CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

With the paradigm shift from the traditional product-oriented approach to the process-oriented writing approach in both first language (L1) (Sasaki, 2000) and second language (L2) writing instruction (Zamel, 1983; Ferris, 1995), process writing has been widely acknowledged and practiced among writing teachers (Reyes, 1991). Process writing approaches focus on the writing process throughout the stages of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (Tompkins, 2004). Writers experience the whole process through activities including brainstorming, discussion, and self/peer evaluations to improve their writing and to produce efficient products. Writing teachers, as facilitators help writers compose their writings not only by correcting their grammatical/linguistic errors but also by inspiring their thoughts. In addition, teachers with the process-oriented belief provide feedbacks in both oral and written forms whenever needed.

Comment [SM1]: CHECK: “efficient” is unclear; suggest something like “to produce successful writing pieces”
However, writing instructors in EFL settings generally prefer to use a product-oriented writing approach instead of the process approach in their teaching. Taiwanese teachers of the English language apply numerous sentence-level writing practices to their students. High school students memorize large amounts of vocabulary and put them into sentence patterns practice with in countless mechanical drills; however, their writing performance is still awfully very low in writing tests. Recent results in the English writing component of the College Entrance Examination (CEE) in Taiwan, from the years of 2004 to 2006, show that approximately fifty percent of examinees get below five points out of a possible twenty in the English writing section, which is worth 20% of the English test. This result evidently reveals the problem that senior high school students are generally poor in English writing ability. The poor English writing performances reported by the College Entrance Examination Center (CEEC) during recent years were due to a number of following key issues, as follows.

The incoherent English writing curriculum design is one of the
major educational problems in Taiwan. Although students start to learn English in the third-year of primary school and English has been as a core subject in the nine-year compulsory educational curriculum, formal English writing instruction remains ignored in junior high education (Lee, 2006). According to the senior high school English curriculum guidelines from the English Education Resource Center of the Ministry of Education of Taiwan, English writing instruction is merely officially designed merely as a selective course of the senior high education (Appendix 4) and the class periods are only two hours per week. In other words, students do not receive any formal and regular English writing courses during the period of compulsory education, and even in the following three years of senior high school, they hardly have any formal training or English writing practice. However, senior high students with limited English writing experiences and practices still have to face the challenge of the English writing examination of the CEE. Due to the lack of sufficient English writing training and practice, s of senior high school students, not surprisingly, senior high school students they encounter various difficulties in composition and therefore get low scores in the English
writing section of the CEE.

In addition, the downplaying the important of English writing instruction in senior high schools is common in Taiwan’s educational settings. Many writing teachers of English hold the belief in a teacher-centered and product-oriented pedagogical approach to their teaching, due to the fact that they are under the pressure of insufficient time to catch up with term schedules and are inevitably under a heavy burden from the CEE. Although constraint of teaching time constraints, more than 80% of teachers express the need for as well as willingness to undertake further study or training in writing instruction (Lee, 2006). To receive the latest information about English teaching, teachers tend to attend certain TESOL-related conferences, which also provide them the access to examine their instruction from different perspectives. In brief, English writing is a long-term learning process; however, with the limited instructional periods and the lack of training for English teachers, it is difficult to enhance the writing quality of their students’ writing simply by enlarging their amount of vocabulary and knowledge of
grammar rules.

Furthermore, insufficient English writing instruction leads to learners having a lack of writing practice. The problems with word-choice and essay structures emerge in their writing process (Wu, 2003). Students, especially senior high school novice writers, do not know how to appropriately express their thinking in their English essays or how to compose an organized piece. To make the matter worse, many novice writers usually do not know how to generate ideas in composition. The above situations are considered to be factors contributing to the low writing scores of CEE of senior high school students.

In fact, many English teachers are unwilling to make efforts in the instruction of English writing on account of the previous reasons, particularly in the senior high schools of Taiwan. However, a private senior high school was chosen in this study to be a model case of teaching prewriting as a process in an EFL context. This study attempts to explore how the outstanding English achievements were reached by their students who learned to use prewriting strategies in an effective writing program.
private senior high school. In other words, this study attempts to investigate (a) how the English teachers practiced with prewriting strategies in the classroom and to see (b) how the students viewed their roles while engaging in these writing activities for thinking development and writing improvement.

In addition to the social issues of English writing, the theoretical rationale further accounts for the motivation of this study. Since the 1970's, writing has been defined as a process of prewriting, planning, generating ideas, problem solving, editing multiple drafts in a cyclical (Badger & White, 2000), nonlinear, exploratory, and generative manner (Zamel, 1983). The process writing approach has been extensively put into practice in the L1 educational settings of the English native-speaking countries. Demonstrating the value of the process writing approach, Gallego de Blibeche (1993) and Kern and Schultz (1992) revealed promising results in their studies concerning the relationship between explicit teaching of the process writing approach and gains in writing proficiency for L2 learners. In an ESL context, Leki (1992) pointed out that process writing approaches prevailed in the ESL classrooms, but the main
focus still remained on the mechanical drills of vocabulary, and sentence patterns. Thus, there it seemed to have be a disparity between ideal and actual English writing teaching in the ESL context.

As for EFL settings in Taiwan, plenty of mechanical drills were also applied in English writing instruction. Lee (2006) found that many teachers spend much time in mechanical drills of sentence writing practice. However, students do not know how to stimulate their thoughts and then to express them logically in their drafts. Even if they are able to write grammatical sentences, they are not capable of putting their ideas into coherent and comprehensible compositions. Thus, the lack of training in prewriting techniques associated with training of the process writing, leads to low motivation among novice writers. Donald Murray (1982) claimed that 70% or more of writing time should be spent in prewriting, which is the most neglected stage in the writing process; however, it and which is as crucial to writers as a warm-up is to athletes. Therefore, despite the importance of correcting of linguistic forms as well as the training in test-taking skills, the significance of developing thoughts of writers should not be de-emphasized (You, 2004).
Recent studies concerning the FL writing instruction increasingly stress on the significance of the effects of a particular teaching pedagogy and of learners’ reactions toward it (Lee, 2006). Few researchers investigate how the teacher as a designer or implementer perceives and develops a teaching measure (Lee, 2006).

Moreover, relatively few studies have paid attention to (a) how the instruction scaffolds students’ learning in writing through oral and written discourse (Warwick & Maloch, 2003), and (b) how the novice writers view themselves as writers applying with the mediating tools in the prewriting activities.

Thus, to fill these gaps, this study adopts long-term observations and in-depth interviews in a private senior high school which was selected for the high average English proficiency of their students and the instructional emphasis on prewriting. The purpose of this study is to investigate how the English writing teachers of a senior high school provided scaffolding to their students via prewriting techniques and how the EFL learners saw themselves as writers in the prewriting classroom. It is hoped to shed some light on English writing teaching and learning in the EFL senior high school.

Comment [SM6]: CHECK: should this be EFL?
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settings, such as in relation to teaching methods, activities, materials preparation, and to afford a better understanding of students’ roles in the learning process of English writing. The two research questions that guided the study are as follows:

1. How do a teachers of English view pre-writing as process and practice in a writing class of senior high school students in a context where English is a foreign language (EFL) context?

2. How do the EFL senior high school learners view their roles and how do they apply mediating tools in the scaffolded prewriting activities?

Comment [SM9]: CHECK: A reminder that any changes made to these 2 research questions should also be reflected in any later repetitions of the research questions.
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