

In terms of how writing has been viewed within the ESL (learning English as a second language) curriculum from the 1940s until the 1990s, the history of ESL writing instruction can be seen as a succession of the product, process, and genre approaches. The product approach after the mid 1960s began to focus on the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms, in addition to maintaining its previous emphasis on paragraph models, grammar and usage rules, and vocabulary development. Since the early 1980s, the shift from finished product to process in writing instruction has provided insight into the behaviors, strategies, and difficulties of writers and has made the composing process become the central focus in both English L1 and L2 writing. However, proponents of the genre-based approach contend that the process approach overemphasizes the individual's psychological functioning and downplays the academic discourse genres that are important for learners to successfully deal with the writing tasks in school.

These pedagogical approaches, which were based on differing conceptions of writing, emphasize different aspects of ESL/EFL (learning English as a foreign language) writing, but all three are often criticized for lacking empirical support for their relative effectiveness when applied in the classroom. Supporters of these approaches appear to have used their intuitions to argue for the advantages of one over another. This might explain why Silva (1990) questions if the product and process approaches are "sufficiently grounded in appropriate and adequate theory and credible research" (p. 20). Since research on the comparison of the effectiveness of these pedagogical approaches has been scarce, there exists no consensus on important issues, preservation of legitimate insights, synthesis of a body of knowledge, or principled evaluation of approaches in the field of ESL/EFL composition. Such a situation must surely cause a great deal of confusion and insecurity among ESL/EFL writing teachers. As a result, Silva (1990), Raimes (1991), Hyland (2002, 2003a), Johns (2003), and Kroll (2003) have urged the

development of an approach to the teaching of ESL/EFL composition based on a broader, more comprehensive conception of what L2 writing involves. This bigger picture, as Johns (2003) depicts, must be “a richer and more complex approach to the writing process, one that takes the genre, the writer’s role and interests, the audience, the situation, and other factors into consideration at the beginning of—and throughout—the process” (p. 316). More important, this approach to the teaching of ESL/EFL composition should be guided by realistic theories and convincing research.

Literature Review

Writing is among the most important skills that students learning English as a second or foreign language should develop, and the ability to teach writing is central to the expertise of a well-trained language teacher. Interest in ESL/EFL writing and approaches to teaching it began in the late 1960s and early 1970s in the USA and the UK as there was a growing concern about the increasing numbers of international students coming to tertiary-level academic institutions and an increasing awareness of domestic ESL students who performed poorly in the public educational systems. For much of the 1970s and 1980s, theorizing on the nature of writing in ESL contexts followed closely on English L1 views of writing (Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Graves, 1984; North, 1987) and theories of the L1 writing process (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). In the 1990s, research in ESL/EFL writing has evolved mainly from the fields of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), contrastive rhetoric, written discourse analysis, functional language use, and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in U.S. settings. Major independent contributions from ESL/EFL settings included the attention to language in writing production, the nature of organizational structuring in writing, and the influence of cross-cultural variation on writing (Connor, 1996, 1997; Leki, 1991, 1995, 1997; Leki & Carson, 1994, 1997; Johns, 1997; Matsuda, 1998; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Silva,

1990, 1993, 1997; Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997).

While research on writing in English L1 and L2 contexts has developed remarkably over the last 20 years, the teaching of writing is only now beginning to reap the benefits of this research. The traditional *product*-oriented approach that emphasized textual features has shifted to focus on the writer and the cognitive *processes* used in the act of writing. These two approaches have dominated much of the teaching of writing for ESL/EFL students. Because process writing has little to say about the ways meanings are socially constructed, it fails to consider the forces outside the individual which help guide purposes, establish relationships, and ultimately shape writing. To address this deficit, genre pedagogies are intended to offer students a principled way to identify and focus on different types of English texts, providing a framework in which to learn features of grammar and discourse. Although these pedagogical approaches have often been pitted against one another, all three continue to exert influence on ESL/EFL writing materials and classroom practices today. The relationship among the approaches can be compared to a cycle in which a particular approach achieves dominance and then fades, but never really disappears.

The pedagogical approaches discussed represent different conceptions of the nature of writing and tend to emphasize certain elements of writing, but they are by no means mutually exclusive and teachers rarely focus exclusively on one approach. As Hyland (2003b) points out, “few teachers adopt and strictly follow just one of these approaches in their classrooms; instead, they tend to adopt an eclectic range of methods that represent several perspectives...” (p. 2). The different perspectives may serve as curriculum options, or complementary alternatives for teachers to design courses that have implications for teaching and learning. An effective methodology for ESL/EFL writing instruction should therefore integrate and extend the insights of the major

pedagogical approaches. In addition, since the existing body of empirical research on the nature of ESL/EFL writing is fairly substantial and growing rapidly, there is a need to conduct research on the relative effectiveness of different approaches when applied in the classroom (Silva, 1990; Grabe, 2001; Kroll, 2003). The present study, therefore, aims to propose an approach to EFL writing instruction that incorporates the relative merits of the product, process, and genre approaches, and investigate student attitudes toward the effectiveness of the integrated approach to EFL writing instruction.

Methodology

Participants

There were 16 students participating in this study. They were required to enroll in an English writing course at a junior composition level. This course was conducted by the researcher two hours and thirty minutes a week for two consecutive semesters, and the students would have two credits for each semester after they had met all the requirements of the course. The students were placed into the same writing class after they had taken the placement test, Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP), at the beginning of the first semester and before the study took place. Based on their scores on the test, which was a mean of 67, they were classified as low intermediate EFL learners and accordingly considered as a homogeneous group of students. All the students were female except one being male. The average age of the students was 21.7. The researcher informed the students of the present study and obtained their permission on the first day of instruction.

The Questionnaire

A questionnaire was given to the students twice a semester to monitor their changing attitudes toward the integrated approach to writing instruction. The same version of the questionnaire was used to collect data at four different times: early November 2004,

early January, late April, and mid June 2005. By doing so, the researcher hoped to see if the students judged the integrated approach differently as the writing class continued throughout the two semesters. The students spent about fifteen minutes each time completing the questionnaire in the classroom. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

The questionnaire contained 26 statements that expressed an opinion or feeling about a certain aspect of the writing class. For example, Item 3 asked the students to assess the amount of course work aimed at their progress in grammatical accuracy, and Item 14 asked the students about the relevance of feedback they got from peer review. The statements were listed in random order, and to the right of each statement was a space for the students to indicate degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, using a seven-point Likert scale (Likert, 1932). All the statements were written by the researcher.

The Course Genres

The researcher taught the course, Advanced Writing I and II, to undergraduate students during the first and second semesters of the 2004 academic year at the Department of English, National Kaohsiung First University of Science and Technology. The genres—description, narrative, explanation, exposition, and procedure—were selected by the researcher for study in the classroom. The first two genres were taught to and practiced by the students in the first semester and the last two genres in the second semester. The third genre spanned both semesters. The order of teaching the genres to the students followed the arrangement of the units in the textbook “Composition Practice, Book 4” (Blanton, 2001). For each genre, two topics were assigned for the students to write about. Besides the fifth topics being taken from the TOEFL sample writing topics, the rest of them were invented by the researcher. The genres and topics for the first semester are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 Genres and Topics for the First Semester

Time	Genre	Topic
1 st semester (Sept. 2004- Jan. 2005)	Description	(1) Describe one place you like most at the NKFUST to your friends.
		(2) Describe a place in Taiwan you would highly recommend foreign tourists to visit.
	Narrative	(3) Tell your readers about the story of one special day as it happened through time—from waking up in the early morning to find.....at the end of the day.
		(4) Tell your readers about the story in which you recall a time in your childhood when you dreamed about becoming a...
	Explanation	(5) Many students have to live with roommates while going to school or university. What are some of the important qualities of a good roommate? Use specific reasons and examples to explain why these qualities are important. or (5) Neighbors are the people who live near us. What are some of the important qualities of a good neighbor? Use specific reasons and examples to explain why these qualities are important.

The genres and topics for the second semester are listed in Table 2. The first three topics were taken from the TOEFL sample writing topics, and the last two topics were invented by the researcher.

Table 2 Genres and Topics for the Second Semester

Time	Genre	Topic
	Explanation	(6) Movies are popular all over the world. Explain why movies are so popular. Use reasons and specific examples to support your

Assessing Student Attitudes toward the Integrated Approach to EFL Writing Instruction

2nd semester (Feb. 2005- Jun. 2005)		answer.
	Exposition	(7) Some people believe that university students should be required to attend classes. Others believe that going to classes should be optional for students. Which point of view do you agree with? Use specific reasons and details to explain your answer.
		(8) Some people say that the Internet provides students with a lot of valuable information. Others think access to so much information creates problems. Which view do you agree with? Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.
	Procedure	(9) Describe and explain the procedure of preparing your favorite food, operating a machine, or accomplishing a task.
		(10) A good friend of yours is going to give an English speech in class next week. Your friend is now getting nervous. Write a letter to your friend in which you explain the basic steps of preparation for a public speech and give some tips for coping with nervousness.

Methods of Instruction

The objectives of the writing class were for the students to increase their fluency in English writing, to build their confidence in composing various types of academic essays, and to develop into independent writers by doing peer-review and self-correction. In order to achieve these goals, the researcher organized his syllabus to form a coherent progression of tasks in the writing class. He guided the students through the writing process, helped them develop strategies for exploring, planning, drafting, and revising their essays. This was achieved through setting prewriting activities to generate ideas, requiring multiple drafts, giving extensive feedback, seeking text level revisions, facilitating peer responses, and employing teacher-student conferences.

The class should have had eighteen weeks for each semester. After excluding the weeks for national holidays, final examinations, and/or the researcher's leave of absence,

the class had actually met for fifteen weeks for two hours and thirty minutes each week for two semesters. The researcher organized every three weeks as a unit of study. Every two units were built around a genre. Since there were five genres for the students to write, they were taught a genre every two units and assigned two topics to write about for each genre. Each unit consisted of reading and writing activities that needed to be done at each stage of the writing process. A sample of the three-week-long progressions in and outside the classroom is given in Table 3.

Table 3 Sample Three-Week-Long Progressions in Unit One

Unit One			
Progression	Setting	Writing Process	Reading/Writing Activities
Week 1	Classroom	Prewriting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students do sentence-combining, grammar, and/or vocabulary exercises. (50 minutes) Genre study: Description <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students explore the situations that require a particular genre, purpose, and topics. Students read texts of the genre. Students notice typical functions, features, and stages of the genre. (60 minutes) Students are assigned a topic. Students learn prewriting invention techniques for exploring the topic. Students identify the audience to whom they will write. (40 minutes)
	Home	Drafting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students write the first draft.
Week 2	Classroom	Revising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students do sentence-combining, grammar, and/or vocabulary exercises.

Assessing Student Attitudes toward
the Integrated Approach to EFL Writing Instruction

			(40 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are told to emphasize content rather than grammar when doing peer review. Students receive feedback on their writing from their peers. (50 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher helps every student refine their thesis statement, topic sentences, supporting sentences, or a conclusion. (60 minutes)
	Home	Revising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students make changes in their compositions to reflect the reactions and comments of both teacher and classmates. Students e-mail their second draft to the teacher by Sunday.
Week 3	Classroom	Editing/ Revising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students were divided into three groups last week and come for a teacher-student conference this week. The teacher already made notes of points to discuss on a draft or listed features of a student's writing that need attention. The teacher attends to global problems before working on sentence and word level problems.
	Home	Editing/ Revising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students turn in their third draft on Monday after they edit and/or revise the second draft.

The only difference in syllabus organization between Units One and Two was the arrangement of reading and writing activities in the prewriting stage, as shown in Table 4. Based on the third drafts submitted by the students, the researcher selected, edited, and/or revised four or five of them. The students were given any two samples of student writing and asked to answer the questions posed by the researcher about how these sample texts were organized and the language choices that the student writers made to achieve their purposes in particular contexts. The students would have about 60 minutes to answer the questions and turn them in to the researcher. Based on the quality of answers and the number of ideas each student had, the researcher graded the independent analysis of the sample texts.

Table 4 Reading/Writing Activities for the First Week of Unit 2

Unit Two			
Progression	Setting	Writing Process	Reading/Writing Activities
Week 1	Classroom	Prewriting	Genre study: Description

Assessing Student Attitudes toward
the Integrated Approach to EFL Writing Instruction

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students read and analyze samples of student writing. (60 minutes) • Students study the unit in the textbook that introduces the same genre they are working on. • Students do the exercises in the textbook to reinforce mechanical, grammatical, rhetorical, organizational, or cognitive points. (60 minutes) • Students are assigned a topic. • Students learn prewriting invention techniques for exploring the topic. • Students identify the audience to whom they will write. (30 minutes)
	Home	Drafting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students write the first draft.

Although each unit of work moved through the process cycle, the students' needs for explicit linguistic knowledge were acknowledged with input provided in various ways to ensure they had the resources to create the texts they were asked to write. Each unit of work would therefore incorporate opportunities for the students to develop their writing strategies together with explicit teaching of the structures and realization features of target genres. Following the guiding principle that "literacy development requires an explicit focus on the ways texts are organized and the language choices that users must make to achieve their purposes in particular contexts" (Hyland, 2003b, p. 75), the researcher invested considerable time on activities that focused on the purpose, structure, and language features of the text as well as the most effective ways of planning and drafting it, when the students were working on a genre.

To help the students gain knowledge of each genre taught in this writing course, the researcher made handouts for the students to understand that "texts are organized in terms of stages, each having a conventional purpose and contributing to the overall purposes of a text" (Hyland, 2003b, 2004; Macken-Horarik, 2002). That is to say, the researcher regarded genre knowledge as knowledge of text structure. He treated this aspect of genre knowledge to be a shared sense of the conventions of grammar,

vocabulary, content, and organization, which allowed the students to write and read texts with ease and confidence.

After the researcher guided the students to explore the situations that required a particular genre, purpose, and topic, he provided the students with one or two texts of the genre in focus. The texts were taken from the textbook, the supplementary book “Composition Practice, Book 3,” or the sample essays written by the students of the last academic year. When the students were reading the sample texts of a genre, the researcher would draw their attention to the social purpose of the text, its prototypical elements of structure, and its distinctive language features. After engaging the students to do the explicit analysis of texts, the researcher assigned a topic for them to work on their own texts. The students brought their first draft to the class the second week and learned to create a target text in collaboration with the researcher and their peers. They were guided through all steps of the planning and drafting process, developing a text together through composition heuristic tasks and teacher questions which shaped the text (e.g., Where did we go first? What did we see? Where did we go next? Then what happened?). The students continued to work on their second draft using processes such as drafting, revising, conferencing, proofreading and editing. To compare the use of the genre in focus by their classmates, the students would be given two samples of student writing to read and analyze in class before they moved on to the next writing assignment. This was done to draw on the same familiarization activities used at the early stages of working with an unfamiliar genre.

Genre-based writing instruction allowed the researcher to use genres as a focus for the students to understand the types of texts they would need in a given situation, and meanwhile to use genres as vehicles for relevant topics. Beginning with contexts, the researcher guided the students to gradually acquire an understanding of how texts and sentences were structured so that they were meaningful, clear, and accurate and a means

of discussing the relationship between the text and its context and how it changed in different situations. The syllabus aimed to move the students through various tasks related to the genre being taught and the kinds of process skills required to produce it. The method used to help the students to distinguish between different genres and to write them more effectively by a careful study of their structures is based largely on “a process of contextualizing-modeling-negotiating-constructing-connecting, which is usually presented as a teaching-learning cycle” (Feez, 1998; Rothery, 1986).

Control over grammatical features of texts is considered crucial for students at lower levels of English proficiency. Students need an understanding of how words, sentences, and larger discourse structures can shape and express the meanings they want to convey. The researcher therefore included grammar in his writing instruction. For the first and second weeks of each unit of study, the students would be given short texts and asked to do exercises for about 40 minutes as soon as they came to the class. Such exercises were chosen from (1) filling in the blanks in a text with the words listed above, (2) filling in the blanks in a text with the indefinite article *a (an)* or the definite article *the*, (3) combining short, choppy sentences to make paragraphs flow more smoothly, or (4) completing a text with the correct form of the indicated verbs. The students were also asked to do a variety of exercises available in the textbook that focused them on achieving accuracy and avoiding errors.

Data Collection and Analysis

The present study was conducted over an 8-month period of time; data collection was done from the first to second semesters of the 2004 academic year. The students were asked to fill in a questionnaire four times across the two semesters for charting their changing attitudes toward the integrated approach. The questionnaire contained 26 statements that expressed an opinion or feeling about a certain aspect of the writing class.

The students were asked to check their level of satisfaction with each statement. For

each item, the Likert scales were scored by assigning a weight to each point along the scale. The scale descending from “Very Satisfied” to “Very Dissatisfied” was assigned a score from 7 to 1 as shown below:

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Score</u>
Very Sat. (Very Satisfied)	7
Sat. (Satisfied)	6
Somewhat Sat. (Somewhat Satisfied)	5
N (Cannot Decide)	4
Somewhat Dissat. (Somewhat Dissatisfied)	3
Dissat. (Dissatisfied)	2
Very Dissat. (Very Dissatisfied)	1

The score for each item was the average of the summated ratings from all the students. Since the questionnaire was given to the students four times across the two semesters, the mean score for each item was first compared with one another each time, and then the mean scores of all the items obtained from the four questionnaires were grouped together for comparison.

Results and Discussion

Table 5 shows the mean score for each of the twenty-six items and the mean score of all the items obtained from each of the four questionnaires.

Table 5 Mean Scores for the 26 items in the Questionnaire

Item	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Mean	Item	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Mean
1	4.94	5.19	5.31	5.75	5.30	14	5.44	5.44	5.06	5.44	5.35
2	5.56	5.81	5.38	5.94	5.67	15	6.19	6.31	5.94	6.38	6.21
3	5.44	5.94	5.50	6.13	5.75	16	5.13	5.88	5.31	5.88	5.55
4	5.81	6.19	5.94	6.19	6.03	17	5.50	5.75	5.38	5.75	5.60
5	5.69	6.00	5.88	5.88	5.86	18	5.06	5.13	5.69	5.44	5.33
6	5.19	5.69	5.56	6.06	5.63	19	5.31	5.81	5.50	5.94	5.64

Assessing Student Attitudes toward
the Integrated Approach to EFL Writing Instruction

7	5. 69	6. 19	5. 69	6. 00	5.89	20	5.63	5.69	5.75	5.94	5.75
8	5. 38	6. 31	5. 50	6. 06	5.81	21	5.75	5.88	5.63	6.19	5.86
9	5. 56	6. 31	6. 19	5. 94	6.00	22	5.94	5.75	5.75	6.13	5.89
10	4. 94	6. 00	5. 56	5. 94	5.61	23	5.88	5.75	5.25	6.00	5.72
11	5. 31	5. 81	5. 75	5. 94	5.69	24	5.56	5.44	5.63	5.81	5.61
12	5. 63	5. 94	5. 81	5. 88	5.83	25	6.06	5.88	5.19	5.94	5.77
13	5. 63	5. 38	5. 63	5. 94	5.68	26	5.94	6.06	5.44	6.13	5.89
						Mean	5.54	5.83	5.59	5.95	5.73

As can be seen in the Table, the mean scores of all the items obtained from the four questionnaires are all above 5.50, and the average of the mean scores for the twenty-six items obtained from the four questionnaires is 5.73. These results suggest that the students, overall, were satisfied with the application of the integrated approach to EFL writing instruction in the classroom. Moreover, the mean scores of all the items obtained from the second and fourth questionnaires (i.e., Q2 and Q4) are higher than those obtained from the first and third questionnaires (i.e., Q1 and Q3). This suggests that the students did judge the integrated approach differently as the writing class continued throughout the two semesters, and that, more important, the researcher did make efforts to improve the quality of his teaching and closely monitor the progress made by the students.

There are three items that receive a mean score below 5.50, that is, Items 1, 14, and 18. First, the students were not quite satisfied with the amount of course work aimed at word choice and usage. This finding suggests that writing teachers need to seek a solution to the problem with a small vocabulary and limited knowledge of word usage in English for students whose proficiency levels of written English are relatively low. Besides, this finding suggests that an emphasis on language structure as a basis for writing

teaching is indispensable to increasing the confidence of novice writers. Second, the students were not quite satisfied with the relevance of feedback they got from peer review. The researcher found that the students did make some use of peers' comments in their revisions. However, he occasionally received complaints from some of the students about the quality of their peers' suggestions. It appeared that the students did not trust peer feedback but generally preferred teacher feedback. This finding suggests that writing teachers need to understand the research findings regarding the potential pros and cons of peer review. Third, the students were not quite satisfied with the amount of course work aimed at guiding them to understand the social purpose of a genre. This finding suggests that writing teachers should develop teaching strategies to highlight the notion that the writer is seen having certain goals and intentions, certain relationships to his or her readers, and certain information to convey, and the forms of a text are resources used to accomplish these.

In contrast, there are three items that receive a mean score above 6, that is, Items 4, 9, and 15. First, the students were satisfied with the amount of course work aimed at such structural units as Introduction-Body-Conclusion. This finding suggests that the styles of thinking and ordering that dominate U.S. academic discourse can be taught to and learned by EFL students. Second, the students were satisfied with the amount of course work aimed at helping them generate ideas about content and structure. Third, the students were satisfied with the effectiveness of feedback they got from teacher-student conferences. These two findings suggest that writing teachers need to support students by offering strategies which will assist a memory search for relevant information. It appears that brainstorming strategies where the students are prompted to think on the topic, in order to produce lists of keywords that can then act as a prompt to the memory, rather than writing whole sentences, proved to be the most valuable. Discussion is also useful, as is conferencing, in order to further explore the student's thought process, to aid

information retrieval, and to extend his or her developing ideas.

Conclusion

The integrated approach to EFL writing teaching proposed in this study aims to take the relative merits of the existing approaches and use them to more fully understand writing and learning to write. This synthesis of product, process, and genre orientations allows teachers to focus on increasing students' experiences with texts and reader expectations, as well as providing them with an understanding of writing processes, language forms, and genres. Results obtained from the satisfaction questionnaire indicated that the students were satisfied with the application of the integrated approach to writing instruction in the classroom, and also confirmed the viability of integrating the relative merits of the product, process, and genre approaches in the teaching of writing in an EFL classroom.

References

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Blanton, L. L. (2001). *Composition practice: A text for English language learners, Book 3* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA.: Heinle.
- Blanton, L. L. (2001). *Composition practice: A text for English language learners, Book 4* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA.: Heinle.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric*. New York: CUP.
- Connor, U. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric: Implications for teachers of writing in multicultural classrooms. In C. Severino, J. Guerra, & J. Butler (Eds.), *Writing in multicultural settings* (pp. 198-208). New York: MLA.
- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. Sydney: McQuarie University/AMES.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 31-50). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Grabe, W. (2001). Reading-writing relations: Theoretical perspectives and institutional practices. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading and writing connections* (pp. 15-47). Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press.
- Graves, D. (1984). *A researcher learns to write*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hyland, K. (2003a). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 17-29.
- Hyland, K. (2003b). *Second language writing*. New York: CUP.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press.
- Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role, and context*. New York: CUP.
- Johns, A. M. (2003). Genre and ESL/EFL composition instruction. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 195-217). New York: CPU.
- Kroll, B. (2003). Teaching the next generation of second language writers. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 1-10). New York: CPU.
- Leki, I. (1991). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25,

123-143.

- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 235-260.
- Leki, I. (1997). Cross-talk: ESL issues and contrastive rhetoric. In C. Severino, J. Guerra, & J. Butler (Eds.), *Writing in multicultural settings* (pp. 234-244). New York: MLA.
- Leki, I. & Carson, J. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 81-101.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 39-69.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 55.
- Macken-Horarik, M. (2002). "Something to shoot for": A systemic functional approach to teaching genre in secondary school science. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 17-42). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1998). Situating ESL writing in a cross-disciplinary context. *Written Communication*, 15, 99-121.
- North, S. (1987). *The making of knowledge in composition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Raines, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 407-430.
- Rothery, J. (1996). Making changes: Developing an educational linguistics. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 86-123). London: Longman.
- Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables in EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46, 137-174.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll. (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). New York: CUP.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 657-677.
- Silva, T. (1997). Differences in ESL and native-English-speaker writing: The research and its implications. In C. Severino, J. Guerra, & J. Butler (Eds.), *Writing in multicultural settings* (pp. 209-219). New York: MLA.
- Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies. *Written Communication*, 14, 398-428.

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of the writing class?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of the writing class.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of the writing class.

Somewhat Sat. means I am somewhat satisfied with this aspect of the writing class.

N means I cannot decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of the writing class.

Somewhat Dissat. means I am somewhat dissatisfied with this aspect of the writing class.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of the writing class.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of the writing class.

In the writing class, this is how I feel about...		Somewhat Dissat.	Dissat.	Somewhat Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1	The amount of course work aimed at word choice and usage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	The amount of course work aimed at sentence construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	The amount of course work aimed at grammatical accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	The amount of course work aimed at such structural units as Introduction-Body-Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	The amount of work aimed at the creation of a thesis statement, topic sentences, and concluding sentences	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	The amount of course work aimed at the creation of supporting sentences and transitions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	The effectiveness of helping me write grammatically correct sentences by emphasizing language structures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	The effectiveness of helping me develop paragraphs through the creation of a thesis statement, topic sentences, supporting sentences, and transitions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	The amount of course work aimed at helping me generate ideas about content and structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	The amount of course work aimed at helping me plan and organize ideas into an essay	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	The amount of course work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Assessing Student Attitudes toward
the Integrated Approach to EFL Writing Instruction

	aimed at helping me draft an essay	
12	The amount of course work aimed at helping me edit and revise an essay	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
13	The effectiveness of multiple drafts for each essay in helping me write well	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
14	The relevance of feedback I get from peer review	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
15	The effectiveness of feedback I get from teacher-student conferences	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
16	The effectiveness of learning to write through an emphasis on the writing process	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
17	The amount of course work aimed at analyzing and discussing genre structures	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
18	The amount of course work aimed at guiding me to understand the social purpose of a genre	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
19	The amount of course work aimed at guiding me to understand the language features of a genre	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
20	The amount of course work aimed at helping me recognize the relationship between I as a writer and the intended audience	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
21	The number of text samples provided for me to understand a genre	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
22	The effectiveness of making genre structures clear for me to follow	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
23	The effectiveness of making the language features of a genre clear for me to learn	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
24	The effectiveness of guiding me to write for audience and purpose	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
25	The effort I have made to improve my writing skills	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
26	The progress I have made in improving my writing skills	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>