

## **Evaluation of 12 Grade Students' English Language Text Book on Process Based Writing approach and the Perception of Language Teachers: Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School in Focus**

Mulu Geta Gencha (Asso. Prof) ,

Elias Womeago (PhD in TEFL) Teferi Abebe (MA in TEFL)

*School of Language and Communication Studies, Hawassa University, Hawassa, PO Box: 05, Ethiopia.*

*School of Language and Communication Studies, Hawassa University, Hawassa, PO Box: 05, Ethiopia.*

*Corresponding Author: Mulu Geta Gencha*

---

**Abstract:** The objective of this study was to evaluate the writing tasks designed in Grade-12 English Textbook and teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks, together with implementation of the tasks in relation to process approach to teaching writing at Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School. In order to achieve the objective of the study, qualitative research method was used. The researcher employed three data collection tools namely: Task evaluation, unstructured interviews and Classroom observations. The findings from the evaluation of the writing tasks indicated that most of the writing tasks were designed in relation to the precepts of process approach of teaching writing. However, a few of them lack clarity of instructions, and they were not designed in line with the interest of the students. Moreover, the result of the teachers' response from the analysis of the interviews showed similar result to the outcome of the task evaluation. Most of the respondents agreed that nearly all of the writing tasks of grade 12 text books were built up in the way they promote communicative writing; i.e., they were designed in harmony with the process approach of teaching writing. Nevertheless, very few of them lack clarity and didn't fit the quality of process approach of teaching writing. Although most of the writing tasks were designed in relation to the precepts of process approach of teaching writing, as to the classroom observation result, they were not being implemented in line with process approach of teaching writing. Finally, on the basis of the findings, recommendations were forwarded to the concerning body to take the identified short comings in to consideration.

Key Words: Textbook Evaluation, Teachers' Perception, Qualitative Research, Writing skills Task, Process approach.

---

Date of Submission: 04-03-2019

Date of acceptance: 20-03-2019

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

#### **Background of the study**

It is evident that language plays a key role in any aspects of human communication. People communicate with each other by means of language. They share ideas using oral, written or sign language. Without language, the world would not have been for human beings what it is now. In short, language has its own significant contribution in advancing our world to its present stage.

Writing, in particular, is one of the popular ways of human communication all over the world. According to Trimmer (1995), Writing is a complex process that requires writers to explore thoughts and ideas, and make them visible and concrete. However, writing is also opportunity. It allows writers to express something about themselves, to explore and explain ideas, and to assess the claims of other people.

In the history of language teaching, there have been numerous approaches to the writing instruction. Traditionally, writing was viewed mainly as a tool for the practice and reinforcement of certain grammatical or lexical patterns; a rather one-dimensional activity in which accuracy was all important and content and self-expression were of little importance. However, with an increase in attention to students' practical needs born out of functional-notional approaches, the significance of writing certain text types as a skill was highlighted (Holmes, 2006). Among various approaches existing in the realm of writing instruction and learning, the product-based versus the process-oriented approaches are the dominant ones. In addition, genre approach to teaching writing also has a considerable role in the arena of writing instruction.

In short, product based approach sees writing tasks mainly in line with knowledge about the structure of language, and writing development as mainly the result of the imitation of input, in the form of texts provided

by the teacher. Therefore, product approach requires skills, such as planning a text, however, gives relatively smaller role to the knowledge and skills that learners bring to the writing activities.

Genre-based approach considers writing as a social and cultural practice. The purpose of this writing involves the context where the writing occurs, and the conventions of the target discourse community. In this sense, relevant genre knowledge needs to be taught explicitly in the language classroom. As to Hyland (2003), in this approach purposeful communicative activities are employed by members of a particular community. Since it focuses on target discourse community, it is not widely used in the foreign language teaching.

But in the late 1980s an approach to writing which emphasized the process rather than the product began to be introduced in to ESL classrooms. Hedge, (1988) & Rimes (1991), pointed out that there are 'parallels between a process writing pedagogy and communicative, task-based curriculum development'. Writing tasks in process approach are seen as predominantly to do with linguistic skills, such as planning and drafting, and there is much less emphasis on linguistic knowledge about grammar and text structure. There are different views on the stages that writers go through in producing a piece of writing, but a typical model identifies four stages: prewriting; composing/ drafting; revising and editing (Tribble, 1996).

Accordingly, this study evaluated whether the writing tasks of the textbook are designed in relation to process approach of writing, and the teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks. In addition, the study tried to check whether the process approach of writing was being implemented in the classroom.

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Explicit instruction on the writing process improves students' writing proficiency. For many years, different theories have offered directions on how to teach writing. As to Swales (1986), and Breen (1987), there has to be a base for both the teachers and the students to develop their English language writing ability; that base is a clear instruction of writing.

When concentrating on the product, we are only interested in the aim of task and in the end product. Those who advocate the process approach to writing, however, pay attention to the various stages that any piece of writing goes through. Therefore, process writing focuses on communicative exercises which are based on the language of argumentation, comparison and contrast, etc than on solving particular grammatical problems.

English language instruction has many important components; among these the essential constituent to EFL classroom are the textbook and some other instructional materials. In Ethiopian context, however, English language teaching is currently based heavily upon textbooks. Most teachers and students perceive the textbook as a vital instructional material for their teaching-learning purposes. Therefore, in most cases students learn what is delivered in the textbooks and the way the textbooks present lessons is one of the factors for successful learning. Thus, evaluation of the textbook was very important to know the level of its quality in relation to precepts of textbook evaluation. To make the evaluation precise and manageable, the researcher of this study focused particularly on evaluation of the writing tasks of the textbook.

The reason to focus on grade 12 writing tasks was that since this grade is considered to be a bridge between preparatory level and the higher education, students at this level are expected to have a good deal of knowledge in writing skills, because they have a lot to do in universities through writing. However, when practically seen, they were unable to reach the expected proficiency through writing that their level demands. In other words, the students at the researcher's school, lack confidence in their ability to use writing as a means of communication. The finding of this study is believed to give practical recommendations to teachers on how to support the students in improving their communication through writing.

In order to investigate the problem, this study was intended to answer the following research questions:

1. How the process approach is designed in the New Grade-12 English Textbook to teach the Writing skills?
2. What was the teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks of the textbook in relation to process approach to writing?
3. How process approach is being employed in teaching writing skills?

### **Objectives of the Study**

The general objective of this study was to evaluate the writing tasks designed in Grade-12 ETB and teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks, together with implementation of the tasks in the classroom in relation to process approach to teaching writing at Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School.

### **Nature of writing**

Nordiques (2009), indicated that students' writing in a second language faces social and cognitive challenges related to second language acquisition. Learners may continue to exhibit errors in their writing for the following social reasons: negative attitudes toward the target language, continued lack of progress in the L2, a wide social and psychological distance between them and the target culture, and a lack of integrative and instrumental motivation for learning. Most research in SL (Second language) writing focuses on the teaching of

writing rather than on the SL learners' experiences in the process of writing. Zamel (1983), for example, presumes that good writing strategies obtained from good writers should be taught to less proficient or inexperienced writers to help them understand and focus less on the requirements of the assignment. However, the use of various strategies in writing is affected by many variables such as gender, attitudes, motivation, cognitive style, self-confidence and the teacher's behavior.

### **Why do we teach/ Learn writing skills?**

Research studies indicated that writing has overriding importance for various interactions of human beings. For example, Gloria (2008) stated that she has a preconception attitude towards writing. However, in later times she feels that writing is incredibly vital to the society. If truth be told, there was a time where our ancestors were neither allowed to read nor able to write. So, she feels that she has to write because it is part of her rights and no one can take that from her. However, the reason why she was objectionable against writing was that she did not like it when teachers gave her difficult topics to students to write about. She thinks, if you are given a title to write on or given assignment it needs to be something that you would like to write about and she suggests that topics for writing should not be against the students' interest. Eventually, Gloria (2008) strongly believes that we need to teach/learn writing skills to meet the needs and interests of learners.

### **General components of writing tasks**

According to Nunan (2004), the basic components of tasks are generally divided into goals, input and procedures which are supported by roles and settings. The specific features of each of these main components are to be inspected in the design and analysis of writing tasks as well. To start with, we need to regard the goal and rationale of the task. As suggested by Nunan (2004), goals may relate to a range of general outcomes (communicative, affective or cognitive) or may directly describe teacher's or learner's behavior. Among the required qualities of goals, he underlines their clarity to the teacher and learner, task appropriateness to the proficiency level of learners and the extent to which the task encourages learners to apply classroom learning to the real world. As Robinson (2001), also pinpoint, writing tasks need to give all learners opportunity to perform to their utmost abilities.

### **Specific components of writing performance**

When there is more than a product approach to the writing instruction and learning, and students are assigned to perform a task with the presence of their teacher and peers, this process can be evaluated by means of the guidelines provided by the process writing theorists and practitioners. As Burton (2005), described that writing is a process which involves at least four distinct steps: prewriting, first drafting, revising/editing and Writing the final draft.

### **Research Design and Methodology**

The descriptive research method was used for this research. This is because evaluation of writing tasks and teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks, and their implementation need qualitative data rather than the quantitative one. The data were collected using different checklists (checklist for task evaluation, and checklist for classroom observation) and interview questions were also interpreted and the findings were summarized through narrative means. Thus, in order to achieve the intended objectives, the researcher used qualitative research method.

### **Sampling Technique**

Several qualitative researchers remark that there is no fixed way to determine the sample size of the population in qualitative study. According to Lodico (2006), in qualitative research Participants are selected through nonrandom or purposeful sampling methods based on whether the individuals have information vital to the questions being asked. Based on this principle, the sampling technique the researchers used to this study was a purposive sampling technique of teachers who have taught grade 12.

### **Participants of the study**

In Angacha secondary and preparatory school, there were twelve English language teachers in general. 10 Ten of them were male and only two of them were females. The researcher used 7 of them that mean 6 male teachers, and 1 female teacher to the study. Of these, 4 of them were used for interview, and 3 of them were used to be observed in the classroom while they were teaching writing. The reason to select only these was that: 1) these were the ones who have taught English in grade 12 for several years. 2) To avoid unnecessary repetition of data, this much number was considered to be enough as a representative sampling. The researcher used the teachers only and not the students because the researcher/HE thought that the students were less experienced to give relevant information about process-based approach of learning writing skills.

### **Instruments of data collection**

The researchers used three data collection instruments; namely: writing task evaluation, interview and classroom observations. They thought that the combination of these instruments would enable them triangulate the reliability and validity of the data collected.

### **Tasks evaluation checklist**

The English textbook of Grade 12 currently in-use was published in 2003 E.C. The textbook was written by Barbara Webb, and edited by Ethiopian scholars Asefa Kassa, Ejeta Negeri, Getahun Gebremedhin and Tesfaye Gebreyes . The textbook contains twelve units, and the current researcher evaluated the writing tasks designed in the all of the 12 units for better understanding. The evaluation focused on the writing tasks, designed in Grade 12 English textbook, in relation to the process approach to teaching writing. The analysis was made based on the criteria of textbook analysis, designed by Cunnings Worth (1995), and Nunan (2004), and adapted by the researcher in the way they could be used to evaluate writing as a process. The researchers used the following major yardsticks: capacity to solve problems, learner-centeredness, authenticity, and contextualization.

### **Interview**

The researcher used the interview to obtain information about the nature of the writing tasks designed in grade 12 ELTB, and how teachers were taking part in implementing the process of teaching writing. The interview was conducted with 4 teachers who were selected from the total number of 7 English language teachers.

### **Classroom Observation**

Classroom observations help the researcher to cross check the data obtained through interview. Three teachers were under scrutiny while they were teaching English language writing skills. Each teacher was observed 3 times in their assigned classroom separately. The researchers used a checklist which was prepared by themselves for the observation purpose, and one of them was assisted by co-observers to manage all situations took places while instruction.

### **Data Collecting Procedures**

The researchers used three steps to collect the data for this study. They began with evaluating the writing tasks designed in the textbook based on the criteria of task evaluation. This was preferred to be the first one in order to include significant questions in both interview and classroom observations. Then classroom observations and interview were administered respectively. Data from Classroom observations were collected using a checklist which was prepared by the researchers. Unstructured interview were used to collect the necessary data from 4 selected English language teachers who were teaching English in grade 12. When the interview was conducted, it was tape recorded, and written on the field-note for analysis.

## **III. DATA ANALYSIS**

The researchers used descriptive/ qualitative method of data analysis. To analyze the data collected through the task evaluation, the researchers read the writing tasks of grade 12 carefully. Then, the tasks were evaluated based on the selected items of evaluation criteria. To analyze the interview, the researcher transcribed the tape-recorded responses in to the field-note and analyzed them one by one. Lastly, classroom observations were analyzed using the following steps: First, the researcher transcribed the information observed in the classroom. After transcribing the data properly, the next step was analyzing the points used to conduct the observation one by one. Then, the data were analyzed though descriptive analysis.

## **IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The aim of this study was to evaluate the writing tasks designed in grade 12 currently in-use English textbook and teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks, and implementation of the tasks in relation to the process approach to teaching writing.

The analysis of the writing tasks was followed by the discussions of the interview and classroom observations results. The first part of the analysis emphasized on discussing the evaluation of the writing tasks, designed in Grade 12 English textbook. The analysis was made based on the criteria of textbook analysis designed by Cunnings Worth (1995), and Nunan (2004), and adapted by the researchers in the way they could be suitable to evaluate writing as a process. Then, discussion of the teachers' responses about the writing tasks

of the textbook, and classroom observation about the implementations of writing activities were the other focus areas of the analysis.

### **Analysis of the Writing Tasks of Grade 12 English Textbook**

To analyze the writing tasks, the researchers sorted out the objectives and the writing tasks designed in grade 12 English textbook as indicated in table 1.

<b>units</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Writing tasks</b>
1	-No objective was set.	Write a short paragraph about each of your five memory -Writing a formal letter
2	-Write a definition of communication. -Write an essay on the given topic.	-Write an essay on the subject of ICT in education. -Write a short report about the information in the graph
3	-Write a report about your own strengths and weakness as student.	-Think about your own study skills and fill in the survey. -Write an essay about going to university.
4	-No objective was set.	- A film review: Ask students if they are familiar to different films. -Write spontaneously, timed writing, and tips for improving writing
5	-Write a paragraph about what makes a good leader.	-Write a paragraph about what makes a good leader. -Write a report on aspects of United Nations.
6	-Write a leaflet on fair trade	-Write a leaflet about Ethiopian fair coffee trade - Write a summary of notes on globalization -Write a business letter to the managing director about fair trade
7	-Write a profile of company you would like to work in	- Write a profile of a company or an occupation you would like to work - Put different parts of formal letter in order
8	No objective was set	-Write an essay on the topic “ Do human beings behave more to be proud of than ashamed of?”
9	-Write a report	-Write a report on a situation to be changed -Write an essay in which you argue a point of view on the given topic
10	Write the story of a new item from one persons point of view -Write a report about some statistical data - Write a formal letter	-Write a description about the Haiti earthquake -Write about worldwide deaths due to earthquake, incidents of terrorism, and road traffic fatalities -Discuss what graffiti poster is and come up with definition - Write a formal letter to your local authority
11	-Write a summary of the talk -Write a dialogue	Write a dialogue between Kate and Win slate, and journalists interview -Write a review of a talk show -Join the parts of formal letter to its function
12	No objective was set	-Write a summary of information about volcanoes -Write a formal letter of complaint to the institute

### **Achievability of the objectives of the writing tasks in relation to teaching writing as a process?**

The objectives of the writing tasks were written in the beginning of each unit together with the objectives of the other skills. However, some of the objectives of the writing tasks were very short and lack clarity. For example, “write a report” unit 9, page 195, and “write a dialogue” unit 11, page 244. Apart from these, the others were designed in the way they can be achieved as a process.

### **Statement of the objectives to each of the writing tasks**

Objectives have a leading role to any activity and performance. Without objectives whatever people do has little or no importance. As it is indicated in table 1, from the twelve units of the textbook four of them had

no objectives at all, for example, units 1, 4, 8 and 12. This indicates that less concern was given to match between the writing tasks and statement of the objectives.

### **Correspondence between the stated objectives and the writing tasks of the textbook**

As it is stated in section 4.2.2 above, some of the writing tasks had no stated objectives at all. On the other hand, when carefully seen the correspondence between the stated objectives and the designed writing tasks of the textbook, there is, of course, a direct correspondence between most of them, but some lack compatibility. For example, in unit 2, page 47, the writing task designed says, "Write a short report about the information in the graph". However, the stated objectives said nothing about writing a report. In addition, in unit 6 pages 141 and 144, two different writing tasks were designed; namely, "write a summary of notes on globalization" and "write a business letter to the managing director about fair trade". Nevertheless, the designed objectives said nothing about these writing tasks. From this the researchers could understand that some of the designed writing tasks were loosely corresponded to the stated objectives. Thus, it can be stated that the inability to correspond each other doesn't encourage the teacher to teach the writing skills in a process based approach.

### **Correspondence between the aims of the writing tasks and the aim of the language teaching program**

The aim of language teaching program in communicative language teaching is promoting communication. Some of the writing tasks designed in the textbook include: Writing a formal letter, writing essays on different topics, writing reports about different issues, writing summary of notes, writing descriptions about different issues, writing a review of a talk show, and the like. When these writing tasks are carefully seen, they all have communicative nature. However, some of them were beyond the level of knowledge of most of the students. For example, "A film review", "Write a report on aspects of United Nations", "Write a description about the Haiti earthquake", and "Write about worldwide deaths due to earthquake, incidents of terrorism, and road traffic fatalities" are far from the imagination of most of the students.

As the researcher examined the nature of the writing tasks and the objective of the language curriculum, most of the aim of the writing tasks had a logical correspondence to the aim of the language teaching program which is promoting communication.

### **The contents of the writing tasks in coping with the interest of the students**

One of the basic concerns of evaluating writing tasks was to check whether their content matches to the interests of students. Interest depends on the level of familiarity someone has to something. When the writing tasks of the textbook are seen with kid gloves, most of them were not strange to the students. For example, the tasks such as "Write an essay on the subject of ICT in education", "Write a paragraph about what makes a good leader", "Write an essay about going to university.", "write a business letter to the managing director about fair trade", "Write a formal letter to your local authority", "Write a summary of information", and "Write a formal letter of complaint to the institute" are familiar topics so that they appeal to the interest of the students.

On the other hand, the writing tasks such as "write a report on aspects of United Nations.", "write a leaflet about Ethiopian fair coffee trade", "Write a description about the Haiti earthquake", and "Write about worldwide deaths due to earthquake incidents, of terrorism, and road traffic fatalities" were new topics to students so that the students may lack interest to pass through different stages of process writing. However, when generally seen, most of the writing tasks could go in harmony with the interest of the students, but some of them lack this quality.

### **Arrangement of the contents of the writing tasks**

In evaluating the holistic nature of the writing tasks, the present researchers found out that most of the writing tasks were not arranged from simple to complex or from less challenging to more challenging. For example, teaching writing should start from sentence level to paragraph level and then to essays. As table 1 above indicates, the writing tasks designed in grade 12 ETB begin with "Short paragraph writing" on page 15, and then promotes to "Formal Letter writing" on page 20. Similarly, when we promote to unit 2, we find "Essay Writing" on page 40 of the textbook. This indicates that the arrangement of the contents of the writing tasks was not in harmony with the principle of teaching from simple to complex, and may affect teaching writing as a process.

### **Clarity of instruction in promoting writing as a process**

The other focus area of evaluation of the writing tasks was clarity of instructions. As it was shown in table 1, most of the instructions were clear to understand what they mean and what to do. However, some of them lack clarity, and they were difficult to understand what they were asking the students to do. For example, in unit 8 page 192, the given instruction says:- "write an essay with this title: "Do human beings have more to

be proud of than ashamed of?”. This instruction asks a question, and the question was “yes” or “no” question which seeks only short answer, and gives no chance to the students to write an essay. Similarly, in unit 9, page 200, the given instruction says: “write a report on a situation that need to be changed”. The message of this instruction was less clear to understand so that it was difficult to the students to write a report passing through different stages of process writing.

#### **Adequacy of the writing tasks to practice writing as a process**

Compared to other skills, the writing tasks designed in the textbook were insufficient to practice writing in advance. For example, in unit 1, there were three speaking tasks, three reading tasks, two listening tasks and two writing tasks. In unit 2, there were four listening tasks, three speaking tasks, four reading tasks, and only two writing tasks. In unit 4, there were three listening tasks, four reading tasks, two speaking tasks, and two writing tasks. In unit 4, the number of speaking and writing tasks was equivalent. However, including this unit, the number of other tasks in all units exceeds the number of writing tasks. From this, the researcher deduced that equal weight was not given to writing tasks compared to other tasks, and this can also affect practicing the writing tasks widely as a process.

#### **Authenticity of the writing tasks to practice writing as a process**

Authentic materials are taken directly from first language sources and are not changed in any way before they are used in the classroom. When the writing tasks of grade 12 ETB are seen, most of them were integrated to reading tasks. Most of the reading tasks were taken from magazine articles and newspapers. For example, the reading passage in unit three pages 75 is taken from magazine article called “The Narrow path” by “Francis Selormey”. likewise, in unit 4 pages 83 and 88 there were two extracts from magazines called “ No longer at ease” and “ Devil on the cross”, and all these are followed by writing tasks. This indicates that most of the writing tasks had authentic nature and considered to foster process writing.

#### **Availability of Varieties of writing tasks which promote process writing**

The researcher used the term "variety" to mean using different types of topics in dealing with writing texts. Using variety of topics in the writing texts helps to maintain students' interest and motivation. As a result, variety leads to interest and motivation which in turn leads to success in learning and thus the whole process of language learning is enhanced. In table 1 above, all of the writing tasks of the textbook were listed out. Paragraph writing, essay writing, report writing, letter writing, and summary writing are the major focus areas of the writing tasks. The tasks mentioned above were presented frequently, and they came along with different topics in different units. Therefore, the writing tasks designed in the textbook were different to one other so that the tasks had a quality of being varied; hence, they had a power of maintaining the students' interest so that they were considered to have a quality of promoting process writing.

#### **Availability of illustrations to the writing tasks**

Some concepts may not be easily communicated and made comprehensive to the learner. In this case illustrations are essential. Illustrations include pictures, diagrams or other pictorial devices which are aimed at facilitating learning by showing rather than telling and by providing additional information. In this regard the writing tasks designed in the textbook were printed on colored papers and most of them were accompanied by different illustrations. For example, in unit 1 page 21, different boxes were presented to write each part of a formal letter within it; in unit 2, page 47, colorful graph was sketched to write a short report based on it. In unit 10, page 227 a picture was introduced to write a descriptive essay based on it. This indicates that there were adequate illustrations which can provide additional information about the topics to be written on, and hence, they are supposed to promote writing as a process.

#### **Convenience of the writing tasks to learn in pairs/groups**

In promoting learner-centered approach of teaching, designing language tasks in the way they promote collective learning is inevitable. In this regard, when the writing tasks designed in grade 12 ETB were seen, most of them were about essay writing, report writing, and letter writing. When the nature of these writing tasks were seen, they were convenient for pair/group learning because the group members can share different stages of writing between them. For example, one of the group members can write the planning stage, and the other group members can share the rest of the writing stages such as drafting, revising/ editing and final writing between them. Therefore, most of the writing tasks were convenient to learn them in pairs/groups.

#### **Convenience of the writing tasks to solve the students' personal or social problems in the real situations**

Problem solving is the one and the foremost important element of writing process. A teacher who trains his students how to write a letter, for example, should make sure that they are able to write letters to different

people or organizations. The students shouldn't only be trained to pass their exams but also to solve their personal or social problems through writing. In this regard, some of the writing tasks of grade 12 ETB were convenient to solving the students' personal or social problems. For instance, the writing tasks which focus on essay writing, report writing, and letter writing are directly related to solving the students' real life problems through writing. However, there were some of the writing activities which were not coined with solving the students' problems of the real life situation. For example, the writing topics such as "write a leaflet about Ethiopian fair coffee trade, Write about worldwide deaths due to earthquake, incidents of terrorism, and road traffic fatalities, Write a review of a talk show", and the like have less coinage with solving the students' real life problem though writing.

#### **Clarity of examples and explanations of the writing tasks in relation to process writing**

Clear examples and explanations give a safe ground for successful writing. They give direction or show the way how to write something especially in process writing. When the writing tasks designed in grade 12 ETB were seen, examples and explanations were given to most of them. For example, in unit 1 page 15, the writing task asks the students to write memories of their childhood. To explain this, the following examples were written: (for example, a time when you broke something important or expensive, how you used to spend religious holidays, the family duties you had to). Similarly, in different units, examples and explanations were given to different topics of the writing tasks. Accordingly, to the most of the writing tasks adequate examples and explanations were clearly stated so that they are considered to lay safe ground for practicing writing as a process.

#### **ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' INTERVIEWS**

The researchers used unstructured interview to the study in order to give freedom to the respondents to express their ideas freely. The interview was conducted with 4 of the selected teachers to evaluate their perceptions about the writing tasks designed in grade 12 ETB.

#### **Teachers' Responses on Appropriateness of the writing tasks to teach writing as process**

Four selected teachers were interviewed to put their opinion forward about the appropriateness of the writing tasks in relation to teaching writing as process. One of the respondents said that most of the writing tasks of grade 12 ETB were designed in line with product approach to teaching writing. He said that he had a rationale to say so. These were his actual words transcribed from a tape-recorder in to notebook:

*Even though the writing tasks have communicative nature, they lack clarity in showing the stages of process writing in which students should go through. As they have weakness in showing clear direction to learners, it is difficult to me to say that the writing tasks are designed in line with process approach.*

The rest of the three respondents, however, said that the writing tasks were designed in relation to process approach to teaching writing. Their reason to say so was, in their experience of teaching English in grade 12 using this textbook (the textbook to be evaluated), they didn't face much problem in teaching writing as a process. To this point, majority of the respondents claim that the writing tasks were designed in line with process approach to teaching writing.

#### **Teachers' Responses on Authenticity of the writing tasks in relation to process approach to teaching writing**

All of the respondents said that although there were few writing tasks which have unauthentic nature, most of them were authentic because most of them were taken from magazine articles and newspapers. They said that most of the writing tasks were integrated to reading tasks, and the language used in the reading tasks was taken directly from first language sources. As the writing tasks were designed based on the authentic reading tasks, the writing tasks were also authentic in their nature, and hence, they were suitable to practice them as a process.

#### **Teachers' Responses on their perception about their role in teaching writing tasks as a process**

In teaching writing tasks as a process, teachers' role is unquestionably significant because as its name indicates process writing needs someone to show the direction of the process how it goes through different stages and that "someone" is the teacher. Each of the respondents was asked how they perceive the teachers' role in teaching writing tasks as a process. All of the respondents said that a teacher has a leading and facilitating role in teaching writing as a process. They added, it is the teacher who shows the direction how to go through different stages of writing and follows up the activity of the students when they practice the writing process. They concluded that a teacher has irreplaceable role in teaching writing as a process.



### **Teachers' Responses on The quality of the writing tasks in encouraging communication through process writing**

Three respondents, who were of the opinion that the writing tasks were designed in relation to process approach to teaching writing. They said that any writing task which is designed in line with process approach to teaching writing can have communicative base by its nature so that the writing tasks are said to have good quality of encouraging communication through process writing. However, the fourth respondent argued that the writing tasks were designed in relation to product approach. He reasoned out that there was no clear explanation given to the students about how to go through different stages of process writing.

### **Teachers' Responses on Convenience of the writing tasks as a process for pair or group learning**

One of the respondents forwarded that the writing tasks of grade 12 ETB were not convenient to collective learning. He argued that the tasks were not designed in the way they encourage group learning. However, he had no tangible reason to say so. On the other hand, three of the respondents believe that as the writing tasks were designed in relation to process approach, they are convenient to practice them in pairs as well as in groups. They added that the writing tasks which are designed in harmony with process approach to teaching writing can be better practiced in groups than practicing them individually because the group members can share different stages of writing tasks between them, they can discuss together and write the final work. To this point, majority of the respondents agreed that the writing tasks of grade 12 ETB were designed in the way they are convenient to practice in pairs or groups.

### **Teachers' Responses on Difficulties they faced up while teaching the writing tasks as a process**

All of the respondents said that none of them were out of challenges in teaching writing as a process. All of them agreed that the first and the foremost challenge they faced up was less interest of students to practice writing as a process. They said that their students were in need of learning only the lessons which can prepare them for national exams. As to them, the other challenges were large number of the student in the classroom, shortage of time for practice, absence of authentic materials such as magazines and newspapers in the library of the school, and the like are some of difficulties that are influencing teaching writing as a process.

### **Teachers' Responses on Suitability of the Writing Tasks to Independent Learning**

One of the qualities of a good task is its feasibility to independent learning. There are times in which students learn by themselves without receiving any support from their teachers. In these times, materials prepared for independent learning are very essential. From the total number of four respondents three of them were with the opinion that the writing tasks were designed in the way they are not suitable to independent learning. They claim that as the writing tasks were designed in line with process approach, they are practiced based on the different stages of writing. As a result, they need teachers who show directions to the students how to practice each stage of process writing. They added that most of the students' textbooks which are practiced under the supervision of teachers are not as such feasible to independent learning. One respondent, on the other hand, said that the writing tasks are suitable to independent learning. He claimed that:

*The one who practices the writing activities is not the teacher but the student. Therefore, if a student receives any piece of help from anyone nearby, he/she can practice process writing without receiving a considerable help from a teacher. He added that if the student convinced him/herself to practice independently, the writing tasks are feasible for independent learning.*

Regarding to this point, majority of the respondents said that the writing tasks designed to grade 12 are not feasible for independent learning so that they are practiced under the follow up of the teachers.

### **Teachers' Responses on their encouragement while the students practice writing as a process**

The respondents were asked how they were encouraging their students as a teacher while the students were practicing writing as a process. Only one of the respondents said that he had been making his students practice writing as a process using each stage of writing. He explained that he encourages his students sometimes giving some bonus marks to each of the stages of writing they perform. The rest of the three respondents, however, said that they were not making their students practice writing as a process using each stage of writing. The respondents added that most of the students consider the practice of writing as wastage of time. This indicates that most of the teachers were not encouraging their students to practice writing as a process.

### **Teachers' Responses on Further points, designing the writing tasks as a process.**

The respondents were asked if they had further points which were not raised in the discussion and they wanted to add about the design of the writing tasks as a process.

They said that most of the topics of the writing tasks were familiar to the students so that they had no negative influence on students' practice of writing. However, some of the topics of the writing tasks such as "write a report on aspects of United Nations", "write a leaflet about Ethiopian fair coffee trade", and "Write a description about the Haiti earthquake", and the like were beyond the level of most of the students' knowledge so that they are believed to discourage them from freely practicing different stages of writing. For this reason, they said, some of the topics of the writing tasks should be revised and replaced by familiar topics which are supposed to rise up the students' interest of practicing writing as a process

## V. ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

### Introduction of the Classroom Observations

The major purpose of the observation was to check the extent to which the process approach was being implemented. One of the researchers observed three English language teachers of grade 12 while teaching writing. He observed them three times each. To each of the observations, the researcher used a checklist format to mark each of the selected activities. To make the classroom observation objective reliable, the researcher was also supported with co-observer, and there was no difference found in comparison with detail scrutiny.

**Table 2: Table which shows the observation result in the checklist format**

No	Items	T1			T2			T3		
		O1	O2	O3	O1	O2	O3	O1	O2	O
1	The teacher uses a lesson plan	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√
2	The teacher makes his/ her objectives clear before the lesson begins.	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√
3	The teacher uses brain storming activities at the beginning of each writing lesson.	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√
4	The teacher gives adequate input (short not) in the form of elicitation.	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	√
5	The teacher gives adequate examples to the students during his / her input sessions to reinforce the students' background knowledge.	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√
6	The teacher motivates students to learn writing through writing	√	√	x	√	x	x	√	√	√
7	The teacher encourages students to generate their ideas for their writing	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	√
8	The teacher gives time to write to revise, edit and final draft of their writing.	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x
9	The teacher provides meaningful contexts for meaningful writing.	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x
10	In conducting the writing lesson, the teacher encourages the students mainly to emphasize on meaning.	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	√	√
11	The teacher encourages learning in pair or group	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	The teacher encourages students to focus on real world activities (problem-solving activities)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13	The teacher attempts to make his/ her writing activities, process oriented.	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x
14	The teacher gives feedback to the students' work	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

### **Classroom Observations in Teacher 1: Observation 1**

The observed teacher entered in to the classroom and greeted the students. The teacher had a lesson plan, and he started the lesson of the day after revising the previous lesson for about three minutes. The lesson of the day was on the topic “**write a leaflet about Ethiopian fair coffee trade**” on page 132. He explained the objectives of the lesson and used brain storming activities about the lesson and gave short note as an input for what the students were going to write. He gave some examples about the topic and how to practice the writing process on the given topic. He motivated the students saying “You can only develop writing through writing.” The observed teacher gave relatively sufficient time to write, revise, edit and final draft writing. However, the period was not enough to practice different stages of writing. He provided the students with meaningful contexts to make the lesson clear, and encouraged them to focus on meaning rather than on form. The activities were given to a group of 4 students each. The given activities, however, were not problem-solving activities of the real life of the students’ because the given topic was beyond the imagination of most of the students who were doing the activities. Finally, the teacher attempted to make his writing activity ‘process oriented’; however, as the topic was new to most of the students, they were not fully interested in going through each stage of process writing. Moreover, he was not able to check and give feedback to the final written work of the students because of the large size of the classroom and shortage of time. Therefore, the observed teacher in this class was not able to use process approach of teaching writing.

### **Classroom Observation 2**

The classroom observation was held on Tuesday 11/03/2016 in the third period morning shift. This is the second observation of teacher 1 in grade 12, section C. The room was clean but not proportioned to the number of the students of the section. The total numbers of the students in the classroom were 73. From these, 42 of them were male students, and the rest of the 31 were females.

As some of the windows were broken, heavy wind was blowing directly in to the classroom and disturbing the students when they were trying to open their exercise books. In addition, electric lights were not totally working. The teacher was so punctual that he arrived at the classroom just on time. The researcher entered the classroom with the observed teacher and sat down at the back side of the classroom. As soon as the teacher entered the classroom, he cleaned the blackboard, and ordered the students to take out their exercise books.

The students were sitting being four in one desk, and the desks were arranged in four rows, and there were 5 desks in each row.

### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 1: observation 2**

The observed teacher preceded greetings to the students as he entered in to the classroom. The teacher had a lesson plan, and he revised the previous lesson for about four minutes before he started the lesson of the day. The lesson of the day was on the topic “**write a summary of notes on globalization**” on page 141. He explained the objectives of the lesson and used brain storming activities to activate the students’ background knowledge. He gave short note and example as an input for what the students were about to write. He motivated the students to make them get involved in to the writing activities, and told them that practicing writing is the only way that they can develop their writing proficiency. The observed teacher didn’t give sufficient time to draft, revise, edit and final writing. The period was completed before the students finished their practice of writing. He didn’t provide the students with meaningful contexts to make the lesson clear; however, he encouraged them to focus on meaning. The activities were given to a group of 3 students each. The given activities, however, were not problem-solving activities of the real world because writing a summary of notes on globalization is not what the students do in their real life situations. Finally, the teacher didn’t attempt to make the writing activities ‘process oriented’, but he simply asked them to write the summary notes based on the given information. Furthermore, he didn’t give feedback to the students’ work. As the teacher didn’t give sufficient time to practice writing as a process, the process approach was not utilized to these writing tasks in this section.

### **Classroom Observation 3**

The classroom observation was held on Monday, 24/02/2016 in the second period afternoon shift. This is the third observation of teacher 1 in grade 12, section E. The room was neither clean nor proportioned to the number of the students of the section. The total numbers of the students in the classroom was 72. From these, 38 of them were male students, and the rest of the 34 were females.

As most of the windows were broken, students were looking at people moving outside the classroom and being disturbed. In addition, electric lights were not totally working in the classroom so that the classroom was not bright enough. The teacher arrived at the classroom three minutes later than the right time of the class

start. The researcher entered the classroom as soon as the observed teacher had entered the classroom, and then the observer sat down at the back side of the classroom. As soon as the teacher entered the classroom, he called on one of the students and ordered him to clean the blackboard, and asked the students to take their exercise books out. Most of the students were sitting being four in one desk, and the desks were arranged in four rows, and there were 5 desks in each row.

### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 1: observation 3**

The teacher greeted the students as soon as he entered in to the classroom as usual. The teacher had a lesson plan, and he revised the previous lesson in short for about three to four minutes before he started the lesson of that day. The lesson of the day was on the topic **“write a business letter to the managing director about fair trade”** on page 145. He explained the objectives of the lesson but didn't use brain storming activities about the lesson. The short note he gave as an input for the students had no sufficient details. He didn't give any examples to the students about the topic to indicate them how to write on the given topic. Moreover, he didn't give sufficient time to draft, revise, edit and final writing as the period was completed before the students finished their writing practice. He didn't only provide the students with context to make the lesson clear but also didn't encourage them to focus on meaning. The activities were given to a group of 4 students each. The given activities were designed in line with solving the students' problems of real life situations because writing a business letter is one of the essential writing activities of real life situations. However, as the teacher didn't give them sufficient time to practice the writing as a process, he didn't attempt to make the writing activities 'process approach oriented', but he simply asked them to write a business letter to the managing director about fair trade. As the period was completed without summarizing the lesson, the teacher didn't give feedback to what the students wrote.

To summarize, the researcher observed teacher-1 in three different sections and periods, as the teacher was not able to encourage the students to focus on meaning, and he didn't give sufficient time to practice writing as a process, the teacher was not able to apply process approach of teaching writing rather he used a product approach.

### **Classroom Observations of Teacher 2: Classroom Observation 1**

The classroom observation was held on Thursday, 20/02/2016 in the fourth period morning shift. The observed teacher has B.Ed degree in English from Mekelle University in 2000 E.C. Before he graduated in degree program, he was a diploma holder for 8 years. He has six years teaching experience at Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School. Before he moved to Angacha he had been teaching English for 10 years in different woredas and schools. Totally he has 16 years experience of teaching English. The classroom observed was 12B and the total number of the students in the class was 67. Among these, 43 of them were male students, and the rest of 24 were females. Since the classroom size was not proportioned to the number of the students, the classroom was so hot that the students were not learning in a relaxed manner. The desks and the benches were fixed to each other and four students were sitting on most of them. The desks were put in four rows, and there were 5 desks in each row. The classroom was clean but very crowded. The discussions of the results were presented as follow:

### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 2: observation 1**

The observed teacher greeted the students as soon as he entered in to the classroom. The teacher had no lesson plan, and didn't revise the previous lesson before he moved to the lesson of the day. The lesson of the day was on the topic **“write a profile of a company or an occupation you would like to work”** on page 161. He didn't explain the objectives of the lesson but used some brain storming activities to activate the students' background knowledge about the lesson, and he gave short note as an input to the students to give some clue about writing the profile. He gave some examples to the students in his input session to show them direction about what they were to write. Moreover, he tried to motivate the students to actively practice in the writing activities.

However he couldn't give sufficient time to draft, revise, edit and final writing, and meaningful contexts were not provided to the students to clarify the lesson; moreover, the students were not encouraged to focus on meaning.

The activities were given to a group of 4 students each. The given activities, of course, were problem-solving activities of the real world life because writing a profile of a company or an occupation someone would like to work is what the students are required to do in their real life situations. No attempt was made by the teacher to make the writing activities 'process oriented'. Furthermore, as there was no sufficient time to practice the writing as a process, the students were not able to complete writing the profile they were asked to write, and the teacher didn't give them feedback to their work, and as a result, the process approach was not utilized to the writing tasks in this section.

### **Classroom Observation 2**

The classroom observation was held on Tuesday, 12/02/2016 in the third period morning shift. This is the second observation of teacher 2 in grade 12, section D. The room was neither clean nor proportioned to the number of the students of the section. The total number of the students in the classroom was 72. From these, 38 of them were male students, and the rest of the 34 were females.

As most of the windows were broken, students were looking at people moving outside the classroom and were not paying much attention to what the teacher was saying. In addition, electric lights were not totally working in the classroom. The teacher arrived at the classroom three minutes later than the right time of the class start. The researcher entered the classroom after the observed teacher had entered the classroom, and then the observer sat down at the back side of the classroom as usual. As soon as the teacher entered in to the classroom, he called on one of the students and ordered him to clean the blackboard, and then asked the students to take out their exercise books. Most of the students were sitting being four on one desk, and the desks were arranged in four rows, and there were 5 desks in each row

### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 2: observation 2**

The observed teacher entered in to the classroom and started the lesson of the day without greeting the students. As he had no lesson plan, he was not able to revise the previous lesson. The lesson of the day was on the topic **“put different parts of formal letter in order”** on page 166. He said nothing about the objectives of the lesson but used brain storming activities about the lesson. He didn't give any note as an input for what the students were going to write. However, he gave some examples to the students about how to put different parts of formal letter in order, but he didn't motivate the students to generate their ideas for their writing.

The observed teacher didn't give sufficient time to write, revise, edit and final draft of their writing. Moreover, he didn't provide the students with meaningful contexts to make the lesson clear, and he failed to encouraged them to focus on meaning rather he ordered them to put parts of formal letter in order.

The activities were given in groups of 4 students each. The given activities, however, were not problem-solving activities of the real world because putting parts of a letter doesn't solve any problem of the real world life.

Finally, the teacher has made no attempt to make writing activities 'process oriented'. He was not able to check the students' final work, and failed to give them feedback. Therefore, the teacher in this section didn't teach the writing tasks in relation to process approach to teaching writing.

### **Classroom Observation 3**

The classroom observation was held on Friday, 22/02/2016 in the second period morning shift. This is the third observation of teacher 2 in grade 12, section D, and this is the second time to observe this teacher in this section. The room was clean by the time of the second observation; however, it was crowded and not proportioned to the number of the students learning in the section. The total number of the students in the classroom was 72. From these, 38 of them were male students, and the rest of the 34 were females.

The teacher arrived at the classroom at the right time of the class start. The researcher entered in to the classroom as soon as the observed teacher had entered, and then the observer sat down at the back side of the classroom as usual. As soon as the teacher entered in to the classroom, he called on one of the students (a female student) and ordered her to clean the blackboard. Then, he ordered the students to take their exercise books out. Most of the students were sitting being four in one desk, and the desks were arranged in four rows, and there were 5 fixed desks in each row

### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 2: observation 3**

As the teacher entered in to the classroom and had the blackboard cleaned, he introduced the lesson of the day. However, he had no lesson plan, and didn't revise the previous lesson. The topic of the lesson was about **“writing a report on a situation to be changed”** on page 200. He didn't explain the objectives of the lesson but used some brain storming activities about the lesson. The students were not given any note about the topic they were going to write, and they were given no examples about how to write a report on a situation to be changed. Furthermore, the students were not motivated to write the report, and sufficient time was not given to them to practice the writing as a process using different stages of process writing such as drafting, revising,

editing and final writing. They were not provided with meaningful contexts to make the lesson clear, and they were also not encouraged to focus on meaning.

The activities were given in pairs and they were designed to solve the students' real life problem because 'writing a report' on different things is directly related to the students' real world life. However, the teacher made no attempt to make the writing activities 'process oriented', and the students' final work was not checked, and feedback was not given by the teacher.

To sum up, the researcher observed teacher-2 in two sections for three different periods, the observation result indicated that the teacher couldn't encourage the students to go through different stages of writing, and he was not able to provide them with meaningful contexts to make the lesson clear. Furthermore, he did not encourage them to focus on meaning. Accordingly, the approach to which the teacher was using to teach writing tasks was not process approach of teaching writing.

### **Classroom Observations of Teacher 3: Classroom Observation 1**

The classroom observation was held on Wednesday, 19/02/2016 in the third period morning shift. This is the third observed teacher, and he is MA Graduate in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) from Wolaita University in 2007EC. Before he graduated in MA program, he was B.Ed degree holder for 9 years. He has five years teaching experience at Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School. Before he moved to Angacha, he had taught for 5 years in different schools. Totally he has 11- year teaching experience of the English language. The classroom observed was 12F and the total numbers of the students in the class were 66. Among these, 42 of them were male students, and the rest of 24 were females. The desks and the benches were fixed to each other, and four students were sitting on most of the benches. The desks were put in four rows. In each row there were 5 desks. The classroom was clean but crowded because of the large size of the students. The discussions of the results were presented as follow:

#### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 3: observation 1**

As soon as the observed teacher entered in to the classroom, he greeted the class before he started the lesson of the day. He had lesson plan, and revised the previous lesson in short within four minutes. The lesson of the day was on the topic **"Write a description about the Haiti earthquake"** on page 227. He explained the objectives of the lesson and used brain storming activities to activate the students about the lesson. He gave short note to the students about how to write the description about the Haiti earthquake and gave them some examples of descriptive writing. Moreover, he motivated the students to generate ideas for their writing and encouraged them to learn writing through writing.

However, he failed to give the students sufficient time to draft, revise, edit and final writing. The students were not provided with meaningful contexts so that the lesson was not clear to them, and they were not encouraged to focus on meaning.

The activities were given in groups of 4 students each. The given topic, however, was not intended to solve the students' problems of the real world life because writing a description about the Haiti earthquake is not considered to solve any problem of the real world life of the students through writing. In addition, the 'Haiti earthquake' is not familiar to most of the students, so it was not interesting topic to most of the students.

Finally, the teacher made no attempt to make writing activities 'process oriented'. Furthermore, He didn't check the students' final work, and he also failed to give them feedback. Therefore, the way the teacher had used to teach the writing tasks was not the process approach of teaching writing.

### **Classroom Observation 2**

The classroom observation was held on Tuesday, 12/03/2016 in the first period morning shift.

This was the second observation of teacher-3 in grade 12, section F, and this was the second time to observe this teacher in the same section. The room was clean by the time of the observation; however, it was crowded and not proportioned to the number of the students learning in the section. The total numbers of the students in the classroom were 66. From these, 42 of them were male students, and the rest of the 24 were females.

The teacher arrived at the classroom three minutes later than the right time of the class start. The researcher entered in to the classroom together with the observed teacher to follow up the teacher's activity from the beginning of the lesson, and then he sat down at the back side of the classroom as usual. As soon as the teacher entered in to the classroom, he cleaned the blackboard himself, and then, he ordered the students to take out their exercise books. The discussion of result of the observation is reported as follow:

#### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 3: observation 2**

The observed teacher arrived at the classroom three minutes later than the right time of the class start, and he had no time to greet the class so that he directly rushed to the lesson of the day. Although he had a lesson plan, he didn't revise the previous lesson because he had no time to do so.

The lesson of the day was on the topic **“Write about worldwide deaths due to earthquake, incidents of terrorism, and road traffic fatalities”** on page 229. He explained the objectives of the lesson and used brain storming activities to help the students elicit what they know about the topic. He gave a short note to the students about the topic “worldwide deaths” because of the reasons mentioned above. The teacher tried to motivate the students to elicit ideas for their writing and told them that writing can only be developed through writing.

Even though, he gave them about 25 minutes to practice different stages of writing, the given time was not sufficient to practice each stage of process writing. The teacher couldn't provide the students with meaningful contexts to clarify the lesson because the given topic seems to be difficult to contextualize it; however, he encouraged them to practice the writing activities focusing on meaning rather than on form.

The activities were given in pairs but the given topic was not designed in line with solving the students' problems of the real world life because writing about worldwide deaths due to earthquake, incidents of terrorism, and road traffic fatalities is not considered to solve problems of the real world life of the students through writing.

Finally, the teacher tried to make considerable attempt to make the writing activities 'process oriented' because he gave relatively sufficient time for practice and also encouraged the students to focus on meaning. However, he didn't check the students' final work because of time and large number of the students, and furthermore, he didn't give them feedback. Although the teacher attempted to make the writing tasks process oriented, because of an inappropriate nature of the given task and the shortage of time, the writing task was not practiced in line with the process approach of teaching writing.

### **Classroom Observation 3**

The classroom observation was held on Tuesday, 26/03/2016 in the second period afternoon shift.

This was the third observation of teacher-3 in grade 12, and the observation was conducted in section G. The room was clean by the time of observation; however, it was crowded. Unlike the other sections, the number of desks in this classroom was proportioned to the number of the students learning in the section. The total numbers of the students in the classroom were 72. From these, 39 of them were male students, and the rest of the 33 were females.

The teacher arrived at the classroom two minutes earlier than the right time of the class start. The researcher entered in to the classroom immediately after the arrival of the observed teacher, and sat down at the back side of the classroom as it was the right position to observe the activities of both the teacher and the students. As soon as the teacher entered in to the classroom, he ordered one of the students who were sitting on the desk of the front row to clean the blackboard. Then, he ordered the students to take their exercise books out. All of the students were sitting being three in one desk, and the desks were arranged in four rows, and there were 6 fixed desks in each row. Although the number of the students was crowded, unlike the other sections, students in this section were relaxed because only three students were sitting on each of the desks.

### **Report of Class Room Observation of teacher 3: observation 3**

This time the observed teacher was so punctual that he arrived at the classroom three minutes earlier than the right time of the class start; as soon as he entered in to the classroom, he greeted the students before he rushed to the lesson of the day. He had a lesson plan, and he revised the previous lesson in short.

The lesson of the day was on the topic **“Write a review of a talk show”** on page 256. He explained the objectives of the lesson and used brain storming activities to help the students elicit what they knew about the topic. He gave a short note to the students about how to write a review of a talk show, and motivated them to develop writing through writing and advised them to generate ideas for their writing.

However, he didn't give them sufficient time to practice each of the stages of process writing. The teacher couldn't provide the students with meaningful contexts to clarify the lesson; similarly, he didn't encourage them to practice the writing activities focusing on meaning rather than on form.

The activities were given in groups of 4 students but the given topic was not designed in line with solving the students' real life problems of the world because writing a 'review of a talk show' needs a field of specialization on critical appraisal but it is not related to real life situation of the students. Finally, as the teacher didn't give sufficient time for practice and didn't encourage the students to focus on meaning, he failed to make the writing activities 'process oriented'. Moreover, he didn't check and give feedback to the students' final written work. As a result, the writing task was not practiced in line with the process approach of teaching writing.

To summarize the observation session of teacher-3, the researcher observed the class activities of this teacher in two sections for three different periods. As he failed to encourage the students to focus on meaning rather than on form, and he didn't give them sufficient time to practice different stages of writing, together with less interest of the students to practice writing as a process, the approach to which the teacher was using to teach writing tasks was product approach of teaching writing and not the process one.

## **VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The general objective of this study was to evaluate the writing tasks designed in Grade-12 ETB and teachers' perception about the design of the writing tasks, together with implementation of the tasks in the classroom in relation to process approach to teaching writing at Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School.

### **Conclusions**

As to the data obtained from the task evaluation checklist, most of the writing tasks have strong sides which indicate the suitability of the writing tasks to practice process approach of teaching writing; however, some of them were not designed in the way they promote writing as a process. When the objectives of the writing tasks are seen, most of them were designed in the way they can be achieved as a process, but some of them were very short and lack clarity.

As the researcher examined the correspondence between the writing tasks and the aim of the language curriculum, most of the objectives of the writing tasks have logical correspondence to the aim of the language teaching program in promoting communication.

When generally seen, most of the writing tasks were designed in line with the interest of the students, but some of them were designed with less concern to the students' interest.

The arrangement of the contents of the writing tasks were not in harmony with the principle of teaching from simple to complex or known to unknown. In addition, equal emphasis was not given to writing tasks compared to other tasks so that sufficient writing tasks were not designed to practice writing as a process.

On the other hand, most of the writing tasks have authentic nature and considered to foster process approach of writing. The writing tasks designed in the textbook were different to one other so that variety of tasks were designed, and they are considered to have positive influence of maintaining the students' interest and promoting process writing.

Adequate illustrations were built up to the writing tasks which were able to provide additional information about them. Moreover, most of the writing tasks were convenient to pair/group learning with regard to process approach of teaching writing, and they were also convenient to solving the students' problems of the real life situation though writing such as Letter Writing, Report Writing, Essay Writing, and Summary Writing.

On the basis of the results obtained from the interviews conducted with the selected English language teachers about their perception of the design of the writing tasks of grade 12 English textbook in relation to process approach to teaching writing, most of the interviewees agreed that most of the writing tasks were designed in relation to the precepts of process approach of teaching writing. However, as to the interviewees, some of them were not designed in the way they were suitable to practice different stages of process writing.

Since most of the writing tasks were taken from magazine articles and newspapers they have authentic nature. In relation to the teachers' role in teaching writing, all of the respondents said that a teacher has a leading and facilitating role in teaching writing as a process. They added that it is the teacher who is responsible to show the direction of different stages of the writing process. The majority of the respondents agreed that the writing tasks were designed in the way they promote communication so that they were design in line with process approach to teaching writing. In addition, most of the respondents agreed that the writing tasks of grade 12 ETB were designed in the way they are convenient to practice in pairs or groups.

As to the respondents, large number of the student in the classroom, shortage of time for practice, and lack of interest of the students were some of the difficulties that were influencing teaching writing as a process.

Majority of the respondents said that the writing tasks designed in grade 12ETB were not feasible for independent learning so that they need to be practiced under the guidance of teachers. This indicates that the writing tasks were designed in the way they promote writing as a process because, as to the respondents, process writing necessarily needs a teacher to show the direction of different stages of process writing.

Finally, the results obtained from the classroom observation concerning the actual practices/ implementation of the writing tasks indicated the following results.



The researcher observed three selected teachers to watch over their classroom activities while they were teaching writing lessons in different sections and periods. The observation result showed that some of the observed teachers had no lesson plan and preparation at all. Therefore, they were not ready to teach the writing tasks as a process. Most of them, however, had lesson plan and preparation but they couldn't make the lessons process oriented. Furthermore, they didn't check the students' final work, and failed to give them feedback.

As to the observation result, shortage of time to practice writing as a process, teachers' less encouragement of the students to practice different stages of process writing, teachers inability to provide with meaningful contexts to make the lesson clear, less interest of the students to practice different stages of writing which are used in process approach of writing, and large class size and lack of conducive classroom environment were some of the challenges of teaching writing as a process.

Finally, although most of the writing tasks were designed in relation to precepts of process approach of teaching writing, they were not being practiced or implemented in line with the process approach.

## VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the discussion of results obtained through data gathering tools and conclusions, the researchers forwarded the following recommendations:

- Some of the objectives of the writing tasks lack clarity, and moreover, from the total number of 12 units of grade 12 ETB, four of them had no objectives at all. As this was one of the challenges of practicing writing as a process, the textbook writers should give attention and revise the objectives to avoid this defect of the writing tasks.
- As some of the writing tasks were not designed in line with the students interest and were not designed in the way they solve the student' real life problem, due attention should be given by the textbook writers to match the writing tasks considering the interest of students.
- Some of the instructions of the writing tasks were less clear to understand so that it was difficult to the students to practice different stages of process writing. Therefore, textbook writers should also give due attention to make the instructions clearer.
- The result analysis of the interview indicated that most of the teachers were not encouraging their students to practice writing as a process. As a result, the process approach of teaching writing was not being implemented almost in all of the writing classes. This indicates that English teachers should think of the problem and take responsibility to implement writing as a process.
- As the classroom observation result indicated, most of the classrooms in the school were not balanced with the number of the students, so the school administration should think of the problem and find out a solution and take the remedial action of balancing the number of students to the size of the classrooms.
- Finally, almost all of the observed teachers failed to teach the writing tasks in relation to the precepts of process approach of teaching writing. Therefore, the concerning body should take responsibility of giving additional training to the teachers who teach English as a foreign language on how to teach writing as a process.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Al-Mashour M. (2003). Learning Strategies and Writing Processes Used by Jordanian EFL University Learners in an Argumentative Writing Task. M. A. Thesis, Unpu Irbid: Yarmouk University.
- [2]. Al-Qomoul, M. (2007), Evaluating written Tasks in EFL composition by secondary school students from the perspective of graduate native speakers of English. Journal of Education, 133(4): 497-509.
- [3]. Breen, M. P. (1987). Learner Contributions to Task Design. In C. N. Candlin & D. F. Murphy (Eds.), Language Learning Tasks (pp. 23-46). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.
- [4]. Brown, D. (2007). **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching**: 5<sup>th</sup> Edition US. Cambridge University Press.
- [5]. Bruton, A. (2005). Task-based language teaching: For the state secondary FL classroom Language Learning Journal, 3, 55-68.
- [6]. Chen, Y. (2007). Learning to learn: The impact of strategy training. ELT Journal, 61 (1), 20- Cunningsworth, A. (1995), chooses your Course book. London: Macmillan: Heinemann.
- [7]. Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. Language Learning, 51, 281-31
- [8]. Ferris J. & Hedgcock (1996), Second Language Teaching. Boston: Boston University press
- [9]. Gabriel Altos, C. (2002), EFL writing: product and process. Retrieved on 25 August. 2010 from <http://www.gabrielatos.com/Writing.pdf>> Gardner, A., & Johnson, D. (1997).

- [10]. Teaching personal experience narrative in the elementary and beyond. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona Writing Project Press.
- [11]. Gloria, M. 2008. I have a preconception attitude towards writing. Essay Forum, Undergraduate Admission Essays. Available at: undergraduate. EssayForum.com
- [12]. Harmer, J. (1991), The Practice of English Language Teaching. Essex: Longman.
- [13]. Hillock, G. 1990, Research on written Composition: New Direction for teaching.
- [14]. Holmes. R (2000), Guides for writing. Jos: Jos university press.
- [15]. Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16]. Hatch A. (2002). Doing Qualitative Research in Education: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- [17]. Jackson L. (2009), Research Methods and Statistics.A Critical Thinking Approach Jacksonville: Jacksonville University Press
- [18]. Jones, F. R. (1992). A language-teaching machine: Input, uptake and output in the communicative classroom. System, 20, 133-150.
- [19]. Kern. R. and Schultz, J. (1992). The effects of Composition instruction on intermediate level French Students' Writing Performance: Some Preliminary finding. Modern Language Journal 76,1-13.
- [20]. Lodico G. (2006), Methods IN Educational Research. From Theory to Practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass printing
- [21]. Matsuda, P. K. (2003a). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Eds.), Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [22]. Matsuda, P. K. (2003b). Process and post-process: A discursive history. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12, 65-83.
- [23]. Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. TESL-EJ, 6 (2), 1-20.
- [24]. Nordiques R. (2009). The writing attitude and your writing goals. The New York Times Company: Grammar and Composition. July, 2009.
- [25]. Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 279-295.
- [26]. Nunan, D. (1993). Task-based syllabus design: Selecting, grading and sequencing tasks. In Pica, T. (1986). An interactional approach to the teaching of writing. English Teaching Forum,24 (3),
- [27]. Paltridge, B. (2004). Approaches to teaching second language writing. 17th Educational Conference Adelaide 2004. Retrieved on 20th September 2010 from [http://www.Englishaustralia.com.au/ea\\_conference04/proceedings/pdf/Paltridge.pdf](http://www.Englishaustralia.com.au/ea_conference04/proceedings/pdf/Paltridge.pdf)
- [28]. Pincas, A. 1982a. Teaching English writing. London: Macmillan.
- [29]. Pincas, A. 1982b. Writing in English. London: Macmillan.
- [30]. Powel, BJ 2004. A composition of student's attitudes and successes in writing. The Journal of Negro Education, 53(4): 242-257.
- [31]. Richard J. (1985).The content of language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- [32]. Robinson, P., Ting, S. C-C., & Urwin, J. J. (1995). Investigating second language task complexity. RELC Journal, 22 (2), 62-79.
- [33]. Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework: Applied Linguistics, 22, 27-57.
- [34]. Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 217-233.
- [35]. Steele, V. (2004). Product and process writing. Retrieved on 5th Sept. 2010 from <http://www.englishonline.org.cn/en/teachers/workshops/teaching-writing/teaching-tips/product-process>
- [36]. Swales, J. 1990. Gener Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [37]. Tomlinson, B (2003) Materials Development in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [38]. Tribble, C. (1996). Writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [39]. Trimmer, J (1995) Writing With A Purpose. Houghton Mifflin Company Boston Toronto. Printed in the USA. ISBN: 0-395-43237-5
- [40]. Trupe, A. L. (2001). Formative assessment of student writing. Retrieved on 24th May 2009 from <http://www.bridgewater.edu/WritingCenter/Resources/sumform.htm>
- [41]. Ur, P. (2002). A Course in Language Teaching. 9th Edition. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- [42]. Walsh K. (2004), Teaching English as Foreign Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [43]. Wenden, A. (1987) Incorporating learner training in the classroom. In a Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 159-68). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- [44]. Zamel, V. (1983), The composing processes of advanced ESL students six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2): 165-187.

Mulu Geta Gencha. " Evaluation of 12 Grade Students' English Language Text Book on Process Based Writing approach and the Perception of Language Teachers: Angacha Secondary and Preparatory School in Focus." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. vol. 24 no. 03, 2019, pp. 30-47.