

تنمية مهارات الكتابة من خلال التفاعل بين المجموعات الصغيرة
لدى طلاب المرحلة الثانوية
د. الصادق محمد سالم ، د إيمان ميلاد زايد - كلية التربية الزاوية - جامعة الزاوية

مقدمة الدراسة:

الكتابة من المهارات الأساسية التي تشتمل عليها مقررات اللغة الانجليزية , وكذلك في تعزيز القواعد والتراكيب النحوية ، وتساعدهم في التعبير عن أفكارهم بكل حرية وبدون أي ضغط يحدث من خلال الاتصال المباشر ، وبخاصة عندما يكون وجهها لوجه وهذا قد يربك الطالب في الكلام .

وهناك العديد من المشاكل في الكتابة تظهر في جميع المستويات ، وبخاصة عند طلاب أقسام اللغة الانجليزية ، والذين تقع عليهم مسؤولية تعلم مهارات اللغة ، والتي تشتمل علي الكتابة .

مشكلة الدراسة :

من خلال طرح مشكلة الدراسة يُطرح السؤال التالي :

ما مهارات تنمية الكتابة من خلال التفاعل بين المجموعات الصغيرة لدى طلاب المرحلة الثانوية ؟

أهمية الدراسة :

تهتم هذه الدراسة بتعلم اللغة الانجليزية ، وإعطاء الطلاب التمارين حتى يتسنى لهم تصحيح الجمل ، ووضعها في موضعها الصحيح ، ووضع الجمل مع بعضها بعضا ؛ لتعبير عن أفكارهم .

التوصيات:

توصلت هذه الدراسة إلى التوصيات الآتية :

1. يجب أن تعطى الكتابة أكثر اهتمام في برامج التعليم .
2. الكتابة تعتبر من المهارات الأساسية للتعلم .
3. الكتابة يجب أن تخطط ، وتدار كوسيلة لتنمية المهارات لتوصيل المعرفة والأفكار والمشاعر .
4. المعلون بحاجة لتدريب طلابهم على التعبير بكل حرية على أفكارهم .

Developing the writing skill of secondary school students through small group interaction

Introduction:

Writing is an essential classroom activity which is included as a component of foreign language syllabic it reinforces grammatical structures and vocabulary and helps students to express their ideas freely without the pressure of face-to-face communication. It also convey student's level of proficiency in the language and effects the other language skills as well. *(Byrne, 1982, Doff,1988, Perpignan,1990, Rivers,1986, and Zamel,1990).*

More importantly, writing is usually related to culture and civilization, as "in most cultures the ability to write carries prestige" (Byrne,1982:6). However, the greatest bulk of literature implies that writing is the most problematic area of language instruction whether in L1 or L2 for the majority of English language learners (raimes,1978 and Zamel, 1983). The reason is that writing is the skill which is most neglected. Furthermore, the sequence of activities in language teaching syllabi implies that written composition has a minimum share in most ELT programmes (Aboderin, 1984, Onaka,1984, and Raims,1978) added to this, there is a widespread pedagogy being employed in composition classes.

Thus, serious problems in writing seem to persist at all levels even among students of language departments who will take responsibility for teaching the language skills including writing.

Therefore, for effective treatment of this situation, Horner (1990:5) strongly recommends that "instructional systems delegate instruction in writing to the lower schools as freshmen are mostly ill-prepared students". However, it might be argued that at the elementary stages the amount of language the learners will have at

their disposal for writing will be limited for introducing any meaningful form of writing practice.

Group-writing practice Gaies (1985:3), as well as several ELT specialists recommend pair and group involvement in language tasks, including writing as a response to practical needs and reality. He argues that programmes which adopts this techniques "have been specifically based on current views about how a second or foreign language is best learned". Group interaction as Gaies (1985), Nation,(1989), Sionis, (1990) and Tylor, (1982) emphasize, stimulate motivation to use the language in real situations to accomplish a writing task. Pincas, (1982a), Pica,(1986) and Stevens (1983) explain that when students decide for themselves what they are going to write about and context and form of their output through collaboration and discussion, they are more committed to the experience. This indicates that they will make special effort to succeed as a result of their contribution (Lewitt,1990 and Tylor,1982). Even slow learners share at their own rate instead of feeling frustrated and alienated while waiting for an opportunity to get illegal help from friends. When the teacher is understanding, sensitive and sympathetic, group work helps to make the atmosphere of the class non-threaten and this encourages. All the students to use their language freely and exploit their resources. More importantly, with group work it is possible to incorporate activity-centered learning advocated domains (Pica,1986).

Group writing is carried out more efficiently when the writing task is designed as a process which is implemented through predetermined and well planned steps. This is termed the process approach to teaching writing. During actual writing each group member has to contribute to the act of writing under the guidance

and supervision of an aware and well prepared teacher, (Bernaus, 1978, Jacobe,1987, Keh,1990, and Leki,1990,Lewitt,1990).

Statement of the problem:

This study is attempt to solve some of the problems associated with teaching/ learning composition in the secondary stage through seeking answers to the following questions:

1. What are the declared objectives of teaching composition writing in the secondary stage as defined in the course specifications?
2. How far does the present teaching / learning methodology seek to realize the declared objectives?
3. How far do the prescribed writing exercises seek to realize the declared objectives?
4. What are the suggested objectives that take into account the nature of the writing process and the students' future needs as performers in composition?
5. What are the characteristics of an effective course to teach composition to second year secondary students in terms of objectives, content and teaching methodology and learning styles and feedback techniques?
6. To what extent To what extent does such a course does such a course implemented through co-operative group-writing affect students' performance in both guided and free composition?

Hypothesizes of the study:

1. There will be significant differences between the first two experimental groups and the control groups and the control groups in the two schools.
2. To determine the relative extent of change fostered by the implementation of the course and the teaching methodology from pre to posttest for experimental groups.
3. To test the third hypothesis which predicts significant differences between the performance of experimental A1 and A2.

4. To determine the degree of improvement generated by the content of the course ,from pre to posttest.
5. Both the posttest means of experimental group were compared to investigate the level of achievement attained by the experimental groups B1 and B2.
6. To determine the relative extent of change from pre to posttest or the two control groups in the two schools.

Significance of the study:

A major aim of teaching English to secondary school students is to give practice in the spontaneous construction of correct sentences and in putting sentences and in putting sentences together to express their ideas or particular points under discussion. The same directives also emphasize that "teacher should cater to develop the students' writing skill through comprehension, précis, composition and letter writing".

This study is significant for teachers who need to be aware of the availability of using appropriate teaching materials and methodology for training their students to write effectively and enjoy writing. They need to be acquainted with suitable and effective teaching / learning techniques which help them exploit the available instructional as well as human resources to achieve higher levels le instructional as well as human resources to achieve higher levels in students' writing performance.

Research method and tools:

1. Review of previous studies within English language teaching in general and within composition writing in particular.
2. A survey research involving the analysis of free and guided composition papers of secondary students.
3. Two questionnaires were constructed to be administered to students and teachers for details pertaining to actual teaching / learning practices, procedures and constraints.

4. Designing and testing the pre post test for validity and reliability.
5. Preparing a rating system.
6. Planning and conducting a training course for two teachers involving in the experiment.

Review of related literature:

This is concentrated with presenting a review of relevant areas of literature related to some aspects of this study. It focuses on recent humanistic trends in language teaching, particularly in teaching writing. Group work is given adequate attention as central to this study.

• ***Humanistic trends in language teaching:***

Currently, there is a strong call for approaching the educational process as a humanistic enterprise (Gebhar,1986, Harmer,1983, Piepho,1993, Stevens,1979, and Tylor, 1983).

"We are generally endowed with the capacity to love others, to be tolerant, and above all, to be compassionate and humane. All of these qualities, should be reflected in the teaching process and in our rapport with our learners, (Finnochiaro,1988:5). One of the teachers' responsibilities, as she asserts is to make learners feel secure, proud and "seven feet tall" when they leave classrooms. Only teachers, as she argues, can achieve that goal.

• ***Teachers' responsibilities:***

Tylor (1988:85) highlights the need for "instructors to avoid adopting a teacher-centered authoritarian posture" as domination of this posture runs contrary to the humanistic approaches. Stevens (1979) stresses that teachers must be willing to accept and tackle differences in style and role of learning of students and their motivations. They must learn to accept multiple styles.

As for teacher feedback and evaluation, many ELT specialists recommend that teachers can reduce threat by being non-judgmental. Being non-judgmental includes using warm, accepting,

but matter of facts language. (Celce-Murica, 1984, Doff,1988, and Zamel,1985).

Sarwer (1991:20), points that Altman talks of three basic aspects that characterize individualized language teaching:

- a. **Responsibility:** this implies that the learners takes charge of his own learning.
- b. **Relevance:** students need relevant materials and contexts of learning that are meaningful.
- c. **Rapport:** it is only through proper rapport that an atmosphere conducive to learning can be built up.

• **Humanistic education and composition lessons:**

Quite a number of researchers and specialists in composition (Dixon,1986, Gebhard, 1985, Raimes, 1987), refer to the fact that the present way of teaching composition is a source of threat to students as it is more or less type of examination.

Students further face teacher criticism which is inhibiting for most of them Gebhard (19985:20), explains that the students with learning difficulties and low level of motivate on form a significant Students further face teacher criticism which is inhibiting for most of them Gebhard (19985:20), explains that the students with learning difficulties and low level of motivate on form a significant part of the work load of teachers of English. He further argues that "conversational approaches to language teaching are unlikely to yield He further argues that "conversational approaches to language teaching are unlikely to yield results with these students". Furthermore, he refers to significant fact about large mixed-ability classes. These classes, as he says, contain a wide spectrum of students "ranging from comparatively well-adjusted slow learners to comparatively able students with low motivation and tendency to be disruptive.

• ***Group work: a recent trend in language teaching:***

Recent discussions of second and foreign e the importance of target language interaction among students for developing communicative skills in the second language". Brumfit,1987, Byrne,1987, Doff, 1988, and Johnson,1981), suggest that along with the linguistic need for interaction is the important role of students' cooperation that is, the importance role of student cooperation and collaboration in learning and completing language tasks. Furthermore, ELT theories call for instructors to get away from a teacher-centered style in language classes by setting up small group discussions. During these discussions, students initiate talk and exchange information while teachers listen, observe, make comments or ask questions. On the basis of these theoretical assumptions, it has been suggested that teachers need to examine their roles and the roles of their students.

• ***Small-group work in language teaching / learning environments:***

Brumfit (1983), classifies classroom language activities into activities for negotiation, language interpretation and expression. He suggests that teaching behavior should integrate these abilities so that classroom activities can serve one of these goals, i.e., conversation, extended writing and extend speaking, this classification integrates each activity with communication. This implies that the process of production of extend text is dominated by personal as well as social factors. (Op cit.) explains that producing an extended written piece does not differ greatly from the process of planning a speech but it requires careful attention to problems of projection and organization which are tackling in discussion activities.

• ***Discussion activities and group work:***

Developing a context for discussion activities as Brumfit (1983), Doff, 1988, and Jacobs,1988 point out, is not an easy task. One of

the frequently suggested solutions to put learners in small group to create the required environment. However, the need for small-group activity as Brumfit (1983:71).

The shift of interest to group work in 1st and 2nd language classrooms, as Brumfit points out, was due to the failure of the traditional lockstep classrooms to cause natural linguistic behavior. He points out that Long (1975) explains that the failure of the traditional classrooms techniques was because they encourage the following behavior:

1. The teacher initiates language exchanges.
2. The students' task is to respond to the teacher.
3. The teacher judges the students' performance.

- ***Characteristics of groups:***

Brumfit (op cit.:27) defines a group as "a number of people who interact with one another, who are psychologically aware of one another and who perceive themselves to be a group". Groups provide for certain psychological needs of their members during the period of their functioning. These needs, as Brumfit explains are:

1. Affiliation needs for friendship and support.
2. A means of developing a sense of identity and self-esteem.
3. A means of testing reality and establishing security about the nature of the world.
4. A means of establishing a sense of coping with external threats.
5. A means of getting specific jobs done.

- ***Group work and possibilities of interaction:***

Several studies on using group work in both L1 and L2 classrooms provide clear evidence that putting students into small groups in the classroom opens up possibilities of interaction which are not available in a whole-class approach. within small groups, as Brumit, 1983, and Savova et al (1991) point out, a closer interaction of language with social behavior is forced.

This integration has been predicated to facilitate language acquisition and use.

- ***Cooperation and competition in writing lessons:***

Among the reasons listed for advocating group activities in language classrooms as Jacobs (1988:97-103) points out, is that "they encourage students to work together, helping each other", Jacobs also stresses that putting students in a group does not necessarily result in natural cooperation. Then he points out that the only factor affecting the success of group activities is "the goal structure presented in the classroom" (p.97). through his experience in using groups in a writing class he refers to the use of three main types of goal structure: cooperative, competitive, and individualistic.

- ***Practical considerations in cooperative writing practice:***

The first step including cooperatively structured group activities, as Jacobs, (1988:99) states, is to discuss with the class how they could help each other write some of the composition. Teachers also need to explain to the students "the benefits that could be gained together". He also points out that during his study he found that the major objections to group activities are "students lack of ability and unwillingness to help each other. "he could solve the first problem by asking students to focus on the language feature covered in class, i.e., "connectors" when giving advice to their peers. As to the second problem, i.e., the grading system he used, i.e., (grade averaging) it was a stimulus which encouraged positive attitudes to actual cooperation.

- ***Research method and procedures:***

- ***Procedural considerations:***

In advanced of planning the treatment a free and guided constructed test was constructed and administered a random sample of 200 third grade secondary students in 5 schools in Zawia.

- ***An Evaluation of the composition component in English for Libya.***

English for Libya is a series of three books to be handle over three years. The course consists of a student book, a teacher's book and a work book. There is another scientifically oriented textbook included as a part of the syllabus. It contains scientific and technical topics and vocabulary. The time allocated for dealing with the component of the syllabus is five periods each week.

- ***The Questionnaire Designed for the teachers:***

This questionnaire was designed and administered to male and female teachers with different numbers of years of teaching experience ranging between 4 to 20. They are all specialist teachers. In this respect, the questions were meant to provide information concerning the actual styles, the teaching styles, the content, feedback and assessment techniques which teachers adopt. Questions also reveal teachers' opinions of their student writers, their expectations with regard to their students' proficiency as well as the possibility of using small group writing as a teaching / learning technique.

- ***The Questionnaire designed for the student:***

The questionnaire was designed and administered to 200 females and males secondary school students. The major purpose was to investigate the extent of their awareness of their preferences, interest, concepts capabilities, needs and weaknesses with regard to the composition instruction they receive.

- ***The Pre-Posttest:***

On the basis of the aims defined by Ministry authorities and those suggested by the researcher, a specially constructed composition achievement test was given twice as both pre- and posttest. The test was intended to evaluate two major aspects of written ***(1)composition, content, organization and style and (2)syntactic***

structure, spelling and punctuation. The test included two: components: a topic to write on using words and heading of topic to write on as free composition with guidance. The test was submitted to a jury of specialists in curricula and language teaching methodology for suggestions and comments pertaining to the appropriacy the test was submitted to the students' of proficiency, relevance and clarity of the wording and task. The comments also included the time proportion that may be suitable for completing the writing task.

- ***The Pilot Study of the Test:***

At the beginning of study, the test was administered to 40 students Zawia secondary school. The researcher was present to detect obscurities in the wording of the topics, the extent of ease with which they approach writing on the topics and actual average time spent on writing. It took most of the students 50 minutes to write the two paragraphs. The suggested assessment system was used and two teachers independently undertook the scoring process. The mean and standard deviation of the scores were calculated. Results of the statistical analysis revealed the following:

Mean score 3.6 / 9.

Standard Deviation 7.46

- ***Test Validity:***

The two topics intended to measure the ability to convey meaningful, clear and relevant content, appropriate organization of sentences into a coherent paragraph with a topic sentence, an opening, a body and an ending and using the appropriate style. The second criterion was appropriate vocabulary sentence structure, correct spelling and punctuation. The two areas of language functioning were specified attached to sample of students' writings submitted to the jury of specialists for further suggestions and

comments. Feedback from the jury as well as the results of the pilot study were in favor of the validity of the test.

- **Test Reliability:**

Two week later, the test was given again to the same sample in the same school. Two teachers independently scored the papers using a modified version of system. The mean of scores granted by each rater was calculated. Then test reliability was calculated for the two types of composition using Pearson Product Correlation Formulas.

- **Results and Discussions:**

In analyzing the data obtained after assessing both the pre-and posttests both the descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (T-Tests and analysis of variance), were utilized.

- **Hypothesis 1:**

The required measures were taken to test hypothesis one "There will be significant differences between the first two experimental groups and the control groups in the two schools. In the post test results of guided and free composition in favor of the first experimental groups in both schools. The detected differences are expected to be in terms of two scales: (1). Meaning, organization and development of ideas; (2). Grammar and mechanics, i.e., spelling and punctuation.....etc.

The posttest papers for the four groups were scored by two independent teachers selected solely for the scoring process. It was attempted to assess each of the two aspects of writing independently. Thus, each paper was granted two marks, one for meaning etc. and the other for mechanics. Further, each paper included two compositions. Consequently, for testing all hypotheses four scales were examined for each group.

Accordingly, data analysis was done to compare the mean and standard deviation of the posttest scores of experimental group.

Table (1):

Mean and SD of posttest Scores of Groups A1 and Cont.1 and A2 and Cont.2:

groups	Guided comp. scores.				Free comp. scores.			
	Scale 1		Scale 2		Scale 1		Scale 2	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Exp.A1	4.56	1.132	4.81	0.98	4.8	0.898	5.17	1.082
Cont.1	2.66	0.985	3.0	1.01	2.72	1.05	3.30	1.13
Exp.A2	4.44	1.157	4.86	1.28	4.27	1.12	4.63	1.14
Cont.2	2.61	1.10	3.2	1.33	2.33	1.13	3.07	1.27

Composition of the mean scores of experimental group A1 and control group 1 in first school and experimental group A2 and control group in second reveals some differences between the first two groups and between the second two groups along the two parameters for the two types of composition in favor of the experimental groups in both schools.

Hypothesis 2:

Two determine the relative extent of change fostered by the implementation of the course and the teaching methodology from pre to posttest for experimental groups A1 and A2, T-test analysis was carried out.

Table 2:

t-test results of comparing pre-and post-test means for A1 and A2.

Comp .scale	Mean differences		SD differences		T-value		Significance	
	A1	A2	A1	A2	A1	A2	A1	A2
Guided Scale 1	1.9	2	0.5	0.59	20.36	20.52	p.0.001	p.0.001
Free	2.25	2.03	0.5	0.55	27.01	21.73	p.0.001	p.0.001

Scale1								
Guided Scale2	1.97	2.03	0.56	0.608	21.16	20.17	p.0.001	p.0.001
Free Scale2	2.22	2.55	0.64	0.582	20.9	26.35	p.0.001	p.0.001

The results of the analysis as revealed in the above indicate that the amount of growth between pre and posttest was significant on the two scales of the guided and free composition for the experimental group students in the two schools as determined by a t-test for related samples.

Hypothesis 3: To test the third hypothesis which predicts significant differences between the performance of experimental groups A1 and A2.

Both the mean and the standard deviation of the posttest scores of the four groups in the two schools along the four scales were calculated as shown in the following table:

Table 3: Mean and SD of the posttest scores of groups A1 and B1 and A2 and B2

group	Guided Comp. scores				Free comp. scores			
	Scale1		Scale 2		Scale 1		Scale 2	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
EXP.A1	4.56	1.15	4.81	0.98	0.98	0.89	5.17	0.82
Exp.B1	3.47	0.87	3.05	1.11	3.74	0.96	4	0.95
Exp.A2	4.44	1.13	4.86	1.28	4.78	0.96	4.53	0.95
E Exp.B2	3.15	1.36	3.33	1.14	3.36	1.23	3.36	1.12

Comparison of the mean scores of the two first experimental groups with the mean scores of the two second experimental groups reveals some differences between the compared group means along the four composition scales in favor of the first experimental group students.(group A1 and B1).

The deviation of scores was more for most scales with groups A2 and B2, which points to variability. In this case individual factors could have accounted for the detected growth levels (motivation, effort, basic proficiency level..etc).

Hypothesis 4:

To determine the degree of improvement generated by the content of the course, from pre-posttest introduced and practiced in the whole-class setting. T-test were performed to compare the pre-and posttest means of groups B1 and B2 in the two schools with the following results:

Table 4:

Test results of comparing pre-VS.

Posttest Means of B1 and B2.

Comp. scale	Mean of difference		SD of difference		T-value		Significance	
	B 1	B 2	B 1	B 2	B1	B2	B 1	B2
Guided Scale 1	0.83	0.97	0.51	0.60	9.85	9.79	0.001	0.001
Free Scale 1	0.83	0.61	0.50	0.59	10.04	6.12	0.001	0.001
Guided Scale 2	1.08	1.36	0.5	0.48	13.04	16.76	0.001	0.001
Free Scale 2	1.16	0.86	0.44	0.92	15.66	8.71	0.001	0.001

t-test calculation revealed significant differences between pre and posttest results at the 0.001 level in favor of the posttest scores for groups B1 and B2 in two schools. These results suggest that the treatment through using the designed content was effective even when implemented through the present actual teaching procedures. However, the level of improvement with these groups was limited when compared to groups A1 and A 2. This conclusion was reached through the relatively low standard deviation of the differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests along the four scales.

Hypothesis 5:

Both the post-test means of experimental group (B1 and Cont. 2) were compared to investigate the level of achievement attained by experimental groups B1 and B2. These were two groups who received traditional instruction in the suggested writing course. Thus, the effect of one independent variable was pursued. Therefore, mean and standard deviation calculations of the post-test results of the above mentioned groups were performed along the four scales. Analysis of variance was also performed to investigate levels of significance.

Table 5:

Mean and SD of B 1 and B2

VS Cont.1 and Cont2

group	Guided comp. scores				Free comp. scores			
	Scale1		Scale2		Scale1		Scale2	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Exp. B1	3.47	0.87	3.05	1.11	3.74	0.96	4	0.95
Cont. 1	2.66	0.98	3.00	1.01	2.72	1.05	3.30	1.13
Exp.B2	3.15	1.36	3.33	1.14	3.36	1.23	3.36	1.12
Cont.2	2.61	1.10	2.02	1.33	2.33	1.13	3.07	1.27

The table display the following results:

- Means of the experimental groups B1 and B2 are higher than those of control groups. Thus, the treatment groups outperformed the control groups on the four scales.
- The standard deviation levels were more for the control groups on most of the scales than the experimental groups.
- **Hypothesis 6:**

To determine the relative extent of change from pre to posttest for the two control groups in the two schools three analyses were performed.

Table 6:

T-test results of comparing pre-and posttest means of control groups 1 and 2:

Comp. Scale	Mean of differences		SD of differences		t-value		Significance	
	Cont. 1	Cont 2	Cont 1	Cont 2	Cont 1	Cont2	Cont1	Cont2
Guided Scale1	0.056	0.22	0.232	0.166	1.44	0.369	Not significant	Not Significant
Free Scale1	0.111	0.041	0.201	0.41	2.09	1.228	Not significant	Not Significant
Guided scale2	0.167	0.161	0.377	0.412	2.65	2.62	0.05	0.05
Free Scale2	0.194	0.182	0.401	0.381	2.904	2.62	0.05	0.05

- The above table reveals that there are no significant differences between the means of the pretest versus to the posttest scores of the two control groups in the two schools on the first scale (meaning, organization and style) for both the guided and the free composition. This result provides partial support to the sixth hypothesis. The growth that occurred to the control groups' students was limited on this scale.
- The same table reveals that there were significant differences between the pre- and post-test means of the two control groups.
- **Discussion:**
The most obvious conclusion in view of the above mentioned results is that writing is a compound skill which requires specially designed courses on the basis of actual proficiency level of students and their future needs. Teacher instruction and training need to be given more attention as far as composition teaching is concerned.

More importantly, the results revealed that teaching/learning approaches with regard to focus on the writing skill vary in the degree of their efficiency.

The pre-treatment procedures and findings of analysis of students' writing actual observation of writing lessons, the analysis of both students and teachers' answers to questionnaires provided a basis for anticipating and dealing with the emerging problems.

The effect of small group the students-centered teaching –learning method; data analysis revealed the superiority of the adopted teaching method and ability by the prescribed procedures in the teacher's notes. These findings may be attributed to the observation that group writing actually contributed to upgrading all levels of proficiency. The adopted strategies gave due care to all resources and encouraged students of all levels to explore their potentials. That appeared to be the reason behind the limited variability of students' scores compared to second experimental groups population and the control groups population, this is in line with newer trends in EFL research and literature on humanistic and affective considerations involved in language learning.

Another factor which fostered students' growth was that from the outset students were reminded that they would be writing for real readers for peers and for a consultant and not a judge. First sessions provided guidance and encouraged the students to seek help throughout the writing stages. This new trend gave them confidence during writing and speeded up the writing task.

Feedback was provided in the form of correction and comments for both the second experimental group and control group during writing for the first experimental group. For the three major towards the termination of the treatment, systematic observation and consultation sessions revealed clear trends towards developing the ability to think critically about what happens in the three classes.

These were signs of honest judgment of their teaching and assessment of the degree of learning that was taking place. When the teachers practically learned what good teaching was they displayed attempts to strive towards better teaching.

• **Recommendations:**

This study brought to light a number of crucial points which if seriously and sincerely considered are assumed to help both secondary school students and teachers solve many aspects of the problems which hamper effective teaching and learning of writing skill. Teachers may find teaching and correcting students' writing less daunting and students may get benefit and pleasure through writing sessions.

1. Writing should be given more attention in second language programmes. It should be allocated more space in the prescribe textbook and on time tables in preparatory and secondary stage instruction.
2. Writing practice should be planned and managed as a means to develop the skill to communicate ideas, feelings and knowledge, effectively and accurately.
3. Writing is a compound and comprehensive skill incorporating grammar, vocabulary, spelling, conception, meaning and other elements, it should be integrated with all language activities.
4. Teachers need to train their students to be resourceful and flexible in expressing their ideas.

References :

1. Aboderin, Y., (1986) "integrating Reading and Writing": English Teaching Forum Vol.xxv/1 pp.38-40.
2. Bernaos, M., (1987), "activities that Motivate and Increase Students output" :English Teaching Forum Vol. XX/1 pp.45-46.
3. Blanton, L., (1987), "Reshaping ESL Students' Perception of Writing", ELT Journal Vol.41/2, pp. 12-16.
4. Brumfit, C., (1983),: Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching Cambridge Uni. Press.
5. Byrne, D., (1982): Teaching Writing Skills, Longman.
6. Celce Muric, M., (1984), "Interaction and Communication in the ESOL Classroom" The English Forum Vol. XII/2 pp2-7.
7. Dixon, D., (1986), "The English Teaching forum Vol. XXIV/3 pp.2-6.
8. Gebhard, J., (1985), "Teaching Reading Through Assumptions about learning": The English Forum vol. XXIII/3 pp.16-20.
9. Horner, P., (1990): The Practice of English Language Teaching Longman.
10. Jacobs, G., (1986), "Co-operative Goal Structure: a Way to Improve Group activities": ELT Journal, Vol. 42/2 pp.97-101.
11. Johnson, K., (1982),: Communicate in Writing Longman.
12. Keh, C., (1990) "A design for a process-Approach Writing Course", The English Teaching Forum Vol. XXVIII/3 pp.10-13
13. Keh, C., (1991), "Teaching grammar as a Process in the Process of Writing", English Teaching Forum Vol. XXIX/2 pp.17-21.
14. Leki, I., (1991), Teaching Second language Writing: Where We seem to Be", English Teaching Forum , Vol. XXIX/2 pp.8-12.
15. Lewitt, P., (1990), "How to Cook a Tasty Essay: The Secret of Real Writing", English Teaching Forum, Vol. XXVII/1 pp.2-5.
16. Mitchell, H., (1986), "Helping Slow and Unmotivated Teenager Learn English": English teaching Forum , Vol. XXIV/2 pp.38-40.

17. Nation, P., (1989), "Group Work and Language", English Teaching Forum, Vol. XXVII/2 pp.20-24.
18. Pica, T., (1986) "An Interactional Approach to the Teaching of Writing", English Teaching Forum, Vol. XXIV/3 pp.6-11.
19. Pincas, A., (1982a) Writing in English Book1, Macmillan.
20. Savova, L., and Donato (191), "Group Activities in the Language Classroom", English Teaching Forum, Vol. XXIX pp.12-15
21. Stevens, J., (1983), "Activities to Promote Learning and communication in the Second Language Classroom": TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 17/2 pp.22-30
22. Stevens, P., "English as an International language": English teaching Forum, Doff, A., (1989): Teaching English: a Training Course For Teachers The British Council and Cambridge Uni: Press.
23. Rivers, W., (1986), Teaching Foreign Language Skills, U.C.P.
24. Zamel, V., (1990), "Writing one's Way Into Reading": TESOL Quarterly, Vol., 24/3