesis statement … the … then when people … when people practise a mental… a mental … I think that ment…mental or… mental or… I’m searching for an expression… mental or material …mental or mater… mental or material activity in order to save the day… in order… in order to save the day … to save the day … but in some cases people na… may get fired … yes… may get fired from their job. I think here I find a bridge between the robber … introduced understand what is work … yes… and then … and then find directly… directly the link … the link to our topic… tis… which is getting fired from their office… then… then… I’d like to start here… and … firing people… firing… I’d like to write thesis… directly the thesis statement … firing people from their office is due… I would rewrite again the thesis statement that is already written in the plan… yes… their office is due to many… many economical… economical … individual … individual and ethical factors the things that are going to be discussed in the body paragraphs… yes and then factors which lead… those factors that lead… which lead to … to effects … effects on people and society… that [unclear word] … I think was… it is… I think that it’s all what is going to be discussed in the body paragraphs and the sentences that are existing here.

I think that the introduction gives me general ideas ideas about what I’m going to talk about in the body paragraphs… and here I think that the focus was much more on the causes rather than on the effects… I think… so I’d like to start to write the body paragraphs … so I thin the ide… the topic sentences I leave them as they are since they are going to introduce for me … but the
concluding sentences in some cases I’ll restate them again…okay … so then the first paragraph is … economical … it’s topic sentence is… economical economical factors economical factors cause firing people from their office … cause firing people from their office … from their office … cause firing people from their office… So I think that the first main idea I’d like to say…I’d like this…I’d like to use the transition first…first ….

The underground of the economy the underground of the economy … the underground of the economy in some countries because of… I’m… I’m not going to generalize … not all countries are suffering from the underground of the economy… and then even the use of the verb makes because I’m go… I’m talking about the underground one single thing… makes … makes their companies … their companies incapable … incapable… [be]cause I I can’t say that eh… to mention here in able … because capability… capability isn’t an in an on … an inside because… someone able is talk about inside and not an inside ability… because there is two kind there is internal ability and there is external ability but here capability is a mixture of both of them…. so their companies incapable to afford… to afford … I’d like to write down here to afford salaries …. to afford salaries to its employees … employees … and here … and here… they fire them… they fire them … and then I’d like to make another tran… another word of transition besides … besides companies could not carry on working because of loses and taxes increasement … so and and even so here I’d like to write it so … companies … companies cannot carry… on carry on because of loses … and … and taxes increasement. Actually… actually their workers are out… and then the final idea in the first paragraph… I’d like to write it here…

Finally government imposes the use of new machines in order to reduce taxes. Actually the modern… do not require much importance (soft cough)… so it’s … this idea is as if it’s not clear … is not much clear … so I’d like to restate it again… the idea itself is good but I think the way I should give it I I should rewri… I should re… restate it again…

So, so what I’m going to say here that … the use of new machines in many factories … factories imposed… imposed by authorities… authorities reduces … reduces the number … the number of workers or employees it will preferable to say employees to avoid repetition… reduces the number of employees and fire… fires them out… and fires them … and fires them from their
office... from their office... and fires them from their office... from their office ... it means (whispered) ... so here I’m going to explain in order to make the idea much much much clear... so... in some countries... in some countries... using new... new machines reduces... in some countries using new machines new machines free factories ... free factories... free factories from taxes and increases production also (with assertion) ... and increases production... okay... this idea it seems to me as if it’s too long , but I think it would be much clear and much better to say it in order to make the reader understand more and more... and then I will write the concluding sentence ... I’d like to mention to mention the concluding sentence ... so financial crisis... loses and modernization of material ... of materials get people out of their job... okay... financial crisis ... so here... financial... financial crisis... financial crisis... financial crisis ... loses... it is loses in general I’m not specific in particular field or... and modernization... taxes also I have discussed this... taxes and ... because I’m ... I’m enumerating and listing ...I’d like to... financial crisis ... loses and taxes and modernization... and modernization of materials ... of materials ... of materials get people out from their office...get people... people out of work... get people out of their ...

I’m going to write the second paragraph... write the second paragraph here...it is it’s about eh and and about causes also ... it is and its topic sentence is about the surrounding circums... circumstances is involved in getting people outside of their job... is involved in getting people outside their job. So so I’d like to write down...so I think the thesis statement shouldn’t consist of the passive voice ... the passive voice (whispered) yes... yes it shouldn’t contain the passive voice... yes ... So I wou... I’d like to start from and in order to move from the first paragraph to the second paragraph I would like to make a transition which is on the other hand... on the other hand, on the other hand... so I say it here... the surrounding... the surrounding circumstances... the surrounding circumst circums circums ... the surrounding circumstances of working situations of working situations is involved ... involved ... is involved in getting people outside their job ... is involved in getting people outside their job (soft cough) ... and then I start by directly without saying that eh [unclear utterance] because I’m going directly to explain because it’s an idea also so so some societies some societies suffer from ... suffer from bribery... bribery and and nepotism nepotism ... it means... so here I’m going to explain the idea ...to explain the
idea … in order to stand in your office comma the boss the boss here should be should be one of your relatives or you give the cachet or you give the cachet yes it’s also existing at any place not only some countries… it’s any place and anywhere… so the changes in the world requires the changes in the employees themselves … and then besides the change in the world… in the world requires the change in the employees the employees themselves … requires the change in the employees … requires the change in the employees themselves themselves… for instance for instance for instance … the tech … an employee… employee (whispered) in the education … education or an employee in the education or in … or in … I think about … I I would like that to say about… say something about eh… or in a workshop or in the workshop … that knows … so it’s better to give the … so this example it’s more to explain the idea to make it more clear since it’s not clear… it’s not more clear…or in the workshop that knows techniques … techniques from … from the [unclear word (x2)] … so the company would bring would bring … so here in order to explain more and more … I use the comma … so the company would bring a new employer who already knows … knows the modern technologies… modern technologies or techniques I would like to say techniques because I have already started saying that techniques talking about techniques… talking about techniques and…

And then I’d like to finish with the first idea here… finally… the working situations working situations situations and problems … problems … between … between employers … employers and employees and employees increases increase … increase I’d like just to make increase because it’s both two things it’s not only one single thing…increase this missing of workers and and because of strikes because of strikes and working … working conditions that are difficult … okay… conditions that are difficult … difficult and here also I’m going to write the concluding sentence… so here I think that all of it it was talking just about working problems and problems and problems in the work….so it’s all of it could be related to working problems…

So as it is written in the plan I would like to say that working working problems working problems affects affects standing standing of workers …of workers in their office… affect standing of workers in their office … and then I think that I have already finished with eh talking about causes here about talking the conditions and causes… I’d like to [went] to the effects
talking effects I think that I was more general here and eh since I’m going to write about the effects… it would be more general … and it would cover I think most of the aspects … I hope so (laughter)

So firing people from their office has several effects… it is it is the topic sentence I think it’s eh so I would like to say that eh… I use another another transition which is… eh but it’s preferable to not to not to use a transition here to start directly… firing pe…because I’m going to talk about the effects so I’m clear here … so firing people from their office … their office has several effects … has several effects … has several effects… so eh among the eff … so I wou… it’s prefable… to put a transition here first transition here first … so people getting fired from their office become jobless and certainly poor… actually they do not work they do not have some money to to live with … yes as I have said in the introduction in order to save their day… so people getting fired from their office from their office became jobless became jobless and poor… it’s certainly… then besides besides besides ar I think that it would prefable to change it because I am from the beginning of the essay and and I was besides so I use there is much and much transitions such as moreover furthermore eh I think that besides next to addition to… then moreover … moreover they will be involved they will be will be involved involved in unethical practices they will be involved in unethical practices and I would like to give an example such as stealing… stealing … drugs trading … trading and smuggling … and smuggling esps especially in third world countries that drugs trading drugs trading and smuggling and stealing because so partic… particularly it’s it’s due to poverty I think that these ca… these are more interrelated and all of them leads to one major effect I think that we used to say that we start from the mos the much important to the least important but here since they are interrelated so I I’d like to make as if the link the link method as we can say it… so the first one cannot be without the second one … so I think that I can’t mention I can’t say the third the third main idea which is people would have a dissatisfied attitude towards the policy of their countries without mentioning why because of poverty … of poverty and unethical practices this make people as if it’s I’m going to have made… such kind of process starting from something that leads to other thing … so it’s here … finally … finally people would have would have a dissatisfied a dissatisfied … would have a dissatisfied … dissatisfied (whispered) attitude and lack …a
dissatisfied attitude towards the policy the policy the policy of their countries…the policy of their countries of their countries (soft cough) the fact that makes … the fact that makes the lack of confidence between citizens between citizens … citizens and governments and governments which is something very dangerous … so here in the concluding sentence … firing people from their office has negative effects on people and nations as well as it would have been discussed here so I write it down… fer … firing people from this as if this such kind of opinion on narrowing down meaning about what is discussed in in the paragraph here… so it has it has several functions the concluding sentence… I think it’s very important for me as is the brainstorming stage important as well firing people from their office from their office has negative … negative effects on people and nations as well … people and nations as well (soft cough) …

So so work in the conclusion I’m going to write what is said in the whole paragraph and in the whole work here and in the whole I’d like to talk talk about discuss to restate again what was said here in the conclusion…and as if what I have understand from this from my writing itself because I think that as much you develop as much you find that there is something missing something you like something is adding … so I think it’s more necessary to leave it until the [end] [unclear word]…

Work is tend to be … I’d like to say in the conclusion … work is tend to be is tend to be a way of getting getting an an acceptable life… an acceptable life …an acceptable life… and because of because of and because of so I’m going to talk here about the economical factors … and because of the economical fact …. and because of economical factors… and and modernization … modernization of the work… workshops… modernization of the workshops … of workshops and working… working situation … the working situations … and working situations … people people lose their office and their [unclear word] an acceptable life… and life and suffer from and suffer from what I have discussed here … and suffer from many ethical ethical and political from… and make people suffer from ethical problems and governments and governments … governments from the lack of confidence … okay.
The revision stage of the writing process

Then ca carry on with write… it’s the stage revision…..what I’d prefer to write here in the second draft … in the second draft I think it would be more better and much better and to avoid some mistakes and before starting writing the second draft I would prefer to reread again what is written and look first at the shape are paragraph much long, are they less long, the way of writing, and the vocabulary, and the grammar, the arrange…I think that I am sure somehow sure about the arrangement of ideas but some irrelevant sentences and …they might be here, so in fact I start reading again the introduction work preserves dignity or I can ss … saves dignity I think it’s the same people practice a mental or material activity in order to save the day but in some cases people may got may get fired from their job… firing people from their office is due to many economical individual and ethical factors which lead to effects on people and I think after after after aft.. making and reading the whole after finishing and treating this subject, I would like to omit which lead to effects on people and nations I can’t say that society only because as in the last paragraph to have already done in the last paragraph when I discussed the effects on society and even nations… I think that nations is a umbrella term… that includes government, people, individuals …

So I’d like to start here by rewriting again… so work preserves dignity dignity then when people people people so here I think it’s a kind of explanation definition of work when people practise a mental a mental or material activity activity in order in order to save the day that is it… to save the day to save the day but it is written here to save the day so but I think that such kind of composition between work and I cannot talk about firing from work without mentioning what is work at least so even am talking about work in general and sentences in the introduction must be general ok it’s something obvious because so that to stick to you in order to look and have a view of what is written… How the reader will understand how the reader will recognize… But in some cases in some cases people may get fired from their job from their office it’s preferable from their office it’s clear then I’d like to thesis statement that firing people from their office is due to many many economical economical economical then as I have seen economical and surrounding circumstances then I can say that ethical factors also, economical then ethical factors individual and ethical factors some societies and then here also……individual facts as I have
analyze … developed here so economical individual… it would certainly include the individual factor because without individuals we cannot have workers we cannot have such things and ethical it’s also here in the development major factor and involving machines and here all those factors must push me do this one and ethical factors which lead which lead to effects on people and nations… it’s not only societies as it is in the first draft because I think that nations is in cover terms includes lots of aspects I put a period here…

Then another indentations then economical factors cause firing people from their their job dot period then I think it includes several aspects and I think that including first this because it doesn’t consist some several aspects so I will not include the transitional word first I will directly write underground of the economy economy in some there is a word missing in the first draft I think that in some countries in some countries mix the companies particularly I have mentioned the definite article the companies instead of their companies because the companies of country we know those companies mix their the companies incapable to afford I prefer to use this word because afford I think that people afford money countries afford money nations afford money I think that even though it’s a general term but I think it’s more credited to afford summaries to its employees to its employees and here they fire them I’d prefer to then I add something else where am going to mention besides then I can say that companies another aspect companies cannot carry on because because of losses and taxes losses and taxes increasement. I add the genitive –s because yes taxes related to the taxes so I have added this the thing that doesn’t exist in the first draft so I’d prefer writing in previous times

I didn’t like to write the second draft but and after practices and self-correction and sometimes and in some in the rare cases the peer evaluation pushed me again to write the second draft in the past I was considering that the second draft the first draft is more perfect the best one… but I think from now until one am still organizing.. The second draft is the best one… taxes increasement… actually their workers comma I’d like to make a comma certainly because this no I would like to make as a result I’d like to make a full stop as a result of as a result of these aspects because this and here there is a result of just these aspects not about the whole causes or it’s just about one single aspect its results is considered from itself as a cause here as a result
their workers are out then finally the use of new machines it seems to me very long I think this last one but I think the use of new machines in many factories imposed by authorities reduce the number of employees and fires them out and fires them out from their offices it means in some countries it means new machines free factories it means new machines um no free factories (murmur) it’s irrelevant from free factories makes factories free from taxes and increases taxes so then the use of new machines in many in many factories imposed by authorities reduces the number of employees reduces and here it’s the idea then after that the explanation it means in some countries…yes it’s the explanation of it then even the idea is somehow ambiguous but the explanation makes it more clear and more understood ok by authorities reduces the number of employees and fires no I don’t need to put the comma since it’s a compound predicate yes I don’t need it doesn’t suppress the idea it’s not listing and fires them from their offices and here something in the academic writing it’s preferrable to put that is instead of it means that is more formal and academic that is in some countries using new machines new machines makes factories free from taxes taxes and so increases increases production and increases production

Then in the concluding sentence it’s also talking about financial crisis losses taxes modernization of materials gets people out of work then I think it’s appropriate this concluding sentence because it summarizes the whole aspects of what is written here inside then I’d like to put a period after that I put my concluding sentence… it’s a shape here shape of a paragraph financial crises losses taxes and modernization of materials it (whispering) gets some people out of work and on the other hand the surrounding circumstances of working situat then it’s the second paragraph about causes I should make a reading again i should read again here what’s put here then on the other hand the surrounding circumstances of working situation yea …so includes getting people outside their job includes the surrounding circumstances I think I think that that I should omit in this topic sentence the surrounding circumstances of working situations is involved in getting people outside their job and anyway I think that I should let it as it here as it is because it remains a sentence even though but it is preferable to avoid is involved in getting people outside their job so I’d like to write like this, on the other hand on the other hand the surrounding cir.. surrounding circumstances of work I think that there is something missing in
this topic sentence I think as I write it in the plan as I wrote it on the plan circumstances surrounding work situations is more appropriate and better to write it like this then I should write as it is in the plan rather than in the first draft so circumstances surrounding working working situations make people outside their work (cough)

And then I directly without transitions some societies suffer from some societies suffer from bribery and nepotism it means in order to … so I think it’s better it is clear the idea here… some societies suffer from bribery and nepotism some societies suffer from bribery and nepotism it means and even though I think that always using that is that is it means that is so I prefer to use it means also I think it’s.. even though it’s less formal and less academic but it has…It’s more expressive I think it’s less formal than that is but it’s more expressive yes it means in order to stand.. because I am going to explain… in order to stand in your office comma the boss should be one of your relative the boss must be I think that must be because.. to insist to give focus here it’s better than should be… must be one of your relatives Must be one of your relatives or you must give the … a cachet… a cachet here it’s about bribery and corruption yes then besides I think that instead of using besides another time I would prefer to use furthermore furthermore the change in the world requires the change in the employees themselves for instance an employee in the education or in workshop that has techniques from nineteen eighties the company would bring a new employer who already knows the modern techniques ok it’s also a fact yes I would like so the change no I can’t say the change in the because I can’t talk about a particular change it’s about surrounding lots of circumstances I would omit the… so I write change in the world because lots of changes not only one single change so lots of changes and we don’t know those changes because there are such changes we are aware of them and the others are not aware so change in the world requires the change in the employees themselves

So here someone who reads this idea I what is this change I can say for instance for instance for instance the employer I’d like to add this thing because it came to my mind because the employer seeks or searches, seeks for for an up-to-date competency competency competency competency uhum then I would write an employee comma an employee I’d come back again to the previous
example in the first draft an employee in the education an employee in the education or in a workshop or in a workshop it means here am talking am saying that in the workshop it means that in any place that an employee who knows instead of that knows who knows who knows techniques and methods of I can’t say that from because from the 1980s it takes time from this text it means that from the 1980s what do we mean from the 1980s that he from the 1980s he knows requires things till now but of the 1980s it specifies time yes from the 1980s the company comma in this case in this case the company company would bring then the use here of would it means that we are in an unreal situation are providing just providing yes we are just providing it’s an example because an illustration would generally represent an unreal past or future in the past or it’s also and even here it’s present an unreal situation either in the present or in the future or bring a new employer and here I carry on ..who already knows modern techniques and methods modern techniques and methods.

And then finally I think that it’s last idea talking about causes working situations and problem between employers and employees increase dismissing of workers and because of strikes and working conditions are difficult working problems affect it seems like as if it’s not clear so I’d like to rewrite it again something ambiguous in the ideas so I rewrite it again so… finally working situations and problems between employers increase dismissing of workers (short silence) and even and even uhmm employers employers are not I’d like to change this expression and because of strikes and working conditions about their difficult so this this expression I think that it has not a direct relation to our topic so I think that it’s out of topic this expression so I’d like to change it and even so by replacing this by saying in such a way and even employers are not patient with their employees when they strike about their difficult working conditions then I write the concluding sentence and it’s all this talking about working problems so I directly write working problems affects the standing of workers in their office.

Then I think that it’s…ok.. then I already I have finished with the third paragraph and the second paragraph and the body and I think that generally speaking in that developing causes and effects either you choose either you focus on the causes or on the effects when you follow the block method as I am doing here..I am following the block method… I try to focus on the causes rather
than on the effects...And even the nature of the topic requires that thing and even while developing the cause and effect for my opinion I think that it should contain more than two paragraphs at least I can’t mention one paragraph for the causes and one paragraph for the effects and even when developing point by point I should be more clear ok then start the last paragraph which is related to the effects ... firing people from their office has several effects… I think it’s ok with um ... I think it is ok with the topic sentence and even the use of transitions is unnecessary here Because I am trying to talk about another thing…about something else and even also by putting the indentation here the capital letter it seems that a new paragraph and new ideas here. Then firing people from their office has several effects has several effects.. first so I’d like to put these transitions here now because I think that one inside the other And as I have said before that I have this way of writing from less important to more important but here things are interrelated one leads to second one and third and second leads to first so interrelated So I’d like to start from the less frequent to more frequent to arrive here… yes and then first people get fired from their office become… it is in the present also always because we are talking about facts I can’t use here the future or the past or it’s the simple present tense Because I am talking about facts something that exist and even before and today you see each day and each time… from their office become jobless and poor then moreover, jobless people... since here I’d like to change it by they since it’s somehow a bit not clear Who are they ..am I talking about whom who are they I don’t know those they so jobless people I think that after we have causes we caught the problem which are getting people fired from their office so here I have the effects.. people who are jobless don’t have then moreover jobless people...as I have said that things are interrelated so they got out of their office they became jobless so here am talking about moreover…so jobless people will be involved in unethical practices such as steeling.. that was double e in the first draft I think that it’s steel it’s about something credited to the metal and iron or steering here it is with e I… yes steeling drugs’ trading… it’s plural -s and genitive -s drugs trading and smuggling…

I am saying just example such as not by narrowing down or something else yes such as smuggling… finally the policy of their countries the fact that makes the lack of confidence between citizens and government… then it’s the final idea here in the effect so I like to write it
down finally people would have a dissatisfied attitude towards the policy of their countries the fact that makes the lack of confidence between the citizens and the government… something dangerous really… firing people out of their offices has negative effects on people and nations as well… finally I think the idea is clear here… people would have a dissatisfied attitude towards the policy of their countries … the fact comma the fact the fact that results in lack of lack of confidence confidence between governments and citizens and then let’s have a look for about the uhum concluding sentence here so all those effects are in general negative so I would like to say like this to have understood in this paragraph and my idea… the idea that I get what I want to know is to narrow down the reader or to narrow the meaning or to make the meaning more narrower… so here firing people firing people from their office as negative as negative effects effects on people and nations as well… since that I’d like to mention this expression of as well in order to say that … as much as the people suffer from those problems and even nations and even nations and even nations also suffer as people and people are part of nations we can’t find nations without people here…

So and then I need to leave some space for indentation here … so work is tend to be a way of getting an acceptable life life is missing here yes in the first draft and because economical factors and comma am listing the modernization of workshops modernization of workshops because here I think that without saying materials and manufactures and something because and even I talked about methods and up-to-date workers it also includes here workshop they are also a workshop… not only a factor a factory or any other… all place of work are workshop even a classroom is a workshop yes … and working situations what was discussed in the second paragraph the causes and working situations…people lose their office… people lose their office and that acceptable life and that acceptable life and suffer from many ethical problems … problems not problems comma am listing here and also to make comma for the idea and governments and governments from the lack of confidence and then I’d like to add a piece of advice here to write it here a piece of advice to write it down… any causes of firing people from their offices like that I’ve done a mistake from the beginning their offices it’s something plural not singular yes it’s something plural not singular… firing people from their office should be avoided in order not to suffer from its negative effects. I think that is it and it’s the end.
APPENDIX VII.4: SCRIPT OF THE THINK-ALOUD PROTOCOLS

STUDENT 04: (H. F.)
HIGH-ACHIEVER 2

Topic: Discuss the effects of the internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

The pre-writing stage of the writing process (brainstorming and planning)
Mm… so I have here th… four topics …the first one I did it in the post-test so I will eh exclude it … So I have discuss the effects of the internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer… it is effect essay… we have compare and contrast between studying at home by suing technology such as computers or television and studying at traditional at school… also I did this essay before…the other one how does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one. Use examples to support your answer… it is a comparison and contrast essay.

I think that I will choose the second topic… discuss the effects of the internet on your civilization. It will be eh…yes a cause and effect essay…it will focus on the causes eh on the effects of the internet…the internet is the cause… the effects… em… I think I have information … also it will be focused on the effects…it will be easy… easier I mean… also internet is a very known topic and it has many effects on eh on all the civilizations, not only mine…mm…so, I will choose the topic…yes topic…discuss the effects of the internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support… to support your answer.

So this eff…this caus…this essay will be a cause and effect essay… so I will discuss the effects… each effect I will discuss it in a paragraph… my essay should contain an introduction, a body maybe of two or three paragraphs and try to be three or more… conclusion I should use transitions of that express effects to organize my essay…
Mm…first of all I will brainstorm to have clear ideas clear and of course I will add other details later on when I plan or draft …okay so brainstorming…brainstorming…I will use listing to… to brainstorm…

So internet has effects on… I will eh organize the effects like … like aspects… the aspects of civilization that are affected by the internet … for example it has effects on learning… learning…eh… eh as an explanation, i.e., it eh… i.e., it eh… it eh…like it eh… it it it …it transformed… transformed ( whispered) em traditional learning to a virtual learning… virtual …virtual (whispered) learning… online learning…em also it has effects on… on social the social habits … social habits … eh … so … people communicate through internet … they do not need… they do not need… they do not need to meet … they do not need to meet… this is not necessary… they can contact one another through internet… no necessity to meet or to…yes… em social habits … also it em it shows the… the habits and traditions of other nations which influence our traditions … tions and habits … eh … on learning… social habits … em (pause 5 secs) … also we should have another example or another category… social habits … (pause 7 secs)… em… it means it eh … (pause 5 secs) …on eh… it has eh … em … no it is eh… it made everything goes quickly … I mean eh easier … for example… instead of going to em… instead of going to school… instead of to meet someone you can send him your work for example through the internet… learning… social habits it’s eh… no I should have included this in the learning … yes … in learning easier… it becomes easier and eh … quicker … em… social habits… traditions em… (pause 15 secs)… I want another category… learning … social habits… em … em… also… a far people…eh people living far from their families can contact through internet… internet, using skype or facebook, for example.

So, I will start planning…brainstorming…I finished brainstorming. I will start planning…introduction…I should start with introductory sentences… ctory sentences…I should write two or three sentences about… technology.. technology… to introdu …technology and its role ..(wul.ah…) in..ah…in society..in life…in life…then I should hint to the internet…then, I should write my thesis statement..I will say that Internet has many effects on people …on people…no…ah I will say….say that the internet ….internet has affected many fields in our life
life such as learning such as learning... such as learning our social habits and... and it... and it... ah... gave a solution... it gave a solution to many troubles that could face us... of course I may have made changes...

Now the body... first paragraph... topic sentence... it is about learning... so, internet... internet... internet... internet influences... influenced learning... the teaching learning process... yes the teaching learning process... process... from many angles... yes... supporting details... I will say that em... it made learning... teaching... learning and teaching easier and quicker... and quicker... of course I should detail more later... and quicker... it... it comes... it came... it came with... with online learning which... which em... no... that's all... ah... when I say easier and quicker I as examples e-mails and so on... concluding sentence... concluding sentence... so, internet... internet... internet... internet facilitated... facilitated the learning teaching... teaching process... also... yes... one paragraph.

The second paragraph... the topic sentence... topic sentence... social habits... yes, int... the internet... the internet changed many social habits in our civilization... it's better to say ‘our’, not ‘my’ because it is an academic writing... ah... so... supporting details... supporting details... em... supporting details... ah... supporting details... em... supporting details... I will talk about traditions and habits of other nations... yes... ah... internet shows the traditions and the habits of other nations, which may... ah... which may influence our beliefs and customs... customs... ah... for example, it shows their life... life and practices... ces as non-muslims, which are different from... which are different from our traditions and beliefs... ah... for example... another example, clothes, food, etc... em... ah... supporting detail... em... ah... people... some people... some people... some people... some people... reduced... no... it... it reduced... it... reduced... em... face-to-face meetings... meetings through communicating online, which is different... which is different from the past... from the past... when ah... when people used to meet and visit [t] one-another... em... yes... it’s enough... concluding sentence... I will restate the topic sentence... I will say... em...
many social habits… social habits have been changed…changed because of the internet…
internet… I will em…of internet or of the internet…yes of the internet…
ahaa… the third paragraph …yes…

Topic sentence…topic sentence…em…social habits and it may… it gave the solution to my… to
many troubles that could face us…yes…ah… I will say that internet facilita…no…not is [t] is t
this easie…easiat…easiated…easiated…em…communication…ation between…between people
who live in different…ferent…pl…in different countries…countries… supporting details…ah
for example, one who lives in Canada can see and talk to his family…oh not family…to his
relatives in Algeria through internet…ternet…for example, through using facebook and
skype…and skype…em… and skype…. I remembered another detail… I should put it in the first
paragraph…. it… it em… it offers courses in many domains, example, cooking … ah yes, I
return to [the thi]…my paragraph…through skype…em…yes…I’ll try to add another detail…
concluding sentence…sentence…restating…tating the topic sentence…now conclusion… I will
write three paragraphs…summarizing the effects and giving the point of view…ok, I finished
planning.

The drafting stage of the writing process
Alors [French word meaning “so”]… the next step is drafting…em… I will write the first draft
after planning and brainstorming…I’ll try to follow my plan, but of course I will make some
changes…I will start with the introduction…ah…I have planned that I will in the introductory
sentences talk about technology and its role in life and [it rela]…to the internet…ah so, I will say
that technology…I will say nowadays, technology has…has influenced many…have influenced
our lives…our life em…in …eh…many domains…em…technology …I will say that…ah..
technologies… em … I will say that technology nowadays…is nowadays…technology is a vital
element in our daily life…life, because it is part of every and…every…domain…and…every
domain…em…every domain…every domain…ah…the internet…I say…ok internet…
internet…the internet is…is a technology that is…ah…that is daily used by people….by peoples
with different…ferent…ah…with different conditions and levels…and levels…ah will say
nowadays….thesis statement…internet…I say the internet has affected…affected many fields in
our life such as... like...like learning, social habits...learning...learning social habits....habits...our social habits normally....our social habits and it offered ah...a useful solution for people living far from their relatives...from their relatives...ok, this is the introduction...

I’ll try to start with the first paragraph...yes... ah, the first paragraph...I will use the conjunction...em...start with...yes...To start with, the internet...internet influenced...has influenced...fluenced...oh yes, I will...I should have made changes...yes in here, in learning...I will change it when I revise.........has influenced the teaching... like...influenced the teaching learning process from many angles...many angles... First, it made learning...it made the teaching learning process more...more ah...no...easier and quicker...and quicker...so through its multi...multiple...multiple services...the internet...the internet made ah...made a message...a message more beneficial in classroom... in the classroom, by offering many...em...many devices... no not devices...many choices to transmit...mit the information...formation...for instance, the students... the learners ...the learners could ...em... could carry out a project with their teacher or with...ah...or with other partners...partners... ah...from different nationalities...ties through the internet...the internet...the internet...ah... Also, the internet came with the option of ...of online learning...ning instead of... instead of traditional learning.. in the classroom for those...for those who cannot go to school...who cannot go to school...ah...In addition...addition, it offers courses...no... ah...online courses...online courses...online courses...online courses...online courses in many domains like cooking, computing, and ah...and...and learning languages...learning foreign languages...and learning foreign languages...em...so, I have to conclude...yes...em...[ineligible sound] ...has...has the internet facilitated...tated the teaching learning process...learning process... em...

Now, the second paragraph...I will use which conjunction...I will use moreover [cough] moreover or furthermore...there [wella (Arabic expression)] or therefore...moreover...I will use moreover...moreover...no...As another effect, yes...as another effect, the internet...the internet changed many social habits in societies...societies not the civilizations...societies...The internet shows the traditions ... traditions and the habits of ...the habits of ...of some nations...nations
which may... may influence the beliefs and customs... customs of other nations... em... no... ah, for example, it shows the... it shows the (pause)... it shows the practices... it shows the different practices like... it shows the different... different practices and beliefs... and beliefs of different civilizations like... like clothes, food, daily life... ah no religions, religions [whisper]... religions and customs of, for example (pause) that may... that may lead to a radical change... changes in the lives of some people... some people... some people [whispering] [pause]... Furthermore... furthermore, it reduced face-to-face meetings through communicating... it reduced face-to-face... face-to-face... face-to-face... ah... face-to-face meetings through communicating... communicating online which... ah... which made life different... different from the past when people used to meet and visit one another... another... em... In sum, many social habits... social habits have been changed... been changed because of the internet... the internet...

Now the third paragraph... I should use [whisper]... I say finally... em... finally... finally [whispered]... ah ok, Finally,... finally, the internet easiated... easiated communication between people... people living... who live in different countries... countries. For example... for example, one who lives... one who lives in Canada can see and talk to his relatives... relatives in Algeria through internet because it is cheaper... cheaper and available... and available... available... available... available because many people cannot use the phone for a long time... long time or travel... travel... ah... I mean ah... travel... em... travel... ah... in a permanent no... travel ah... travel... travel... long time or travel... or travel in ah... from time to time... I will see later [whispered]... (pause) In short, the internet has shortened... shortened [whispered]... has shortened the long distances between people...

Now the conclusion... [long pause] In a nutshell, internet is... in a nutshell, the internet entered every civilization and... and eh caused... and affected many aspects... aspects like the teaching learning process... teaching learning process, social habits... habits and its facilitates communication between people who live far from their families... families... em... [pause] ah, in fact, the internet affects everyone but one should try to have its good effects and... and omit... omit its bad effects... ok, I chan... I eh... I have finished my first draft... I’ll try to have a look on it and to revise it to write the second draft... I revised when I was writing but... ok...
Nowadays, technology is a vital element in our daily life because it is part of every domain…
em… I should hint to the eh negatives… an…negative and positive effects…ok in the
introduction…yes…em I should restate here… teaching learning process instead of
learning…eh… solution…yes… start with…em…has influenced first through its… no… I should
have a conjunction here… so, I sa… ah therefore…fore…em… I think it’s all… I’ll move to
revising.

The revision stage of the writing process
I’ll start revising… so, nowadays… I think that this sentence is ok… nowadays, technology is a
vital element in our daily life…daily life…yes, because it is part of every domain…yes…ah
no…negatives and […] of internet…yes…internet…among…yes…now… I should take this…
among tec… ah… among the technologies…technologies that are used daily by people the
different… different conditions and levels, we have the internet…we have the internet…[pause]
As every technology, the internet has positive and negative effects on people and
civilizations… zations…yes… so, the thesis statement …the internet has… I should use the
present perfect… has affected … affected many fields … fields … in our life… ah no… many fields
like… in life in general …yes..(erasing)…many fields in life… fields in life… many fields in life
like the teaching… no ..[I should] not fields… aspects (erasing)… aspects like the teaching
learning process, teaching learning process, the social habits … habits and it has offered… offered
a useful solution … sful solution… solution… solution for people… people living far from their
relatives… many aspects… ok….

To start with, to start with… ah… the internet has influenced the teaching learning
process…. teaching learning process from many aspects, not angles… from many
aspects… aspects. First, it made the teaching learning process… process easier and quicker for
both the learner, the teacher and the learner… the teacher and the learner… and the
learner… yes… therefore … [pause] so, through… ah therefore… fore… through… through its
multiple services… its multiple services, the internet … internet made… has made… has made the
message… made the message more beneficial… ficial and effective in the classroom… room by
… by offering many choices… many… many choices to transmit … transmit the information… no
the message… the information…yes…inform…em…yes…em…therefore…em…therefore, the internet has made…yes… I should omit this from here through…through its…(erasing)…therefore, the internet has made the message more beneficial and effective in the classroom by offering many choices to transmit the information like…many choices like mails, chats, blogs…many choices like e-mails, chats, blogs, and wikis…and wikis…Also, the internet has come…has come with the option …the option of the online…the online learning…the online learning instead of …instead of traditional …traditional learning in the classroom…classroom for those who cannot …not go to school… who cannot go to school…In addition…in addition, it offers… it has offered…offered no…it not…not it has…it has not…it offers…I think this detail is unnecessary… I will omit it…it is the same online learning [yes] ah…so…hence…[Erasing] … Hence, hence, the internet… hence, the internet has facilitated …facilitated the teaching learning process.

Now the second paragraph… As another effect …em…yes, as another effect, the internet has changed… changed many…many social habits …cultural habits in societies…societies…the internet… it, it’s kind of repetition…it shows…shows the traditions …and the habits of some nations that may… that may…that may influence… influence the beliefs and the customs… the customs of other nations… for example, for example, it shows the different… different practices and ah… beliefs of different… different civilizations… customs like clothing, cooking…living…em religions, and other customs… customs that may lead… that may lead to radical, not to a rad… to radical changes…[ya]…changes in the lives …in the lives of some people… some people… Furthermore, furthermore, it has reduced… it has reduced face-to-face…face-to-face…reduced face-to-face…reduced face-to-face…face-to-face meetings through communicating… communicating online using e-mails or… or emails or…emails or…Facebook, for example…for example… for example…which is different … is different…which made…which made life different from the past…from the past…from the past when people…when people used to meet… people used to meet and visit one another in a permanent way… permanent [whispered]…permanent [whispered]…permanent way… In sum, many social habits have been changed because of… because of the internet… the internet.
Finally, finally the internet easiated... easiated communication between... the communication... between people who live in... in different countries... For example, one who lives in Canada can see and talk to his relatives in Algeria through internet, because it is cheaper than using the phone and travelling in short periods... yes, this is... I found the real right structure, I think... I should detail... As many people could not travel due to money or work, yes now... In short, the internet has shortened... or shorten... not sure... check... (dictionary)... short... I need the verb shorten... it is the regular... it has shortened the long distances between people.

So, conclusion... In a nutshell, the internet has entered every civilization and its affected many aspects like the teaching learning process... teaching learning process, the social habits... and it facilitated... and it has... and it has affected... it has... it has affected and it has facilitated... I should use the same tense... facilitated... it has affected... the contact between people who live far from their families... from their families. In fact, the internet the internet affects everyone... everyone, but one should try to get its positive effects, not good, and avoid, not omit... it needs now a peer revision or a teacher revision... I can do nothing else... yes, I made some changes... not radical but I made changes... yes... So, I finished.
APPENDIX VIII.1: SCANNED COPY OF
A LOW-ACHIEVER’S PRE-TEST (ESSAY)

1. The Introduction

2. Definition of the internet

2.1 Body

1st paragraph is about the advantages of the internet.

- and the domain with we use the internet

2. The disadvantages of the internet

Conclusion
The internet is one of the famous ways of communicating in the world especially in these last years. It has many or several advantages. Now we can say that if someone doesn’t use the internet in his life, that he is a small very older person. Apart from students, but the question here, how this way has changed our life, positive or negative?

First of all, students in their studies, need more the internet to help them. The other people, because they need it for doing their topics, project, research or anything about their studies, and in addition to that, they can learn directly on it, like a teacher. They can exchange the information they need to know or things about their studies. In addition to that, they can communicate directly with each other. Even students, teachers from other countries. Students, teachers from different countries; U.S., Australia, France, student... etc. whereas in the other countries, in our jobs, all the workers in any administration, schools, factories, or some they should use the internet for gathering more experience from another country, for organize their job, for more facilitate especially for exchange the experience and the knowledge. They products some times for gathering more information, different cultures... etc.

Where as, in the other sides, there are a difficulties, problem and disadvantages with the internet. Firstly, some people use the internet in a positive ways, for example,
The internet is one of the famous and modern ways of communicating, learning, and working in the world; especially in these last years. It has many advantages and disadvantages. Now we can say that, if some one doesn't or can't use the internet in his life, then he is a very old person, especially students. But the question here, how this modern way can change our life in the two sides, negative or positive?

There are many advantages of the internet in different domains. First of all in studies, students need more the internet than the other people, because they are used it for doing their topics, projects, researches or many things about their studies. In addition to that, they can learn directly from the internet, they can exchange the information.
between another students, teachers, scientists in
different countries, U.S.A students, france... etc.
Whereas in the other side, (domain) like, the jobs; we
can say that, all the workers in any domain of work,
like administration, schools, factories,... etc. they
should use the internet for gathering more information
about their jobs, for organize their jobs' program
and for more facilitations, especially for exchange
the experience, the the knowledge, and the products
some times. Whereas, there are some people use
the internet just for look to the cultures, the countries
or for playing, enjoy... etc like children, or
for gathering information.

"On the other side, we can't forget the
disadvantages of the internet, in we can gathering
some false information, we can know some bad
people, because there are some people use the internet
in negative method. Some people use the internet
for stolen, banks, or something like that....
and there are some children use the internet all
the time, they can forget the society, and the society
can forget them.

Finally, the internet has two side are
good and, the second it is bad. But we can't
mean ever work without internet, because it is the just
a way in the world, for facilitate and for help
the persons get in their life."
APPENDIX VIII.2: SCANNED COPY OF 
AN AVERAGE-ACHIEVER’S PRE-TEST (ESSAY)

As many people internet has totally changed my life since the day that my dad had bought us a computer and put internetconnect in it every my lifestyle had changed, and many bad habits appeared and all my manners changed in this essay I’ll try to show how internet did influence my whole life.

As a student at university internet changed my life but to a positive one. I use it for my studies, everything that the teacher says I note it and from the first moment I open my laptop I go directly to google and type what the said in the lecture, even if I didn’t note what the teacher said I try to search for more information. I don’t limit myself for what the gave me in the information I use internet also in researchers I download books from it I download also researches of other researchers, it’s a way to find more information.

In my life internet has not only changed my life, Internet has been a new one which was not mine it really brings me to be addicted, I can’t live my phone for another word I’ve become addicted, I can’t live my phone for another word. Internet brings me new friends on the social network brings me new people, new friends you can say virtual friends like the life in the same town as me, they became a part of life, Internet brings me also some bad habits like eating in front of laptop. I don’t sleep early I face difficulties in sleeping, I can’t live without internet it’s my oxygen.

In my environment, I think that many people are like me. I’m not the only one who’s addicted to it. I can say that all my generation suffer from the same problem.

Finally I don’t say that internet has a very bad effect on person’s life.
As many people internet has totally changed my life, since the day that my dad had bought us a computer and put internet connection in it, my lifestyle had changed, and many bad habits appeared and all my manners changed. In this essay I’ll try to show how internet did influence my whole life.

As a student at university internet changed my life but to a positive one. I use it for my studies, everything that the teacher says I note it and from the first moment I open my laptop I go directly to google and type what he said in the lecture, even if I didn’t note what the teacher said. I try to search for more information. I don’t limit myself for what he gave me. I use internet also in researches I download books from internet, or I download researches of other researchers, it’s a way to find more information.

In my personal life internet has not only changed my life. Internet has bring me a new me which was
not mine, it really brings me to another world that I’ve become addicted. I can’t live my phone for one single moment because I have internet in it, the social network brings me new people, new friends, it brings me also bad habits, like eating while in front of laptop. I don’t sleep early. I find difficulties to sleep.

for my environment, I think that many people like me, I’m not the only one who’s addicted. You can say that all my generation suffer from it.

Finally, I dare say that internet has a very bad effect on person’s life.

I have chosen the second topic. I follow steps which are: introduction, body: 3 paragraphs, conclusion.

I’ve chosen this topic because I’ve found it very interesting. I started by making a plan for my essay choosing ideas and the I’ve extended them. I wrote an introduction and the body which contains paragraphs and my ideas are in these paragraphs. I use the conclusion to resume the ideas I dealt with.
Steps:
- Understanding keywords of the topic.
- How shall I develop my essay? By classification, exemplification, argumentation.
- Brainstorming.
- Finding a Gropper to start.
- Planning in the mind.
- Making a general shape/shape.
- Finding examples, and quotes.
- Outlining then writing the essay.
APPENDIX VIII.3: SCANNED COPY OF
A HIGH-ACHIEVER’S PRE-TEST (ESSAY)

The important of learning a new foreign lge.

- It helps more in developing intelligence.
- Variety is the spice of life. Corriber
- Travels forms people.
- Be open-minded to the word outside.
- We can have knowledge from other nations.
- Translations x transliteration.
- Our lge is social so learning a foreign lge makes it up to date with like of Greeks from history.
- We can acquire knowledge from other nations.
- Making new connections, new societies, new people traditions.
- we can keep the threats of other nations by learning their lge.

Variety is the spice of life.

Learning a foreign lge has very important aspects. First, it

Language is a window to the world.

First, it
Topic: "The importance of learning a foreign language"

Outline:
Introduction:
Topic sentence: There are many languages around the world.

Concluding sentence: People learn foreign languages.

Development:
Topic sentence: Learning a foreign language has very important aspects.

3. 1. Learning a foreign language makes people acquire new knowledge and recent technologies, e.g., the new earthquake alarm from Japan, its software is just in Japanese language.

3. 2. Learning a foreign language keeps the threat and menace of the other nation, e.g., Experts and...
engineers in such sensitive posts have to learn various languages in order to stand aware and attentive vigilant from any danger.

S. D. 3: learning a foreign language keeps the mother language up to date and make it a living phenomenon.
   e.g. Structuralists believe that language is a living phenomenon only if has borrowed from other language
   meaning transliteration and translation.

S. D. 4: Variety of languages in the human's mind provides him with more intelligence and reflex.
   e.g. Neurologists believe that the huge number of the cells in the human's mind due to using different languages.

S. D. 5: learning a foreign language provides people with new connections, new societies and new traditions.
   e.g. Ferdinand de Saussure says: "Language is social, general, idiosyncratic, and shared by all the members of
   the speech community."

Concluding sentence: People learn foreign languages for its huge importance in our life.

Conclusion:
   People use various languages and learn many foreign not as an end on itself but for many reasons.
The essay

Variety is the spice of life, no one can live the whole with the same things; among these things, language plays a vital role. Communication. There are many languages around the world, the nature of the human being that makes humans always in inquiry and investigation. For this reason, people learn foreign languages.

Learning a foreign language, has many important aspects. First, learning a foreign language makes people acquire new knowledge and recent technologies. For example, the new earthquake alarm system in Japan to tell us to learn that language.

Besides, learning a foreign language keeps the threats and menace of other nations. For instance, experts and engineers in sensitive places have to learn various languages in order to stand aware and be vigilant from any foreign dangers. Moreover, learning a foreign language makes the mother language up-to-date and makes it a living phenomenon. Structuralists in language believe that language is a living phenomenon only if it has borrowed from other languages by using translation and transliteration.

Furthermore, variety of languages in the human mind provides him with more intelligence and reflexes. Neurologists believe that a huge number of the cells related to the human mind is due to using different languages. Finally, learning a foreign language provides people with new connections, new societies, and new traditions as Ferdinand
De Saussure says: "Language is social, general, idiosyncratic, and shared by all the members of the speech community. We can get a lot of things from different communities by knowing their languages. People learn foreign language for its huge importance in their life lives. People learn foreign languages and use them not as an end on itself but here many foreign languages are learnt to solve other purposes since everyone knows that language is communication, this for this latter is life."
Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cellphone for any reason.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer/rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.

Your Topic: The effects of the Internet on our civilization.
Internet is the most common technology in the world and in our society, because it represents a source of information and communication. This important technology has several advantages as well as many disadvantages. It has two different faces.

First of all, the advantages of the internet are diverse and numerous. The first advantage of the internet is the whole information that it gives us, because if we need to know about something, we can go to the internet and find all the information immediately, correct, and correct. For example, when you want to search about a specific book and its information, you find it as it is and who wrote the book, when and where. In addition to that, the internet is like a library. We find Facebook, Skype, emails, all these so-called social media. These latter ones are very important nowadays. Many people use it, whether to make relations or to know something. To exchange knowledge with other people from different countries and different cultures, Internet since as a source of information and
A means of communication, it gives more help to people whether in educational domains or in other domains like economy and politics, or we can use it as a source of entertainment we find several games. As a result, Internet in our society or in other societies is very important, as people in different domains or in different ages need it so much.

In the other hand, Internet has other face, in other factored, Internet has many disadvantages. The first and one is relate to the internet as a source of information, sometimes some information are fake and incorrect, and in this case, people cannot depend on it all the time, now Internet as a means of communication, also people may find some problems when they communicate with other people, may find some people give fake information about themself or may represent themselves as a famous people form, they use artist's name and communicate with people and give people misleading information about the artist.

Finally, Internet in general is the most common technology in the world without doubt, this technology has different advantages and disadvantages, but regardless to all these disadvantages, Internet is
The Internet is the most common technology in the world, and in our society, probably because it represents a source of information in a side and a means of communication in the other side. But, this important technology has several advantages as well as many disadvantages. It has two different faces, and each face has specific effects.

First of all, the advantages of the Internet differ and numerous. The first advantage when the Internet is a source of information; it gives a reliable information because if someone needs to know something or to search on the Internet about something, he can find it easily, quickly, and correctly. For example, if someone searches about a specific book, and its author, he can find it easily and where the author wrote this book and when. In addition to that, the Internet is like a library on the web, also, it is as the most common means of communication like Facebook, e-mail, Skype, and others. means, all these are called social net, where people can communicate and exchange information. It is very useful nowadays by many people in different places, whether to make new relations (friendships), or just to exchange ideas and knowledge. Internet since it is as a source of information and means of communication, it gives more help to people, whether in educational domains or in other domains like economy and politics. In addition to that, we can use the Internet as a source of entertainment, may find video games.
As a result, the advantages of internet in our society and in other societies, internet in general are very very important for people in different domains and for different ages.

On the other hand, internet may have other flaws. In other words, internet has many disadvantages that many people know it. The first one relates to the internet when it is a source of information. Sometimes some information are wrong and incorrect. In this case, people cannot depend on it all the time.

And internet as a means of communication, also people may find some problems when they communicate with other people. Maybe some people give false information to other people about themselves, or may represent themselves as a famous person. For example, they use an artist’s name and communicate to people and give them misleading information about this artist.

Finally, internet in general is the most common technology in the world. Without doubt, this technology has its different faces. One is good and the second is bad. But regardless to all the disadvantages, we cannot utterly or neglect this big and large technology, all countries need internet.
Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cellphone for any reason.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer / rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.

Your Topic: Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization

................................................
Since the beginning of human life, people were interested in how they can connect and communicate in a every and fast way. There were a lot of discoveries such as phones, TVs, Telecommunications, and among these discoveries, it was the creation of internet, which is a huge net, which, where all the world is connecting using computers, people exchange ideas, share new information. At the same time, internet has changed the way of people toward the world, it's effect on the economy, education, science and human daily life; it became an important tool in people's life.

First of all, the use of internet has been increased, time after time, people couldn't work without it. For example, a huge number of factories and institutions work with internet, where they communicate with other factories, so as to exchange their products or their new information, and with internet they make advertising in the net, so many institutions depend on internet in their work.

Secondly, internet makes the world a small country, people use different blogs, such as YouTube or Yahoo, in order to communicate and share ideas, instead of showing their beliefs, where the whole world see. Through these, more over a lot of people makes their books and blogs and make it their work and they earn money through it.

Third, internet has opened a lot of doors to people, as an example, for scientist and researchers to compare their researches, besides and publish them in order to see the latest discoveries, be-sides in the domain of education, a lot of changes happened, where the school makes the internet an important tool to depend on it in their teaching and learning process.

In addition to that, and more important, internet has brought
an important changes in all the societies, the use of Facebook, Twitter, Daily motion, MySpace has made a lot of changes and revolutions in all over the world where people revolt against their states and we have the big example of the Tunisian revolution that emerged from Facebook.

To conclude with, internet makes a lot of transformation in human's life where it becomes a right for people to have it, and it bring people connect together at the same time even if they are far from each other.
Topic: The effects of the internet on your civilization

Internet: listing:

* It's a network where all the world is connecting, share ideas in at the same time.

* Internet has made the world as a small country, it's facilitate the connection between different places.

* Internet has opened a lot of doors to whom they are interested in scientific research or any domain.

* Internet in a lot of domains like education has brought Internet for use by teachers, because it helps them to find a lot of information.

* Since the discovery of internet, people's life has changed, in any thing they search for, they find it in the net.

* New generation of internet like blogs, wiki, research engines content creation, has been created such as Facebook, Twitter, Wikipedia, they are used in posting new information that lead to a lot of changes such as wars, conflicts...

The essay:

Since the beginning of human's life, people were interested in how they can connect and communicate in an easy and fast way. There was a lot of discoveries such as phone, TV, telegram. Among these discoveries, it was the creation of internet which is a huge net work where all the world is connecting by computers. People exchange ideas, share information at the same time.

Internet has changed the view of people toward the word; it's affect all the domain, in education, science, and human daily life, where any one could not live will out internet.
First of all, the use of internet has been increased time after time, people couldn’t work without it, for example, a lot of factories and institutions work with internet; where they communicate with other factories so as to exchange goods or information, so here internet become an important tool, any institution can win or lose here place as among other institutions.

Second, internet make the world a small country, the any one can communicate at the same time, people use different blogs to i.e. in order to post their ideas or talents, a lot of hobbies emerge in internet where the whole world see them and through these blogs a lot of people gain many.

Third, internet has opened a lot of doors to people especially to scientists and researchers to compare their work; besides in education, a lot of changes happened where, the schools are depending on using the net in their teaching.

In addition, and more important that the internet brought a changes in human life, where all people use blogs such as facebook, where from this source the whole world is changing. For example these wars and changes that are happened like the tunisian revolution.

To conclude with, the emergence of internet make a lot of transformation in human life, where it become as a right for each individual, and it bring him connect with the whole world at the same time even if we places are different.
Dear student,

This is a writing test (post-test) which is designed to measure your writing abilities and techniques after a writing course has taken place. Note that your name and answer sheet will not be disseminated or used by any other member apart from the researcher herself, and that the results of this test will solely be used to serve research aims.

Test Instructions

The test consists of writing an expository essay about one of the suggested topics. Your essay must contain several paragraphs, no less than one page. Please note that:

- The test lasts for two hours after the actual time of the test.
- The space of your answer has no limited number of pages.
- You can use a blue or black pen.
- You cannot use erasers on your answer sheets.
- You should write clearly and neatly.
- You must respect the form of an essay (introduction, body, and conclusion).
- You cannot use a dictionary.
- You cannot use your cellphone for any reason.
- You cannot talk to your mates.
- You may ask questions by raising your hand.
- You may use as many answer/rough sheets as you wish.

Test Topics

- People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Discuss the effects of the Internet on your civilization. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

- Compare and contrast between studying at home by using technology, such as computers or television, and studying at traditional schools.

- How does an academic style of writing differ from a personal one? Use examples to support your answer.

Your Topic: People attend school for many different reasons. Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.
Why do you think people decide to go to school?

The Reasons:

1. To study
2. To be working later on in a good position
3. To have prestige
4. To know and to cultivate

Planning:

Introduction:

1. Introductory sentences
   - Definition of learning.
   - Importance of learning.
   - Where to learn.
   - Thesis statement.

   Reasons behind attending school differ from one person to another. Some people learn because they are obliged, others to have prestige, some to be working later on.

Body:

1. Supporting sentences
   - Some people attend school because they are obliged.
   - Supporting details
   - Parents oblige them.
   - Government obligation.
Topic Sentence:
The reason behind learning for other people is to have prestige.

Supporting details:
- They think that knowledgeable people are more respected.
- Societies are known through their intellectual achievements.

Concluding Sentence:
Restatement.

Topic Sentence:
Other people learn just to know more and to cultivate.

Supporting details:
- Learning is good for thought.
- They are curious to know and learn everything.

Concluding Sentence:
Restatement.

Topic Sentence:
Some people look at school as a means to work.

Supporting details:
- Good work = good knowledge.
- Good work = high position.

Concluding Sentence:
Restatement.

Conclusion:
- Restatement.
- Point of view.
Learning is the process of developing intellectual abilities, enhancing manual skills and refining social awareness. It is the process through which the mind develops. The effective setting of learning is school. The reasons behind going to school differ from one person to another. Some people attend school because they are obliged, others might go to school for prestige, others learn to know more about their world and to cultivate, and other people may see school as a bridge to the world of work.

To start with, some people attend school because they are obliged. These are some people who do not have the desire to attend school, they may have the attitude that it waists time and work is more profitable. But, those people are obliged to learn because of their families. Some families oblige them to attend school because of the constitution of the country. In short, some people may be attending school only because they are obliged to do so.

Furthermore, the reason behind attending school for other people might be to have prestige. Some people think that well-educated people are more respected than illiterate people in societies, so they opt for learning to be prestigious people. Also, they believe that societies are classified as having high culture according to their intellectual achievement and their average of educated people. In short, behind attending school, there might be prestigious reasons.

Moreover, another reason behind attending school might be just to know more about their world and to get more cultivated. These people are curious to know and to interpret the phenomena in their lives. They consider learning
good for thought; they seem to feed their epistemic curiosity. In other words, learning may be "a food for thought" for some people.

In addition to that, some people look at school as the bridge to the world of work. They consider learning as a necessary condition to have a good work, because without a grade one cannot find a good work. Then, they think that when they have a good work, they would have a high rank, for example, a doctor or an engineer is not the same as a simple worker. In brief, people may attend school to have a good work or better on.

In a nutshell, people can be different and they do learn or attend school for different reasons. They may attend school because they are obliged to, to have prestige, to foresee more or to have a good position later on. As a matter of fact, learning attending school is very important and beneficial if it is the result of a noble reason.
learning is the process of developing intellectual abilities, enhancing manual skills and refining social awareness. It is the process through which the mind develops. The effective setting of learning is school. The reasons behind attending school may differ from one person to another; some people may attend school because they are obliged, others may do for prestige, other people may learn to know more about their world, and others people may see school as a bridge to the world of work.

To start with, some people attend school because they are obliged to. They are some people who do not have the desire to attend school, they may have the attitude that it is a waste of time and work is more profitable. But these people are obliged to learn because their families obliged them to attend school, or because learning is obligatory in the constitution, for instance, in Algeria learning is obligatory and it is defined in the official constitution of the country. In short, some people may be attending school only because they are obliged to.

Furthermore, the reason behind attending school for other people might be to have prestige. Some people think that well-educated people are more respected than illiterate people within societies. So, they opt for learning to be prestigious. Also, they believe that societies are classified as having high culture according to their intellectual achievements and the scale of educated people. In sum, behind attending schools, there might be prestigious reasons.

Moreover, other people may attend school just to know more about their world and feed their curiosity. These people are curious to know and to interpret the phenomena they see in their lives. They consider
Learning as good for thought; they learn to feed their epistemic curiosity. In few words, learning may be good for thought for some people.

In addition to that, some people see school as a bridge to the world of work. They consider learning as a necessary condition to have a good work, because without a grade one cannot find a good work. They think that when they have a good work, they would have a high rank, for example, a doctor or an engineer is not the same as a simple worker. In brief, people may attend school to have a good work later on.

In a nutshell, people learn or attend school for different reasons. They may attend school because they are obliged to, to have prestige, to know more or to have a good position of work later on. As a matter of fact, learning is an important fact, but it besides it may be more beneficial and pleasurable if it is the result of a noble reason.
Final Draft
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To start with...some people attend school because they are obliged to...

Some see some people who do not...have the desire to attend school...they...
may have the attitude...that school wastes time...and work is more profitable...
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For some people, an adult is to that, some people see school as a bridge to the world of work. They consider learning as a necessary condition for having a good work. They think that without a good work, one cannot find a good job. They think that without a good work, a person would have a high rank, for example, an electrician or an engineer is not the same as a simple worker. In brief, people may attend school to have a good work later on.

In a nutshell, people may attend school for different reasons. They may attend school because they are obliged to, to have prestige, to show more to have a good position in the world. Later on, it is a matter of fact learning is an important tool. Besides, it may be more beneficial and pleasurable if it is the result of a noble reason.
Abstract

This work reports the results of a study conducted at the Setif University English Department. The aim of the study was two-fold: to explore the factors accounting for undergraduate students’ writing difficulties and investigate the effect of strategy training on enhancing their writing performance and positive affect. To achieve this aim, it was hypothesised that students’ writing difficulties can be attributed to one or more factors: (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and/or affective. It was also hypothesised that strategy training can have positive effects on these students’ writing performance and affect. The participants of the study were second-year English students, among whom a group of 24 participated in a training writing course as an experimental group, and a control group was used for comparison. To collect the data for this research, a combination of instruments was used. A pre-test and a pre-questionnaire were used to collect data on the participants’ writing background and affective factors. A post-test, a post-questionnaire, and a think-aloud procedure were employed to obtain information on the participants’ progress, if any, in their writing performance and affect level, as well as examine their processes and strategy use to confirm the post-study results, qualitatively. The data were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively, and a comparison was carried out to examine the differences between the experimental and control groups as well as between high-and low-achieving participants in terms of the degree of progress they made. The exploratory study findings demonstrated that the participants’ writing difficulties were attributed mainly to the (meta-) cognitive, followed by the linguistic and, to a lesser extent, the affective factors, mainly writing apprehension and self-efficacy levels. Moreover, a comparison of the pre- and post-test results of the experimental and control groups has shown that the participants in the former group have improved considerably and with varying levels in their writing performance, strategy use, and affect level, compared to the latter. These results have yielded to the conclusion that explicit writing strategy training contributes to the students’ writing development and progress if applied effectively and at a long-term level.

Key words: Affective factors, EFL learners, strategy training, writing difficulties, writing performance, writing process/strategy (ies).