CHAPTER TWO
Literature Review

Chapter II presents the review of the previous research pertaining to the research questions of the present study in the following order. First, it describes the studies on language learning strategies in general and on the writing strategies in particular. In this respect, the chapter places an emphasis on studies of the identification of EFL and ESL writing strategies and theories in the field of ESL writing that can be used as a theoretical framework for the categorization of writing strategies. These are contrastive rhetoric theory, cognitive development theory, and social constructive theory. Second, the chapter examines the studies of factors influencing strategy use. In this regard, the review mainly focuses on the studies that deal with three major factors: fields of study, writing instruction approaches and motivation that influence the use of writing strategies. The chapter treats each of the three factors in different sections. In the first section, the chapter reviews the studies on language learning strategy use across different fields of study and it goes on exploring the evolution of writing for specific contexts or disciplines. The second section of the chapter reviews writing instruction approaches that include ‘product’, ‘process’, and ‘genre’ approaches. The third section deals with the relationship between the learners’ motivation and their writing behaviour. Here the review mainly focuses on the motivation models that can be used for analysis purpose. In this regard, particular attention will be given to Gardner’s (1985), Dornyei’s (1994) and Williams Burden’s (1997) models of motivation.

2.1 Writing strategies

2.1.1 Identification of writing strategies

Stating McDonough’s view on strategy research, Archibald (2006) writes “One of the things that the strategy research has enabled is for people to go to expert language learners, expert writers, expert readers in a foreign language and try to classify the sorts of things that they are doing in order to explain what is making them such good language learners” (P.63).

In the history of language learning strategy research, researchers have not only been able to explain the reason why some language learners are more successful than their classmates are (i.e., the difference in success rate among learners under the same
condition “is attributable to the varying strategies which different learners bring to the task” (Griffiths and Parr, 2001, p. 249), but have also identified taxonomies of learning strategies that have been used as sources from which different parties (learners, teachers, and researchers) choose to learn, practice, and/or apply in a wider context.

In early second language writing research, some researchers were interested in studying process-oriented composition and tried to deal with all the aspects of the second language composing processes. But visibly, the researchers were trying to gain insights into the composing behaviour of the learners, particularly identifying effective and ineffective behaviour that pertained to writing effective L2 compositions (Krapels, 1990). For example, in one of the early L2 writing process studies, Jones (as cited in Krapels, 1990, p. 40) analyzed the composing behaviour of his subjects who were classified as poor and good writers. His findings indicated that “the poor writer was bound to the text at the expense of ideas, whereas the good writer allowed her [the subject’s] ideas to generate the text”. Jones also pointed out that the problem of the poor writer was not lack of linguistic competence, but lack of experience in composing.

Similar to Jones’ conclusion, Zamel (1982) stated that composing experience as a process was more important than linguistic competence in producing effective composition. Moreover, Zamel asserted that the primary behaviour that makes skilled writers different from less skilled writers is the writing strategies they employ in composing texts.

In another study, Zamel (1983) investigated the composing behaviour of six advanced L2 students. In studying them, she made direct observations while they were writing an essay on a given topic and at the end of the writing task, she interviewed them. Finally, she found that the successful students spent more time on revising their essays trying to ensure clarity of the meaning they wanted to convey than less successful writers. Zamel further pointed out that the successful writers were concerned about their ideas first and left the editing tasks for the end of the process and their writing strategies were found to be similar to those of skilled L1 writers. Concerning unskilled writers, she found that they concentrated on sentences and paragraph creation instead of the whole discourse. Moreover, they edited their writing from the beginning to the end focusing on surface level errors and paid little attention to the organization of the text and exhibited less commitment to revising their writing than skilled writers.
A study of the writing strategies of graduate research students in social science was conducted by Torrance et al. (1994). Using cluster analysis, the researchers found three categories of writers: Planners, Revisers and Mixed Strategy, who showed distinct differences in some of the strategies they employed while writing. The first group, ‘Planners’ made a decision on contents (having clear ideas) before writing and liked also to make fewer revisions on content. The second group, ‘Revisers’ liked to produce content and make revisions while writing. The third group, ‘Mixed Strategy’ writers tried to make a decision on content before writing and revised their content extensively.

Although the three groups showed differences in some of their writing strategies, most of the subjects were found to use note taking, drafting and revising strategies while writing. On examining the relationship between writing strategy and success in academic writing, the researchers found that there was significantly higher productivity for Planners than Revisers and Mixed Strategy writers.

In this research, productivity was determined by the number of words used in the text produced divided by the time taken to write the text. This may require careful interpretation of the data reported by the subjects, for they may face difficulties in remembering reasonably the amount of words used in the texts they produced and the number of time spent on writing these texts as a whole. Therefore, the reliability of the findings that indicate the relationship between writing strategy use and success in academic writing requires further research.

In a recent study conducted in undergraduate psychology students essay writing strategies at the university of Birmingham, UK, Torrance and his colleagues (2000) analyzed the responses given by 322 students and identified four clusters of writing behaviour: a minimal drafting strategy, an outline-and-develop strategy, a detailed-planning, and think-then-do strategy. Of these, “the detailed-planning and think-then-do strategy both appeared to have resulted in better quality essay, although differences were small” (P.181). This means that students who employed the detailed-planning and think-then-do strategy were found to be better achievers in their essay writing performance.

In general, on reviewing the scarce studies of writing strategies, the researcher observed certain problems in the investigation and implementation of the strategies. First, researchers like Jones (as cited in Krapels, 1990) and Zamel (1982, 1983) used
very few subjects to arrive at those conclusions. Second, in the studies conducted by Torrance et al. (2000) most of the subjects were native speakers of English. Generalization based on a study of native speakers may not be applicable to ESL and EFL learners. In other words, the writing strategies which work well for these participants may not be effective for the second or foreign language learners from different contexts and cultures.

The third problem noted in many ESL/EFL writing strategy studies is that they depended on think aloud protocols (Arndt, 1987; Jones and Tetroe, 1987; Wenden, 1991b) and case study (Zamel, 1983) as main data source. Although these instruments are useful to collect reliable data, they cannot be used to collect data from a large sample size, which is usually recommended for making generalization on writing behaviour of EFL learners (see Sasaki’s, 2000 explanation on further limitations of think aloud protocols). To fill this gap, in the present study a questionnaire was designed to collect data from a large sample size.

Moreover, the list of strategies which have been obtained from the studies on writing strategies seems to be incomplete and needs further investigation to obtain more strategies employed by EFL students in different socio-cultural settings so as to establish a comprehensive taxonomy of writing strategies and to get better insight into the ways or practice of learning writing in the EFL context.

One benefit of exploring the writing strategies of EFL students is to find a list of effective writing strategies that have a strong relationship with proficiency in writing. This list can be used by motivated students to choose and implement strategies for developing their writing competence. The use of effective writing strategies in turn sensitizes the students towards their writing performance and take charge of their own writing skill development.

The idea of exploring a list of effective writing strategies also with the intention of their being used in training the students for using appropriately and flexibly can be an alternative to address the writing difficulties EFL undergraduate students face.

Obtaining a list of effective writing strategies of EFL students is not enough to meet the intended objectives but these strategies need to be classified into major categories on valid grounds so as to make them accessible to different users such as researchers, teachers, and students.
2.1.2 Classifications of writing strategies

In the review of writing research, it is noted that writing strategies have been identified using different instruments and classified into different groups by different writers. But the bases for classifying the strategies are not clear. Thus a further discussion on a review of related studies on EFL/ESL writing strategies and their classifications is required with the intention of presenting the endeavors made towards investigating writing strategies and establishing a better categorization of writing strategies.

Arndt (1987), by studying the composing behaviour of six Chinese postgraduate EFL students, identified eight categories of writing strategies, evaluating protocol used while they were writing papers in both their first language and English. These include: planning, questioning, revising, editing, re-reading, global planning, rehearsing, and repeating.

Another list of writing strategies was proposed by Victori (1995), who has investigated seven types of writing strategies that include: planning strategies, monitoring strategies, evaluating strategies, resourcing strategies, repeating strategies, reduction strategies and use of L1 strategies.

Riazi (1997), using the qualitative approach, studied four Iranian doctoral students of education at Canadian universities. He categorized the various composing strategies employed by the four subjects into three categories: cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies based on the distinctions made by previous studies and search strategies, which he inferred from the data obtained.

Sasaki (2000) studied the composing strategies of twelve Japanese EFL writers with different writing ability levels (four expert writers, four more-skilled student writers and four less skilled student writers). Data were collected from these participants using different sources (written texts, video taped writing behaviour, recall protocols and analytical scores to written texts). The writing strategies of these subjects were classified into eight major categories. These are planning, retrieving, generating ideas, verbalizing, translating, rereading, evaluating and others.

Mu (2005), reviewing the studies on ESL writing strategies, identified thirty strategies. Examining the big size of these strategies and the ways these were classified, Mu (2005) commented that these are difficult to learn by heart and distinguish clearly. To make these strategies easily accessible to ESL learners and teachers, the researcher
proposes five categories of writing strategies. These strategies include rhetorical strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, communicative strategies and social/affective strategies. The bases of these categorizations are the previous classifications of strategies and theories related to ESL writing.

2.1.2.1 The reasons for modifying the classification of writing strategies
For the present study, a modified taxonomy of writing strategies is needed for various reasons. First, a classification of writing strategies is needed in order to ease the analysis of data collected on writing strategies and draw conclusions about the use of the same study subjects. During the analysis, the language behaviour of subjects will be compared, described, and discussed.

   Yet, another reason for developing a modified category of writing strategies is to come up with a comprehensive taxonomy that can serve as a reference for both teachers and EFL students considering the available taxonomies of writing strategies are incomplete in certain aspects and varied in their nature. The presence of such myriads of varied categories of writing strategies may confuse researchers, teachers and student alike.

   One reason for generating new categories of writing strategies is also to fill the gap created by available categories of writing strategies. Among other things, the development of some of the existing classifications of writing strategies are based on the studies conducted on a small sample size. For example, Riazi’s (1997) four composing strategies (cognitive, metacognitive, social and search strategies) were developed based on the studies made on the four EFL postgraduate students. Similarly, the other writing strategy classification based on a theoretical instance and a small sample size was proposed by Wenden (1991b). Wenden studied the composing behaviour of eight ESL students and classified their strategies into two major categories: cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Such findings were based on a small sample size so the results obtained cannot be considered for making generalization.

   Moreover, as the review made on studies conducted on writing strategy classifications demonstrates, most of the categorizations made do not have theoretical grounds. For example, Sasaki who came up with an interesting description of strategies has produced a list of writing strategies which is difficult to apply for research purposes, for the strategies are not systematically classified into smaller groups. To fill
this gap, the present classifications are based on the three theories related to writing strategies.

In fact, in the present classification of writing strategies, the influence of Mu’s (2005) classification scheme appears to be sound because his classification of writing strategies is developed on a good theoretical foundation relevant to writing. These include rhetorical, cognitive, metacognitive, communicative and social/affective strategies. Most of these classifications are interesting because they are explicit and understandable. They are also suitable for a research project, for they can be compared and described easily to make generalizations about the writing behaviour of the subjects. Although Mu’s classifications scheme has strong sides, there are two weaknesses observed. One is that the grouping of the four categories was based only on theoretical instances or grounds without using any empirical data or evidence to support and justify the categorization. Second, unlike Riazi (1997) and Oxford (1990), Mu classified ‘assigning goal’ under social/affective strategies, which is not convincing. Contrary to this, for the establishment of the present classification, writing strategy data was collected from 680 EFL learners and was used to justify the four proposed categories of writing strategies and ‘assigning goal’ is labeled under metacognitive strategies.

The following section discusses the procedures employed to develop categories of writing strategies, the empirical evidence obtained from the present study and theoretical justification given in support of the classification of strategies.

2.1.2.2 Modification of writing strategy classification

To meet the objective of the study, the data collected using a set of closed questions is summarized into fewer dimensions and the classification of writing strategy items into identified dimensions was done.

In obtaining the dimensions of writing strategies, the previously identified dimensions by different researchers (Mu, 2005; O’Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Riazi, 1997; Wenden, 1991b) were considered. Attempts were made to use selected taxonomies from the set of proposed taxonomies of these researchers based on their direct relevance to one or more of the objectives of the study. The selected writing strategies were categorized into fewer groups so as to make them easily accessible for the EFL learners and teachers. The selected dimensions include: rhetorical strategies,
cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies and social affective strategies. The list of these categories along with their references is delineated in the table below.

**Table 2.1: Modified category of EFL writing strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rhetorical strategies</td>
<td>Mu, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social/Affective strategies</td>
<td>Mu, 2005; O’Malley and Chamot, 1990; Riazi, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Sasaki, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other criterion used for the selection was the suitability of the categories shown in Table 2.1 to accommodate at least five writing strategy items out of 38 items used to assess the writing strategies of the subjects based on factor loading of each item; that is, each item to be considered into categories should satisfy the minimum requirement of item loading (greater or equal to .4 and less than -.4) (see Table 3.3).

The analysis of the reliability coefficients of each category was also carried out and each was found to meet the required level of reliability. Items with low reliability were grouped under the heading “others” (see Table 3.2 for the details).

The empirical evidence obtained from the present study will be backed by related theories of writing to justify the classifications made. These theories will be discussed below.
2.1.3 Theoretical framework for the classification of writing strategies
(Theories related to ESL Writing)

The other issue considered during the establishment of the above categories of writing strategies relates to theories in the field of ESL writing that can be used as a theoretical framework for the categorization of writing strategies. These are contrastive rhetoric theory, cognitive development theory, and social constructive theory. While reviewing the studies conducted on a classification of writing strategies, these theories including the communicative theory were found to have been effectively used by Mu, (2005) to develop his five categories of ESL writing strategies. In fact, communication theory was not considered in the present classification because it might be more appropriate to use it as the base for classification of oral communication strategies than writing strategy.

In the next section, the three theories which are believed to be relevant to the objective of the present study will be described briefly to justify the proposed categorization of writing strategies.

2.1.3.1 Contrastive rhetoric theory

The introduction of contrastive rhetoric as a new field of study was made in 1966 by Robert Kaplan. Kaplan while studying essays written by L2 students arrived at a conclusion that learners with different L1 backgrounds employ different rhetorical patterns in organizing their writing. And these differences can be attributed to the different cultures the learners have.

In another study, Kaplan (1967) examined the essays written by an Arab student in a US University and found problems in grammar and mechanics in his essay. In addition to these, he found the overuse of parallelism in the essay. He then concluded the problems Arab students faced in producing texts in English were caused by the influence of Arabic rhetoric which is different from the English system. To overcome such problems, contrastive rhetoric studies can help ESL/EFL learners get insights into the organization of texts in different cultures.

Contrastive rhetoric theory has contributed to the development of the current tradition of rhetoric. The main concern of the current tradition of rhetoric is the logical arrangement of ideas in a text. As explained by Silva (1990), in learning to write, ESL writers are required to identify and internalize ways of text organization at a paragraph.
and essay level. Elements of paragraphs that comprise topic sentences, support sentences and concluding sentences, and methods of paragraph development that include illustration, comparison and contrast, classification, definition and so on, as noted by Silva, are the central focus in current rhetoric theory.

In contrastive rhetoric research, the presence of formal differences in texts written by native and non-native speakers of English has been identified. As reported by Mu (2005, p.2), “these textual differences have been related to cultural differences in rhetorical expectations and conventions”

Therefore, to produce effective written texts that meet standards of the native speakers of English, EFL learners are required to acquire rhetorical strategies that are in line with the culture of the native speakers.

2.1.3.2 Cognitive development theory

Cognitive development theory is one of the two major views of cognitivism: cognitive development theory and information processing theory. The former was developed by a leading psychologist named Jean Piaget, whereas the latter by Atkinson and Shifrin. Cognitivism is concerned with the study of the mental activity of the learners that includes how they learn, what they know, how they acquire, structure and process knowledge. Cognitivism has emerged as a dominant theory in language learning methodology as a reaction to behaviourism, which regards language learning as habit formation. According to behaviourists’ theory, learners are required to engage in imitating linguistic features of the model texts (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

Contrary to the views of behaviourists, cognitivists regard the learner “…as an active participant in the learning process, using various mental strategies in order to sort out the system of the language to be learned” (Williams and Burden, 1997, p. 13). The cognitive approach also regards learning as an active mental process in which the learner uses his/her innate and creative ability to construct new sentences and patterns to develop his/her language competence (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

Cognitive theory has served as a sound foundation for the study of writing as a process. Using this theory as a framework, many researchers have been attracted towards studying the composing behaviour of ESL learners and also developed models leading to study of writing as a process. For example, as stated by Mu, “In English composition studies, Flower and Hayes’ model …and Bereiter and Scardamalia’s
model ... are worth mentioning because they directly influence ESL writing research” (2005, p.2). As he further explained, the model of Flower and Hayes depicts the four steps to be followed in the production of a piece of writing. These steps comprise planning, generating, translating and editing that take place in a recursive order. But this model was criticized by Bereiter and Scardamalia, for it did not make any distinction between writing strategies used by novices and expert writers. And later, Bereiter and Scardamalia came up with two models: knowledge telling and knowledge transformation models that serve for novice and expert writers respectively. As confirmed by O’Brein, “These models provide a framework for the description, analysis, explanation, and understanding of writing processes” (1995, p. 443).

Generally, the investigation of writing strategies of ESL learners or writers “is based directly on theoretical and instructional trends in writing as a-process-theory” (Grabe and Kaplan, as cited in Mu, 2005, p.3). Most writing strategies that fall into cognitive and metacognitive categories are obtained and applied on the basis of cognitive development theory. In fact this theory is not without criticism. Some researchers blame this theory for disregarding the context of writing (e.g., Flower, 1994). Writing is not only the product of cognitive process, it is also a social product, for there are a number of cultural factors that influence writing a text.

2.1.3.3 Social constructivism

As mentioned above, cognitive approaches to language teaching have placed an emphasis on understanding on what goes on in the mind of the learner when language learning takes place including the thinking process. However, understanding of how the mind works while language learning occurs is not enough by itself to explain what happens in one’s mind when one learns something (Williams and Burden, 1997).

Constructivism, which is a wide theoretical framework in education, “...is rooted in notions from cognitive and social constructivism” (Kaufman, 2004, p. 304). The prominent researcher in cognitivism is Piaget (1954; 1955; 1970; Piaget and Inhelder, 1971) and in social constructivism is Vygotsky (1962, 1978).

Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist, “...strove to prove that social interactions enable humans to develop advanced thoughts through repeated interactions with more experienced individuals in the community” (Vanderburg, 2006, p.375). Similarly, Kaufman (2004, p.304) states that “Vygotsky advanced the view that
children’s thinking and meaning-making is socially constructed and emerges out of their social interaction with their environment”. The environment: families, peers, teachers and other people significantly contribute to and facilitate children’s learning process.

Vygotsky with his concepts of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and inner voice has been able to attract the attention of researchers in writing. A lot of researchers have used his notion of learning through social interaction and inner voice as a framework or driving force to investigate how students can develop their writing competence through scaffolding techniques that encompass modeling, coaching, conferencing, providing feedback and reflection (Vanderburg, 2006).

According to Vygotsky (1978), the Zone of Proximal Development refers to the distance between an individual’s level of development measured by his/her ability to solve problems and his/her level of potential development in solving problems judged by more capable or experienced individuals. Inner speech is also described by Vygotsky (1986) as something which emerges gradually, developing first as social speech and then as egocentric speech of children and finally as inner speech. He further states that “…inner speech is speech for oneself; external speech is for others” (p.225).

Having briefly describing the Vygotsky’s concepts of Zone of Proximal Development and inner speech, the important role played by these theories will be dealt below.

After reviewing the studies conducted using Vygostky’s theories as a framework, Vanderburg (2006) noted that “The use of Vygotsky’s concepts of ZPD as a framework in writing research appears to have clearly helped improve students writing ability, understanding of the writing process and what is gained by writing and desires to produce text that is reader focused”(p.383).

In his review of writing research carried out using Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development, Vanderburg, (2006,p.379) cited several researchers, one of whom is Sperling, who studied how teacher-student conferencing contributes to the students’ learning how to write. The findings of Sperling’s study (as cited in Vanderburg, 2006, p.380) reveal that “teachers taking authoritarian and directive roles fostered lower retention rates among students…. [And] the students are more apt to interact with their
teachers who presented questions and modeled writing tasks as opposed to telling students what was right and wrong.”

Research demonstrated that teachers use different ways of scaffolding to help their students improve their writing ability. For instance, Green and Smith (1999) witnessed that teacher’s scaffolding through raising a number of questions that focus on different aspects of their writing was found to be useful to motivate students in engaging themselves in improving their writing while they attempt to address the questions. Dyson (2004) observed that discussion held among students help them participate actively in writing tasks that help them create written voice.

Other studies also disclosed that more capable students strive to impart their inner voice to less capable students. In this respect, Sommer (1980) studying the behaviour of experienced and less experienced writers during the revision process, proposes that when experienced writers work together with less experienced writers to revise texts, less experienced writers may learn from the revision strategies employed by experienced writers and in the discussion experienced writers may endeavor to impart their inner voice to less experienced writers.

Recognizing the importance of creating an editing voice in the students, Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver and Stratman (1986) came up with a revision model that can help teachers teach students revision strategies during the revision process. These researchers developed the model of revision using Vygotsky’s theories.

To sum up, from the social constructivists’ perspective writing is not only a cognitive activity but also a social activity. Meanings and text types are socially constructed and they are expected to meet the needs of the target discourse communities. Therefore, the writer is expected to include his/her experiences, others experiences, situations, purposes and to use socially recognizable language and patterns of organization.

2.2 Factors influencing strategy use

Since the 1970s, there has been a growing interest in language learning strategy research. In many of the empirical studies conducted on strategies learners employ in learning and using second language, the relationship between strategy use and language proficiency has been found (e.g. Dreyer and Oxford, 1996; Green and Oxford, 1995;
Learners who use a variety of strategies appropriately and flexibly are found to improve their language ability.

However, there are a number of factors that influence the frequency of language learning strategy use. As a review of several studies on factors affecting strategy choice made by Oxford (as cited in Oxford and Nyikos 1989, p.291) revealed that the factors that affect language learning strategy use include:

1) language being learned; 2) level of language learning, proficiency or course; 3) degree of metacognitive awareness; 4) sex; 5) affective variables such as attitudes, motivation, and language learning goals; 6) specific personality traits; 7) overall personality type; 8) learning style; 9) career orientation or field specialization; 10) national origin; 11) aptitude; 12) language teaching methods; 13) task requirement; and if relevant 14) type of strategy training.

Another list of factors that influence the frequency of language learning strategy use presented in the study by Wharton (2000) includes:

cultural background, language studies, stage of learning, age, motivation, language learning goals, FL versus second language (SL) settings, previous language learning experience, language learning styles (including the influence of language teaching methods and task requirement), gender, anxiety, lack of inhibition and career or academic specialization (p.207).

Student learning, according to the study by Entwistle (as cited in Vermunt, 2005), can be influenced by three major groups of factors. These are students’ characteristics, teaching characteristics, and departmental characteristics. According to Entwistle, students’ characteristics refer to prior knowledge, intellectual abilities, learning styles, personality, attitudes to courses, motivation, work habits and study skills. Teaching characteristics refer to level, pace, structure, clarity, explanation, enthusiasms, and empathy of teaching. Departmental features include course design and objectives, learning materials, assessment procedures, workload, freedom of choice and study skills support.

As the above reviewed studies revealed, there are many factors that have been mentioned to affect the use of language learning strategies, but in the present study, only three factors which are believed to have a major impact on learning strategy use in general and writing strategy in particular will be investigated further. These factors
which were selected from the above studies are fields of study, writing instruction approaches and motivation along with attitudes and goals in learning writing. In fact these factors have been researched by several researchers but their influence on writing strategy use of students in an EFL context, particularly in Ethiopia, has not been studied well. Therefore, the present study aims to provide empirical evidence towards the influence of the three factors on the writing strategy choice of Ethiopian undergraduate students.

2.2.1 Fields of study and language learning strategy use

Research suggests that students majoring in different fields of study employ language learning strategies in different numbers and frequencies. In support of this assumption, several researchers (e.g., Park, 1999; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985) have found that students whose fields of study were humanities were found to employ more varied strategies than did students from science/engineering. Similar findings have been obtained in many other studies as reviewed below.

Oxford and Nyikos (1989) found that in the use of functional practice and resourceful independent strategies, students of social science/education/humanities showed greater strategy use than did students from engineering/computer science/physical science.

In a study of language learning strategy use of tertiary level students in China, Rong (1999) found that in the use of four categories of strategies (cognitive, compensation, affective and social) English major students employed more strategies than students from science did.

Peacock (2001) studying the language learning strategy use of 140 science, mathematics and engineering students found that physics students employed a smaller number of strategies than did students from mathematics and engineering.

In a recent study held by Peacock and Ho (2003), language learning strategy use among eight fields of study (building, business, computing, engineering, English, mathematics, primary education and science) was investigated using SILL. In this study, differences in strategy use were noted among students from different disciplines. For instance, computer studies students were found to employ seven strategies that have a strong correlation with higher proficiency than did students with lower frequency from other disciplines. The other difference in strategy use was seen in
science students. These students showed lower use of compensation and social strategies than students from other disciplines.

In general, as the review of the above studies demonstrates, fields of study affect strategy use. Students from certain disciplines may be deficient in certain strategies which are important in improving language ability (see Peacock and Ho, 2003 for further explanation and examples of low use of certain strategies in some fields of study). Such findings can be helpful for teachers “to know the deficiencies and the strengths regarding strategy use in particular discipline that they teach and use this knowledge to train students... in the importance and use of these strategies” (Peacock and Ho, 2003, p.194).

2.2.1.1 Writing strategy use: Theoretical background

As the review of the literature investigating the use of language learning strategies shows, many of the strategies are meant for learning and using English in general. But focusing on selective learning strategies, which are useful for developing specific language skills such as reading and writing, is required. This is because in certain academic or professional settings, certain skills are more in demand than the others. For instance, more writing tasks are required in social sciences, arts and humanities than in sciences, mathematics and engineering (Cooper and Bikowski, 2007). So students from these social science areas needed to develop better writing skills in order to be successful in their studies than did students from science fields.

Identifying the writing tasks among different disciplines enables teachers to focus on what the students from specific disciplines are required to do so that they can prepare learners for genres in their respective disciplines. Researchers also strongly recommend that “students entering academic disciplines need a specialized literacy that consists of the ability to use discipline-specific rhetorical and linguistic conventions to serve their purposes as writers” (Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman, 1991, p. 19). This view is grounded on some of the basic principles of English for Specific Purposes that “the language we speak and write varies considerably, and in a number of different ways, from one context to another” (Widdowson, as cited in Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). The field of discourse analysis also shows that “the rhetorical patterns of a text organization differed significantly between specialist areas of use: the rhetorical
structure of science texts was regarded as different from that of commercial texts, for example” (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987, p. 12).

Both the register and discourse analyses of texts in different disciplines have brought the linguistic features and the organizational patterns of texts into the attention of teachers and material developers to make these features the basis for learners’ course.

A greater emphasis on writing instruction that concentrates on discipline-specific aspects of writing was placed in the 1970s, when a pedagogical reform movement known as Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) emerged partly as a response to the 1970s literacy crisis perceived in America and other parts of the world. As reported by Townsend (2004), a number of social factors have contributed to the literacy crisis among students which include “changing educational demographics, increased demand for higher education, declining test scores, open policies in public colleges and media attention” (p.1). The major complaints about students’ writing ability commonly reported include that students were deficient in language skills, organizational skills and critical thinking skills (Townsend, 2004).

To address the writing problems of students, the writing-across-the-curriculum movement mainly advocates that “instructors in all disciplines...make writing an inevitable part of the teaching and learning process in their courses” (Spack, as cited in Janopoulos, 1995, p.44). In relation to writing skill development this approach is believed to benefit students in two major ways. One is that students will get opportunities to learn and practice forms and conventions of writing that are unique to a specific discipline. For instance, aspects of writing related to a laboratory report in science course are distinct from the aspects of writing related to a report of fieldwork in social science course. Second, the integration of writing across the curriculum will provide opportunities for students to practice writing persistently that may ensure their writing skill development.

Writing Across the Curriculum, which is meant for the response to the growing concern about the students’ inability to write well, is based on certain premises, among which the major ones are: writing must be incorporated in all courses and practiced throughout the programme so as to sustain the development of the writing skills of students, and since writing in content areas increases the understanding of the concepts
and information and familiarity with genres, teachers must employ writing-to-learn strategies while teaching their courses.

In teaching WAC courses targeted towards the development of students writing skills and reinforcement of content learning, instructors have often employed student centered pedagogy that includes collaborative writing, journal writing and writing assignments (Townsend, 2004).

Fascinated by its aims, developing writing and critical thinking skills and enhancing content learning and learner-centered pedagogy, various educational institutions in different countries have developed WAC programme and have reported on successful integration of writing into the courses that yielded the desired outcomes. For instance, in an attempt to translate WAC in a New Zealand tertiary context using action research as a methodology, Emerson et al. (2002) found that “WAC programme positively impacted on students’ attitude on the value of writing as part of the curriculum. It has also a long term persuasive impact on the curriculum; since this project was developed, the writing pedagogies we used have been integrated into second and third year horticulture curriculum” (pp.130-131).

Reporting the positive outcome of Writing Across the Curriculum programme, for instance, Townsend (2004) stated that “Comprehensive, longitudinal studies on the role of writing in general education show that students’ writing ability, critical thinking ability, general knowledge, and overall satisfaction with education increase when they take course that emphasizes writing” (p.4).

Furthermore, in their study, Hilgers, Hussey and Stitt-Bergh (1999) found that “When writing in their chosen fields, students were aware that the body of existing knowledge and the conventions of the field were factors in how they researched and wrote. Their perception that specific writing and research tasks were preparing them for their future careers cast a high-stakes aura around writing in the major” (p.325).

The requirement of writing proficiency to meet the demands of writing in the workplace is recognized by professionals in different fields. For instance, written communication skills are essential for new graduates of engineering to be successful in their workplace. This is because “Reports from professionals in the workplace have shown that engineers often spend up to half of their time writing and the amount of
time spent writing is correlated with position within an organization” (Paradis, Dobrin and Miller; Roberts, as cited in Ford, 2004, p.301).

Regarding the importance of writing in the work places, Zhu (2004) interviewed both business and engineering faculty and found that writing was recognized as an essential skill for success in career in these two areas. But the comments from the two faculties indicated a variation in terms of emphasis given to writing in the academic curriculum. That is, more attention was given to the integration of writing into all the courses by business faculty than by engineering faculty. This is ascribed to “… the differences in the disciplinary cultures” of the two faculties (Zhu, 2004). This is further substantiated by the comments from business faculty that clearly reveal that giving more emphasis to written communication differentiates their faculty from engineering faculty.

The other findings of Zhu’s (2004) study demonstrate the different views the interviewed professors held on writing instruction. The first view focused on general writing skill development programme undertaken by English instructors, who are responsible for developing students writing skills that would be transferred to all the courses and later would be used in the work place. The second view centered on having a joint venture on taking responsibility for developing the writing skills of the students. The English instructors should offer basic/general writing courses that lay foundation for the development of writing skills of students and then content area specialists would be responsible for teaching writing in particular disciplines.

Generally, from the review of studies on writing across the disciplines, although there are variations on writing instruction approaches, the roles of English and subject instructors and practice, it is possible to conclude that Writing Across the Disciplines has the potential benefits to help the students from different disciplines develop their academic writing ability as well as prepare them for the demands for proficient communication in the workplace that requires consideration of purposes, audiences and contexts.

The presence of variation of language learning strategy use across the fields of study, the evidence obtained from the register and discourse analyses of text variations produced in different disciplines and the recognition of the importance of writing in content learning and skill development in a specific discipline and the distinctive needs
of writing in the workplaces as a whole imply that students from different disciplines may tend to employ different writing strategies to produce texts demanded by their respective majors. Therefore, the main motivation for conducting this study is to provide more empirical evidence that shows variation of writing strategy use across fields of study in the EFL context.

2.2.2 Theoretical background to approaches to writing and strategies

An approach, according to Anthony’s conception as cited by Richards and Rodgers (2001), “refers to theories about the nature of language and language learning that serve as the source of practice and principles in language teaching” (p. 20). Based on this notion, approaches to writing refer to assumptions and beliefs in teaching and learning writing held by the teachers and the students that lead them to practice and implement the principles of writing.

As the history of writing research reveals there are a number of writing approaches that have been employed in the teaching and learning processes. Among these approaches, the most influential and relevant to the objectives of the present research are briefly discussed in this section.

Silva’s review (1990) of the second language writing research reveals that there are four major approaches to writing that have been prominent since 1945. These approaches are controlled composition, current traditional rhetoric, process, and English for academic purposes. Each of these will be discussed as follows.

2.2.2.1 Controlled composition approach

The primary focus of controlled composition approach is to enable learners achieve formal accuracy in writing through imitation and manipulation of recurring patterns of language from purposefully produced model texts (Pincas, as cited in Silva 1990). This approach is criticized for giving much emphasis to the formal linguistic features of writing by overlooking the aspects of purpose and audience in writing.

2.2.2.2 Current traditional rhetoric

In the mid-sixties, the controlled composition whose main concern was imitating linguistic features of model texts (vocabulary, sentence patterns) was no more considered sufficient to meet the growing demands of writing longer texts by ESL students (Silva, 1990). To fill the gap created between controlled writing and free
writing of a longer text, the current-traditional rhetoric approach to writing was called for. This approach comprises the basic principles of Young’s current traditional paradigm and Kaplan’s theory of contrastive rhetoric (1967).

According to Young (as cited in Silva, 1990, p.13) one of the prominent features of current traditional rhetoric is “the emphasis on the composed product rather than composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the classification of discourse into description, narration, exposition, and argument; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style (economy, clarity, emphasis)”. The other feature of current traditional rhetoric is deep rooted in Kaplan’s definition of rhetoric, “the method of organizing syntactic units into larger patterns” (1967, p.15).

The main concern of the current-traditional rhetoric theory is the logical arrangement of ideas in a text. As explained by Silva (1990), in learning to write, ESL writers are required to identify and internalize ways of text organization at a paragraph and essay level. Elements of paragraphs that comprise topic sentences, support sentences and concluding sentences, and methods of paragraph development that include illustration, comparison and contrast, classification, definition and so on, as noted by Silva, are the central focus in current traditional rhetoric approaches.

As pointed out by Silva (1990) both the controlled composition and the current traditional rhetoric approaches were found to be deficient, for they did not foster thought and “ the linearity and prescriptivism of current traditional rhetoric discourage creative thinking and writing” (p.15). Such criticism of both the controlled composition and the current traditional rhetoric approaches called for the process approach to appear.

2.2.2.3 The process approach

The process approach was introduced to fill the gap created by both the controlled composition and the current traditional rhetoric approaches. The basic principles of this approach, as reviewed by Silva (1990) are:

- writing is a recursive activity (Taylor, 1981);
- during writing, ESL writers employ strategies which are similar to those of English native speakers (Zamel, 1982);
• writing means expressing ideas, conveying meaning, thinking, (Raimes, as cited in Silva, 1990);
• content determines form; and
• it helps learners develop good writing habits.

When this approach is applied in the classroom context, it presupposes the collaboration of students among each other and the help from teacher so that they can develop relevant strategies required to carry out activities in different stages of writing: planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

Although this approach encourages creative thinking and collaboration, it does not take into consideration the context and the audience in writing.

2.2.2.4 English for academic purposes

Many of the proponents of English for academic purposes argue that the process approach does not help students prepare to undertake writing tasks required in both academic and professional settings. Most of the writing tasks carried out in the academic and work place require familiarization and practice of the formats and specifications. That means the linguistics features and patterns of organization of a variety of texts favored by the specific community should be practised. From the perspective of English for academic purposes, learning to write is to acquire the skills recognized and accepted by the discourse community. This is clearly evident in Silva’s statement “students writing must fall with in the range of acceptable writing behaviour dictated by the academic community” (1990, p.17).

So far the four writing approaches reviewed above are the ones discussed by Silva (1990). But currently, only three major approaches available for teaching writing for EFL are discussed by different researchers (e.g. Badger and White, 2000). These are the product, process and genre approaches. These approaches are found to be more comprehensive and relevant to the present study and will be discussed here briefly.

2.2.2.5 Product approach

Introduced in the early teaching and learning of second language writing, this approach was found to be rooted in the behaviourist theory in which learning is considered as habit formation which can be achieved through repetition and imitation. Based on this
notion, “Learning to write in a second language is seen as an exercise in habit formation” (Silva, 1990, p.13).

As stated by Badger and White (2000, p.153), “One of the most explicit description of product approaches is provided by Pincas”. Badger and White (2000) pointed out that in order to write pieces of text in the classroom using the product approach, learners are required to go through four stages: “familiarization; controlled writing; guided writing; and free writing”( p.153). In the first stage, awareness of learners towards the linguistic features of a specific text is raised. In the second and third stages, learners are exposed to the model text to understand and practice the structures of sentences, vocabulary and cohesive devices of the text so as to develop the skills required in the free writing stages.

This approach seems to incorporate the features of controlled composition as well as the current traditional rhetoric, for it is mainly concerned with grammatical accuracy and the use of appropriate organization patterns. It is still widely employed in the teaching and learning of L2 writing, though it is criticized by many. For example, Watson (1982) comments:

The classic product approach to writing involved students more or less copying or manipulating the model in various ways: turning declaratives into interrogatives, or example. As a result, not only is the language produced patently inauthentic, but the risk of boredom is great (p.9).

Other comments given include that of Badger and White (2000, p.157) “The weakness of product approaches are that process skills, such as planning a text, are given a relatively small role, and that the knowledge and skills that learners bring to the classroom are undervalued”. In addition, the approach gives more emphasis to the organization of ideas than the ideas themselves and the sequence followed in producing a parallel text do not reflect the actual process of writing. Moreover, Berline et al. (as cited in Chimbganda, 2001) strongly attacked the product approach for it gives too much emphasis on recurring patterns, for stressing accuracy at the expense of fluency and for considering “style” and “form” as the most important aspects of writing.

The product approach is mainly criticized for encouraging learners to produce a text parallel to a model text following a linear model (read-practice-write). Such an
approach not only restricts creativity, but also distracts learners from the actual paths that lead to the production of a text.

2.2.2.6 The process approach

As mentioned earlier the process approach was introduced to teaching writing around the early 1970s in response to the dominance of the product approach, which was known as current traditional rhetoric (Crowley; Tobin, as cited in Matsuda, 2003, p.67).

According to Faigley (as cited in Benesch, 1995, p.194), the process approach reflects three views: expressive, cognitive, and social. The expressive view refers to the individual writers’ freedom to express their feelings and thoughts and have their own voices in their writing. The cognitive view concentrates on what is going on in the mind during the composing process. The social view focuses on “how the individual [writer] is a constituent of a culture” (p.535).

In describing the major features of the process writing, Zamel states that writing in the process approach is a “a non linear, exploratory, and generative process whereby writers discover and reformulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning” (1983, p.165).

Similarly, Tribble wrote “…writing activities which move learners from the generation of ideas and the collection of data through to the ‘publication’ of a finished text” (1996, p.37).

In fact, the process approach to writing involves different classroom activities that take place in different stages. However, there are different outlooks about stages the learners need to go through to produce a piece of text. But Tribble (1996, p.39) identifies four stages in a typical model that includes prewriting, composing/drafting, revising, and editing. When learners perform the activities in each stage, they can acquire various strategies that can help them develop a good writing habit which is the ultimate aim of the process approach to writing.

As many advocates of the process approach believe that the approach attained the status of dominance in the teaching of writing in the early 1980s because of the following:

- unlike the product approach, it promotes thinking;
- it forces the learners “produce multiple drafts to achieve meaningful communication” (Reid, 2001, p.29);
- it encourages the learners to familiarize and develop various strategies for planning, organizing, and drafting, revising and editing writing;
- it helps the learners to get feedback from their peer and teachers before submitting their final writing;
- it fosters cooperative learning;
- it employs student-centered pedagogy;
- it enhances the understanding of the learners towards the importance of skills involved in writing (Badger and White, 2000) and
- it enables the learners to recognize their inputs in the classroom to the development of their writing ability (Badger and White, 2000).

Although the process approach has many advantages, it could not remain free from criticism. Badger and White argue that process approaches “often regard all writing as being produced by the same set of process: that they give insufficient importance to the kind of texts writers produce and why such texts are produced; and that they offer learners insufficient input, particularly in terms linguistic knowledge to write successfully” (2000, p.157). Similarly, Nunan (1991) argues that the process approaches give an emphasis to fluency at the expense of accuracy; that is, in this approach, learners are not encouraged to practice linguistic features and the use of appropriate organizational patterns they need to achieve effective communication.

Another researcher criticized the process approach for disregarding the importance of language form and structure in teaching writing for English L2 learners. But for them, “many writing conventions will remain a mystery unless teachers are able to bring these forms and patterns of language use to conscious awareness” (Reppen, 2002, p. 321).

In the process approach learners are encouraged to use their own resources, but “they are forced to draw on the discourse conventions of their own cultures and may fail to produce texts that are either contextually adequate or educationally valued” (Hyland, 2003, p.20).
The think-write-revise framework of the process approach “provides students with the ‘freedom’ to write may encourage fluency, but it does not liberate them from the constraints of grammar in constructing social meanings in public contexts” (Hyland, 2007, p. 150).

Generally, the main criticism commonly raised against the process approach is that it fails to adequately prepare the learners for the writing tasks they are required to do in academic and work places.

### 2.2.2.7 Genre approach

The genre approach was introduced in the teaching of L2 writing so as to address the inadequacies of the process approach to provide learners “explicit and systematic explanations of the ways language functions in social contexts” (Hyland, 2003, p.18).

The genre based approach is a favored methodology of teaching writing, for it has varied theoretical bases. As the review of Hyland (2003) reveals, there are three broad schools of genre theory. These are the New Rhetoric approach; the ESP approach; and the Systematic Functional Linguistics.

The New Rhetoric approach, which includes the influences of post structuralism, rhetoric and first language composition, studies genre “as the motivated, functional relationship between text type and rhetorical situation” (Coe, as cited in Hyland 2003, p.21). This approach is mainly concerned with the rhetorical contexts in which genres are used and constructed socially and makes clear the relationship between the text and the context: how one reshapes the other.

The English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach is based on Swales’ (1990, pp. 45–47) definition of genre as “a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by the members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs”. The genre is primarily identified by the communicative purpose it intends to achieve and it is this purpose that gives it shape and internal structure. In brief from the ESP perspectives “genres are seen as the purposive actions routinely used by community members to achieve a particular purpose” (Hyland, 2007, p.154).

Systematic Functional Linguistics is grounded on Hallidayan functional linguistics (Halliday) and socio-cultural theories of learning (Vygotsky) (as cited in Hyland, 2007, p.153). This approach underlines the language use in context. That is,
language differs from context to context and a variety of text types are produced with their distinct patterns of lexico-grammatical and rhetorical features to achieve the communicative needs of different social situations.

Generally, the genre approach has perhaps attained popularity in L2 writing instruction worldwide, “grounding teaching in a solid research base and drawing strength from an eclectic set of pedagogies and linguistic theories” (Hyland, 2003, p.22).

2.2.2.7.1 Benefits of the genre based approach to teaching L2 writing

Basically, the genre approach is a response to the inadequacies of the process approach to teaching writing in various aspects. One of the problems of process approach is that it failed to prepare L2 learners to meet their academic work and future demands of writing in the workplace but the genre approach equips learners with the linguistic resources they need to do specific things through writing, express themselves effectively and the recurring organization patterns in the types of texts they require to write in different contexts.

The process approach is also found to neglect the language use to achieve social purposes in particular contexts. But “genre-based writing instruction offers students an explicit understanding of how target texts are structured and why they are written in the ways they are” (Hyland, 2007, p.151) to achieve communication in particular contexts.

The process based pedagogy is also criticized for not making clear what is to be learned and how it is evaluated but as pointed out by Hyland “By making explicit what is to be learnt, providing a coherent framework for studying both language and contexts, ensuring that course objectives are derived from students’ needs, and creating the resources for students to understand and challenge valued discourses, genre approaches provide an effective writing pedagogy” (2007, P.150).

For instance, to assess writing, genre approaches base on the following principles (Hyland, as cited in Hyland, 2007, p.161):
Table 2.2: Principles of writing assessment adopted from Hyland (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>They provide explicit criteria for assessment and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>They integrate teaching and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>They are directly related to learners’ writing goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>They specify student competencies and genre features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>They ensure assessment occurs when students are best prepared for it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major benefits of the genre approach have been effectively summarized by Hyland (2004, pp.10-16). The genre approach is recommended as an effective writing pedagogy because it incorporates all these features shown in Table 2.3 below:

Table 2.3: Hyland’s summary of the benefits of the genre approach to writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Makes clear what is to be learnt to facilitate the acquisition of writing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Provides a coherent framework for focusing on both language and contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs-based</td>
<td>Ensures that course objectives and content are derived from students’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Gives teachers a central role in scaffolding students’ learning and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>Provides access to the patterns and possibilities of variation in valued texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Provides the resources for students to understand and challenge valued discourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness-raising</td>
<td>Increases teachers’ awareness of texts to confidently advise students on writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2.7 Stages of writing based on the genre approach

There are different stages of writing in which learners have to go through in order to write texts based on the genre approach, but among these, the most common are presented by Dudley-Evans. He suggested that to produce a piece of text using the genre approach, learners are required to go through three stages. First, they read and analyze a model of a particular text or genre for understanding and familiarization with the pattern of organization and linguistic features commonly found in the text similar to it. Next, they do exercises on the linguistic and organization features of the model text and finally, they write the text required (Dudley-Evans, 1997, p.154). In this case, there
is similarity between the product and genre approaches, but the main difference is that the genre approach regards the model texts as belonging to specific genres produced to achieve communicative purposes in particular contexts. That is the model texts may belong to specific types of text (letters or reports or advertisements or research articles or essays) written by writers to accomplish different purposes in different situations.

In short, the genre based approach encourages learners to produce effective texts that satisfy the readers’ expectation in terms of linguistic and organizational features. After all the texts produced are to carry social meanings and confirm to the conventions of writing valued by the readers or discourse communities.

2.2.2.7.3 Criticism against genre approach

The genre approach is found to be useful to encourage L2 learners to see that writing is mainly concerned with knowledge of language and organizational patterns geared to achieve social purposes in specific contexts. Genre based approach to writing also enables learners to practice writing effective texts in their target contexts. However, this approach is criticized for “undervalu[ing] skills needed to produce a text, and see the learners as largely passive” (Badger and White, 2000, p.157). But nowadays since students joining colleges and universities are culturally, ethnically, economically, linguistically diverse, they have different learning experiences, and they are expected to make use of these resources while carrying out group work in writing. These opportunities again enable them to develop various skills in language use and other skills required in producing texts and encourage collaborative learning.

Genre based pedagogy to teaching writing is also criticized for being prescriptive by its nature while instructing students to act in certain ways to produce texts but according to Hyland’s argument this is not prescriptive in a true sense because providing particular genres for familiarization and practicing helps students get alternatives for expressions and patterns of organization to choose from for creating meanings. “By ensuring these options are available to students, we give them the opportunity to make such choices, and for many L2 learners this awareness of regularity and structure is not only facilitating, but also reassuring” (Hyland, as cited in Hyland, 2007, p. 152).

As the above review of studies on the approaches to writing reveals, each of the three approaches to writing has its own strengths and weaknesses. This implies that
there is no single approach to be employed as an effective model for basing writing instructions. Instead, it is recommended that the best insights of product, process and genre approaches be synthesized and reformulated as an approach which is a synthesis of the three. For instance, the linguistic input which the product approach advocates, the empowerment of learners in developing skills in writing emphasized in the process approach, the purpose and the context of writing stressed in the genre approach are all essential aspects that the learners should focus on in order to develop their writing competence. Based on this notion and believing that the writing strategies are derived from the approaches of writing which learners and teachers follow, the present study examines the strategies that emanate from or associate with each approach.

2.2.3 Motivation and writing strategy use

The present study examines the relationship between learners’ motivation and their writing behaviour. To this effect, studies conducted earlier on the subject are reviewed. The review mainly focuses on the motivation models used by different researchers with particular emphasis given to the ones employed by Gardner, Dornyei and Williams Burden.

2.2.3.1 Studies on the relationship between learning strategy use and motivation

As discussed earlier, various factors have been found to affect language learning strategy choice. According to a review of Oxford (as cite in Oxford and Nyikos, 1989), these factors include sex, motivation, personality, attitude, learning style, proficiency, degree of metacognitive awareness, course status, fields of study, years of study, nationality, teaching methods and others. From this set of factors further study was conducted by Oxford and Nyikos (1989) on sex, motivation, fields of study, years of study, course status and proficiency. One of the findings of these researchers reveals that motivation “was the single most powerful influence on the choice of language learning strategies...” (p.249). That is, highly motivated students were found to use more learning strategies than less motivated ones. Again, the results of self-proficiency rating equally show the more motivated students are the more proficient they would become. In fact, here the relationship between motivation and learning achievement is indirect since motivation is the antecedent of behaviour, not achievement (Dornyei, 2001). But in general Csizer and Dornyei (2005) acknowledged that motivation plays an important role in the process of mastering L2. In their previous study, Dornyei and
Csizer underlined the importance of motivation saying “Without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals, and neither are appropriate curricula and good teaching enough to ensure student achievement” (1998, p. 203).

Researchers like Gan, Humphreys and Lyons (2004) admitted that learners’ factors such as attitude and motivation have not been studied well, particularly their combined effects on the use of strategies for language learning in EFL contexts. Such learners’ factors may play a significant role in determining the differences in language learning outcomes. In other words, among others, attitude and motivation are crucial variables that could be used to show the difference between high achievers and low achievers. The findings of these researchers indicated that “different levels of success may be explained by a complex and dynamic interplay of internal cognition and emotion, external incentives, and social context” (p.228).

Based on their findings, researchers such as Spratt, Humphreys and Chan (2002, p.245) concluded that “motivation is a key factor that influences the extent to which learners are ready to learn autonomously”. They further recommended that teachers have to motivate learners in order to help them become independent learners. To do this, the researchers suggested various options to be considered, among which training the learners in using learning strategies and providing them with other pedagogical choices about their own learning are underlined.

A study of the interrelationship of characteristics of 102 Canadian university students and their language achievement conducted by Gardner and his associates (as cited in Dornyei and Skehan, 2003) indicated that language proficiency was the result of motivation, language aptitude and language learning strategies. The other finding of these researchers also showed that the use of language learning strategies was influenced by motivational factors.

Later, Lunt (2000) studied the learning strategies of 154 adult immigrant learners of English in Australia. The results of the analysis of the qualitative data gathered from 19 subjects out of 154 subjects through classroom observation, think aloud protocols and interviews show that the choice of language learning strategies was caused by both internal factors such as intrinsic interest of activity, value perceived,
self concept, attitude... and external factors such as learning environment, significant others and interaction with significant others and the broader context.

As the above reviewed studies have demonstrated, motivation is one of the key factors that influences the use of language learning strategies. The studies also showed that motivation results from a number of influences which an individual brings to the learning situation. Based on the classification of motivation by Williams and Burden (1997), these influences are classified into two broad categories: internal and external influences. Internal influences are the ones that prevail inside the individual, such as interest or curiosity, whereas external influences come from the influence of other human beings or the wider context. These motivational factors work at different stages interactively (decision to act, effort to expend on it and persistence with the act) throughout the entire language learning process, acting as driving forces.

2.2.3.1.1 Gardner’s model

According to the literature review carried out on motivation, one of the pioneer researchers who is recurrently referred to is Robert Gardner, who described motivation as having four elements: a goal, a desire for achieving the goal, positive feelings towards the goal and an effort to be exerted to attain the goal (1985). Moreover, Gardner (1985) developed a model which has been popular among researchers who carried out studies on the impact of motivation in the EFL and ESL contexts. The model provides conceptual delineation of learners’ cultural beliefs, their attitudes towards the learning situation, their intergrativeness, and their motivation. Of these factors, motivation is the basic concept in the model. He also stated that motivation can be influenced by other factors such as intergrativeness and attitude. And the goal was seen as an impulse that generates motivation.

Gardner has paid much attention to the reasons for learning a language which he identified as orientation that comprises integrative and instrumental orientations. Integrative orientation refers to learning a language in order to be integrated into the native speakers of that language by having a positive outlook on them and adapting to their culture. Instrumental orientation refers to those external factors that motivate learners to learn a particular language (i.e., passing exams, getting promotion, opportunity to pursue further studies).
Although Gardner’s socio-educational model has been widely adopted and used in different studies conducted to determine the relationship of motivation to learning foreign and second language, it was criticized for not accommodating different components of motivation including cognitive view of motivation (Williams and Burden, 1997) and also for laying too much emphasis on the integrative motive which he found as the most significant factor of motivation based on the outcomes of his studies (1985). But the study by Ellis (as cited in Williams and Burden, 1997) concluded that factors like confidence or friendship appear to be more significant than the integrative motive. Moreover, Dornyei and Csizer stated that Gardner’s model of motivation does not provide adequate “description of classroom dimensions L2 motivation, one that could have been used to explain specific student behaviour and to help him generate practical guidelines for motivating learners” (1998, p.205).

Skehan (1991) commented that Gardner’s distinction between integrative and instrumental orientations lacked acceptance in general terms, for they did not accommodate the social factors, particularly in the case of minority indigenous and immigrant groups learning second language. Furthermore, several other researchers commented on the integrative orientation of the model highlighting its lack of universality. For instance, Noels et al. (2000) pointed out that integrative orientation has been found no more critical in language learning as it has been found to work in only specific socio-cultural context particularly in the places where English is used as a second language but not in the place where English is used as a foreign language.

Recently, Gardner’s integrative orientation has been under strong criticism (see a review by Kormos and Csizer, 2008). The major problem of this orientation is that the current function of the English language, as a lingua franca of the world community has separated it from being identified with its native speakers and their cultures. So Gardner’s integrativeness into the culture of the native speakers of English, developing a positive outlook to the native speakers is no more considered as a significant motivational factor to learn the language in foreign settings. This is because a large number of students who learn English as international language with the objective of being able to communicate and interact with people who speak English as a foreign or second language have been motivated in different ways. For instance, as suggested by Yashima (2002), it is better to consider “international posture” as a significant motivating factor that includes “interest in foreign or international affairs, willingness
to go overseas to study or work, readiness to interact with intercultural partners and a non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures” (p. 57).

In broadening the theoretical perspective of Gardner’s model of motivation, particularly to make a model incorporate different components of motivation and cognitive views of motivation, several researchers have investigated alternative ways of conceptualizing motivation (e.g., Dornyei, 1994; Oxford, 1994).

A cognitive approach to motivation stresses “ways in which individuals make sense of their learning experiences and are seen as being motivated primarily by their conscious thoughts and feelings” (Williams and Burden, 1997, p.112). The central focus of cognitive view of motivation is that the learners are seen as decision makers of their own actions. This view contrasted with behaviourists’ view that the external factors determined individual’s response to actions. While discussing the cognitive view of motivation further, Williams and Burden state that:

motivation is concerned with such issues as why people decide to act in certain ways and what factors influence the choices they make. It also involves decisions as to the amount of effort people are prepared to expend in attempting to achieve their goals (1997, p.119).

In line with the cognitive view of motivation, Deci and Ryan’s (1985) regarded motivation as intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation based on the theory of self determination framework. Intrinsic motivation refers to “motivation to engage in an activity because that activity is enjoyable and satisfying to do” (Deci and Ryan, 1985, p.39). But extrinsic motivation is described as “actions carried out to achieve some instrumental end such as earning a reward or avoiding a punishment” (p.39).

These dimensions of motivation have attracted the attention of many researchers (e.g., Brown, 1994; Dornyei, 1994; Noels, et al, 2003; Williams and Burden, 1997). In support of the distinction of the two dimensions of motivation as intrinsic and extrinsic, Brown (1994) wrote that “The intrinsic-extrinsic continuum in motivation is applicable to foreign language classrooms around the world, regardless of the cultural beliefs and attitudes of learners and teachers” (p.157). Furthermore, Noels, et al (2003) wrote about the advantage of the intrinsic-extrinsic continuum of motivation saying that “it provides psychological mechanisms-self-determination and perceived competence-that can explain and predict how orientations are related to learning outcomes” (p.63).
Empirical evidence also appears to exist in substantiating the usefulness of intrinsic motivation in predicting language learning outcomes. For example, Tachibana, Matsukawa, and Zhong (1996) learned that Japanese students’ desire to learn English was highly correlated to intrinsic motivation factors, that is, they demonstrated more determination to obtain high scores in English.

### 2.2.3.1.2 Dornyei’s model

Dornyei (1994) has developed a model of motivation that incorporates different components of motivation including cognitive aspects of motivation. His model encompasses three major dimensions that consist of a list of motivational components (see Table 2.4).

#### Table 2.4: Components of foreign language learning motivation (Dornyei, 1994, p.280)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE LEVEL</th>
<th>Integrative Motivational Subsystem</th>
<th>Instrumental Motivational Subsystem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARNER LEVEL</td>
<td>Need for Achievement</td>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language Use Anxiety</td>
<td>• Perceived L2 Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Causal Attributions</td>
<td>• Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING SITUATION LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-Specific Motivational Components</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Specific Motivational Components</td>
<td>Affiliative Drive</td>
<td>Authority Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Socialization of Motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modeling</td>
<td>• Task Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-Specific Motivational Components</td>
<td>Goal-Orientedness</td>
<td>Norm &amp; Reward System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Goal Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three levels of factors embodied in Dornyei’s model include not only orientations but also the specific situation in which the learners and their environment gets involved. These levels also incorporate different orientations and motives associated with the dimensions of second language learning. As shown in Table 2.4 above, the first level is the language level. This level comprises both integrative and instrumental motivational subsystems along with different influences on language learning, like the culture and the community and the value of the language. The next is the learner level, which encompasses those attributes of learners influencing the learning tasks. Of these learners attributes, the major ones are the need for achievement and confidence together with language use anxiety, perceived L2 competence, causal attributions, and self-efficacy. The last level is the learning situation level, which comprises aspects associated with the course, the teacher and the group dynamics. In relation to the course, aspects such as the syllabus, teaching materials, teaching strategies and learning activities are treated. Teacher-specific motivational components include the teacher’s behaviour, personality and teaching style, whereas group-specific motivational components incorporate aspects such as goal orientedness, the norm, the reward system, group cohesion and classroom goal structure (competitive, cooperative and/or individualistic).

Recently, Dornyei (2005) and Csizer and Dornyei (2005) have suggested a new model of L2 motivational self-system that attempts to address the problem of English as a result of becoming a world language. This model comprises three major constituents: Ideal L2 Self, Ought-to L2 Self, and L2 Learning Experience. Ideal L2 self refers to one’s ideal self image expression that he/she wants to become a good user of L2. Here intergrativeness carrying modern meaning is embodied in the concept of Ideal L2 self, for L2 learner wishes to be an efficient L2 speaker. The Ought-to L2 Self refers to “attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e., various duties, obligations, or responsibilities) in order to avoid possible negative outcomes” (Dornyei, 2005, p. 106). L2 Learning Experience refers to “situation specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” (Dornyei, 2005, p. 106).

In short, as pointed out by Kormos and Csizer (2008), Dornyei’s (2005) model of L2 motivational system attempts to address the problem of the absence of the native speakers of English who can be used as a benchmark. The model encourages L2
learners to think about “cosmopolitan community of international L2 speakers as a group of which they intend to become a member” (p.232).

Dornyei’s model encompasses not only integrative motives but also instrumental motives. He contended that perceived importance of learning L2 can be internalized by the learner, which is part and parcel of one’s Ideal L2 self and the extrinsic instrumental gains obtained by way of discharging one’s duty and responsibility or fear of punishment may be included in Ought to L2 Self (see the review by Kormos and Csizer, 2008).

2.2.3.1.3 Williams and Burden’s model

Drawing on a cognitive view of motivation, Williams and Burden have come up with the definition of motivation that is in line with the framework of social constructivism. It is:

• a state of cognitive and emotional arousal,
• which leads to a conscious decision to act, and
• which gives rise to a period of sustained intellectual and/or physical effort
• in order to attain a previously set goal (or goals) (1997, p.120)

The cognitive and the emotional arousal can be made by either internal or external stimulus. Internal influences are the ones that prevail inside the individual, such as interest or curiosity, whereas the external influences come from the influence of other human beings or the wider context. Once the motivation is aroused, an individual makes a deliberate choice “…to act in certain ways in order to achieve a particular goal (goals) related to the activity undertaken….Once the activity has begun, the individual needs to sustain the effort needed to achieve that goal” (Williams and Burden, 1997, p.120).

Williams and Burden’s (1997) motivational influences which are classified into two broad categories as internal and external influences are further subdivided into different factors. The internal factors include:

• **Intrinsic interest of the activity**: arousal of curiosity, optimal degree of challenge

• **Perceived value of the activity**: personal relevance, anticipated value of outcomes, intrinsic value attributed to the activity
• **Sense of agency**: locus of causality, locus of control re process and outcomes, ability to set appropriate goal

• **Mastery**: feelings of competence, awareness of developing skill and mastery in a chosen area, self-efficacy

• **Self-concept**: realistic awareness of personal strengths and weaknesses in skills required, personal definitions and judgments of success and failure, self-worth concern, learned helplessness

• **Attitudes**: to language learning in general, to the target language, to the target language community and culture

• **Other affective states**: confidence, anxiety, fear

• **Developmental age and stage**

• **Gender**

and external factors comprise:

• **Significant others**: teachers, parents, peers

• **The nature of interaction with significant others**: mediating learning experiences, the nature and amount of feedback, rewards, the nature and amount of appropriate praise, punishments and sanctions

• **Learning environment**: comfort, resources, time of day, week, year, size of class, class and school ethos

• **The broader context**: wider family networks, the local educational system, conflicting interests, cultural norms, societal expectations and attitudes (Williams and Burden, 1997, pp.138-40).

The social constructivist perspective places an emphasis on motivational factors that “include the whole culture and context and the social situation, as well as significant other people and the individual’s interactions with these people” (Williams and Burden, 1997, p.120). The point of view also acknowledges that motivational factors may not act in similar ways on all individuals, for individuals are motivated in distinct ways. That is, “what motivates one person to learn a foreign language and keeps that person going until he or she has achieved a level of proficiency with which he or she is satisfied will differ from individual to individual” (Williams and Burden, 1997, p.120).
In short, in the development of models of motivation, much progress has been made, for there has been a clear shift from the two dimension models comprising two strong and opposing components, integrative and instrumental or intrinsic and extrinsic motives to multifaceted models of motivation (e.g., Dornyei, 1994; Williams and Burden, 1997) that incorporate different components of motivation. These models provide insights into how motivation may be generated and can be influenced in different contexts. They help to develop further understanding of L2 motivation from different perspectives.