

A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Report Writing to Arab EFL Computer Science Students

Hussein Taha Assaggaf¹

¹ Faculty of Arts & Humanities, Al-Ahgaff University. Republic of Yemen & Department of English Language, College of Sciences & Arts- Qilwah, AlBaha University, AlBaha, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Hussein Taha Assaggaf, Department of English Language, College of Sciences & Arts- Qilwah, AlBaha University, AlBaha, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. E-mail: saggaf11@yahoo.com

Received: September 1, 2016 Accepted: September 29, 2016 Online Published: November 23, 2016

doi:10.5539/ijel.v6n6p8

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n6p8>

Abstract

In the teaching and learning of EFL writing, the Process Genre Approach (PGA), an integration of the process approach and the genre approach, has recently received much attention worldwide. This approach, however, has not been given enough focus in the Arab EFL context. The purpose of this paper is twofold: to report an implementation of a process genre approach in teaching a report writing course; and to explore views of the Arab EFL students attending that course. The study employs two instruments for data collection: observation, for describing the implementation of the PGA; and a questionnaire specifically designed for eliciting students' views. Participants are 17 students who attended a report writing course in a computer science department at a university in Yemen. A description of the implementation of the approach is presented in five main areas: preparation of form; preparation of genre; planning, drafting and revising; feedback; and teacher roles and scaffolding. The findings revealed positive views of computer science EFL students on using the process genre approach in teaching report writing. The study concluded with relevant implications and recommendations for Arab EFL writing teaching and research.

Keywords: Arab EFL learners, EFL writing, L2 writing, process genre approach

1. Introduction

In the teaching of writing in EFL settings, three major traditions are overwhelmingly recognised: the product-based approach, process-based approach and genre based approach (Raimes, 1991; Silva, 1990; Hyland, 2002; Badger & White, 2000). These approaches, however, have been in practice for years and have had both advocators and critics till the current time. The product-based approach on one side has been admired for the emphasis it places on accessing learners to model texts. It is also liked as it enhances the writing proficiency of learners (Badger & White, 2000). This approach, on the other hand, received much criticism as it devalues the linguistic and personal potential of learners (Prodromou, 1995).

In the mid- 1970s the process approach began to replace the product approach. In the process-based approach there is less weight on linguistic knowledge such as grammar; and writing is seen as predominantly to do with linguistic skills such as planning and drafting (Badger & White, 2000, p. 154). Its major focus is on how a text is written rather than its final product. This approach has recently come under serious scrutiny because of its monolithic view of writing (Badger & White, 2000). It has also been attacked as it tries to prepare learners as authors while they are not yet ready to be ESL writers (Johns, 1995).

The genre approach became popular in the 1980s. This approach places emphasis on the linguistic knowledge of the learners, just as the product approach does. In addition to that, it gives more attention to the social context in which the text is produced (Badger & White, 2000). In teaching writing using this approach, learners should be offered explicit and systematic explanations of how language functions in social context (Hyland, 2003; cited in Nordin & Mohammad, 2006). This approach, too, was also subject to criticism especially for not providing enough help for the learners, as it makes them more dependent on their teachers (Caudery, 1998; cited in Nordin & Mohammad, 2006).

As has been seen, all the language approaches above have received criticism. As a result, a recent development has been an integration of the process approach and the genre approach, which resulted in the Process Genre

Approach (PGA) (Flowerdew, 1993; Badger & White, 2000). This approach has impressively been admired and discussed in the literature of second language writing (e.g., Badger & White, 2000; Yan, 2005; Kim & Kim, 2005; Nordin & Mohammad, 2006; Frith, 2006; Goa, 2007; Chow, 2007; Hasan, 2011).

Even though this approach has been studied in many EFL contexts (e.g., Babalola, 2012; Gupitasari, 2013; Pujianto, Emilia, & Ihrom, 2014; Tuyen, 2016; Ghufron, 2016; Saputra & Marzulina, 2016), to the best of the researcher's knowledge no records have been found for studies in the Yemeni or any other Arab EFL context. This research paper, therefore, attempts to study the use of the PGA in teaching report writing for Yemeni EFL students in a computer science department. In particular, it aims to report an implementation of the process genre approach in teaching report writing at an undergraduate computer science program in a local university in Yemen. It also aims to investigate the views of the student participants on applying this approach in the teaching of writing. The study is intended to answer the following research questions:

- 1) How was the process genre approach implemented in teaching report writing for computer science EFL students?
- 2) What are the views of computer science EFL students in teaching report writing using the process genre approach?

The importance of this study springs out of the fact that it combines both the implementation of the approach along with the views of the students in the use of that particular approach. It is envisioned to give some insight to Arab EFL writing instructors (particularly in Yemen) on using the PGA in teaching writing. Course designers and administrators might also benefit from the findings of the study as it attempts to attract their attention to a recent approach in the teaching of writing. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this line of research is the first to be undertaken in a Yemeni tertiary level context.

2. Literature Review

This section intends to review both the basic theoretical premises of Process Genre Approach (PGA) as well as the most relevant studies.

2.1 Process Genre Approach

The process genre approach (PGA) has been set to employ the strengths of both the process approach and the genre approach. In particular, it has adapted writing processes such as planning, drafting and publishing, being the major features of the process approach; and language and context knowledge, being the major features in the genre approach. According to Badger & White (2000), the PGA involves creating a situation and providing sufficient support for the learners to comprehend its purpose and other social context aspects. The learners are then provided with sample texts and are required to consider the genre's real situations, purposes and audiences. The learners are then requested to practise language use on that specific genre by going through different processes of pre-writing, drafting and editing.

Yan (2005) noted that PGA is an effective tool to teach writing to EFL learners by comprising content, organization, revising and thinking. As confirmed by Raimes (1983, p. 266), the writing course should always try to provide students with assignments that can "unite form and content, ideas and organization, syntax and meaning, writing and revising, and above all, writing and thinking". Yan (2005), furthermore, provided six steps for this approach namely: preparation, modelling and reinforcing, planning, joint constructing, independent constructing and revising. Yan also emphasised the role of the teacher as a consultant and assistant to students, particularly when students do the written tasks during class time. Teachers should also take the roles of guides and facilitators and should "work closely with students to encourage them, offering them helpful feedback and suggestions" (Yan, 2005, p. 20).

Kim & Kim (2005) proposed four principles to the teaching of writing using PGA in EFL contexts. The first principle is balancing form and function by integrating the formal aspects of writing with the writing process. This entails that language learners should understand that grammar and linguistic form aid "in clear understanding of meaning and is always related to its function in the discourse" (Kim & Kim, 2005, p. 79). In this regard, Kim & Kim emphasise that the form should be grounded on an analysis of the communicative needs, rather than from an imposed syllabus (2005).

The second principle suggested by Kim & Kim (2005) is scaffolding. This is defined as a special kind of assistance that helps learners to move toward new skills, concepts or levels of understanding (Gibbons, 2002; cited in Kim & Kim, 2005). This principle highlights the importance of instruction during the beginning stage as the learner "assimilates the task demands and procedures for constituting the genre effectively" (Kim & Kim, 2005, p. 80). The role of instructor, therefore, is vital to ensure that the learners are able to reproduce the

language needed for the particular genre. The scaffolding method will help qualify learners with the knowledge and skills to produce the required text type with confidence in a creative way.

The third and fourth principles suggested by Kim & Kim (2005) are extending the curriculum, and feedback and assessment. According to Kim & Kim, learners should experience diverse types of texts in order to be able to write a particular genre. The writing course should be integrated with various resources such as extensive reading, searching the Internet, and watching movies or documentaries. Besides, the writing instructor should employ different types of feedback. Written formal feedback is important, but other forms of feedback such as peer feedback and teacher-student conferencing are also helpful in teaching writing using a process genre approach. Kim & Kim (2005) noted that teacher-student conferencing provides opportunities for teachers and students to negotiate meaning as students can be active by asking questions, clarify meaning and discuss their work vigorously (Kim & Kim, 2005).

In the Arab Yemeni EFL context, Assaggaf (2010) studied the needs of computer science students in the teaching and learning of report writing based on Badger & White (2000) model. He, consequently, proposed a model of four main components. These include reviewing basics of grammar and language, situation and purpose of learning, readers and audiences (tenor), writing process steps (planning, drafting and revising), and feedback.

For implementing the PGA in the present study, the researcher has formulated a framework grounded on the theories discussed above. This is divided into five components: 1) preparation of form; 2) preparation of genre; 3) planning, drafting and revising; 4) feedback; and 5) teacher role and scaffolding. These are explained below.

1) Preparation of form: the low writing proficiency of Arab Yemeni EFL learners (Abbad, 1988; Assaggaf, Stapa, Mustafa, 2012) entails assisting students with linguistic aspects when they learn to write. This involves revising basic grammatical and writing aspects such as tenses, punctuation, sentence structure, and paragraph structure.

2) preparation of genre: this includes familiarising students with the specific genre required in the particular context by providing models, and explaining and illustrating the purpose and situation.

3) planning, drafting and revising: these processes of writing have to be introduced and thoroughly practiced all through the writing course in a recursive way.

4) Feedback: the teaching of writing includes three types of feedback: written formal feedback, peer feedback and teacher-student conferencing.

5) Teacher roles and scaffolding: instead of only lecturing, the instructor has to adopt different roles. According to Harmer (2001), teachers can adopt other roles such as facilitators, controllers, organizers and guides. Learners need to be assisted in their process of writing different tasks and assignments including writing the envisioned genre.

2.2 Previous Studies

Since the beginning of the twenty first century, teaching writing using PGA in EFL contexts has received much attention (e.g., Nordin & Mohammad, 2006; Frith, 2006; Goa, 2007; and Hasan, 2011). These works have tackled a number of conceptual issues in relation to the PGA. There are also some works in the literature that deal with the implementation of the PGA and its effect on the teaching and learning of writing in different EFL contexts. These studies are reviewed below.

In an attempt to find out whether the implementation of process genre approach can improve students' abilities of writing business letters, Gupitasari (2013) conducted a study at a vocational school in Indonesia. The study also aimed to obtain students' responses with regard to PGA. The study used a classroom action research design employing three instruments: observation, a test and a questionnaire. The findings showed a positive attitude of the participants towards the use of this approach in teaching business letters. It also uncovered improvements in students' writing abilities.

A similar study was undertaken in an Indonesian high school context. Using a descriptive case study design, Pujianto et al. (2014) explored whether a process genre approach can develop senior students' writing skills of report writing. Analysing students' written texts and data from the teaching process, it has been found that the process genre approach helped students develop writing skills of report text. Specifically, the students improved their skills on the genre knowledge, writing process, and feedback (teacher and peer). This was obtained from analysing the teaching process, the schematic structures and the linguistic features.

Babalola (2012) investigated the effect of the Process Genre Approach on the written English performance of computer science students at the Federal Polytechnic in Nigeria. The study adopted a quasi-experimental pre-test, post-test and control group design with the use of Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for data analysis. The

findings uncovered a significant effect of the Process-Genre based Approach on the performance in written English of computer science students involved in the treatment.

Saito (2010) investigated the argumentative essays by third year English majors at a university in Thailand. The study used a t-test to analyze data from student scores and qualitative analysis for content of first and second drafts of essays. The findings revealed improvements in the quality of student writing using PGA.

Tuyen, Osman, Dan, & Ahmad (2016) aimed at determining the core components of Research Paper Writing (RPW) program for EFL/ ESL students using Process Genre Approach. Employing Delphi Technique, data from interviews with experts from a university in Vietnam and another one from Malaysia were analyzed. The study concluded with a list of core components of RPW for EFL/ESL undergraduate students.

All in all, the studies above have evidently shown that using the PGA has improved students' writing abilities. None of these studies, however, has been conducted in relation to Arab EFL learners. The present study, therefore, aimed to fill this gap. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this is the first study to be undertaken in relation to the PGA in the tertiary level in Yemen.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants were 17 male students attending a Technical Report Writing course in a Computer Science Department at a university in Yemen. These were the only students who attended the course during the first semester of the academic year 2012/2013. The Technical Report Writing course is the last in a series of English language courses offered in this academic program. They start with two proficiency courses in the first and second semesters, then two English for computer science courses offered in the third and fourth semesters. The Technical Report Writing is offered in the fifth semester, after passing the previous four courses. This course is intended to qualify learners to write project reports (PRs), which are graduation requirement projects needed in the eighth (final) semester of the computer science program. The course is offered in 15 weeks, two times a week, and each class is 75 minutes.

3.2 Data Collection & Analysis

This study employed two techniques: observation, to describe the PGA implementation; and closed-ended questionnaire to elicit students' views. To answer the first research question, a descriptive research designed embracing single-case study characteristics (Creswell, 2014) was employed. For this purpose the researcher acted as both a course instructor and an observer, applying a participant observation role. As stated by Bernard (2006, p. 260), participant observers are "insiders who observe and record some aspects of life around them". Creswell (2014) also noted that the observer as participant allows researchers to record data as they occur. The participant observer role was selected so as to avoid suspect of self-reported data, to guide the identification of the data to be more focused, and to lessen reporting biases (Bernard, 2006). Data were recorded based on both the course instruction and the course description and outline.

To find out answers for the second research question regarding students' views on the implementation of the PGA, a specially designed questionnaire was used. Employing a 5-point Likert-scale (strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, not sure = 3, agree = 4, strongly agree = 5), the questionnaire was constructed in light of the components and aspects in which the PGA was implemented. In particular, it covered five areas: writing and language abilities; report writing abilities; situation and purpose; audiences and feedback; and planning, drafting and revising. The questionnaire was administered in week 15, before the end of the semester. This is to ensure that the students have completed all lessons and written all tasks assigned to them. All the 17 students participated in responding to the questionnaire, and all their responses were received back and were later calculated in the analysis.

For validity purposes, the questionnaire was piloted to a number of students after it was first designed and its items were later amended accordingly. For analysing data from the questionnaire, statistical analysis of percentages and mean scores was obtained. The higher the percentage and mean score, the closer the response to the statement will be.

3.3 PGA Implementation Procedure

The PGA is implemented throughout the fifteen-week semester. Before the beginning of the course, its contents were revised and amended based on the components of the PGA. Before any amendments were undertaken, the course instructor approached the administration at the Faculty of Computer Science & Engineering at Al-Ahgaff University and obtained their approval. The modification was based on the foundations discussed in the literature

review above. These modifications covered topics on language and basics of writing. These are: sentence structure, subject-verb agreement, paragraph structure, conjunctions, word selection, style, and unity and cohesion in writing. In addition, a unit about the writing process including brainstorming strategies, drafting and editing was added. The preparation also included using portfolio technique where a portfolio is requirement to be maintained by the students throughout the semester to preserve all written texts and other documents. The students were advised to bring this portfolio with them in all classes. It was also allocated 10 marks of total grades of the course (see Assaggaf & Bamahra, 2016, on how portfolio was used in this course). When the course started, the components of PGA have been introduced and thoroughly enhanced in teaching the course. This involved linking the course to project reports, giving model reports, using different forms of feedback, assigning various roles to the instructor and scaffolding. The students were also encouraged to approach the instructor whenever they needed any help and that was reinforced in the classroom in various usual sessions including feedback sessions, as will be explained in the section below.

4. Findings and Discussions

4.1 PGA Implementation

This section is intended to answer the first research question concerning the way the process genre approach was implemented in the report writing course. As the implementation of the PGA was based on five grounds (as explained in 2.1 above), the discussion here is summarised in these five main sections: preparation of form; preparation of genre; planning, drafting and revising; purpose and situation; feedback; and teacher roles and scaffolding.

4.1.1 Preparation of Form

The first component of the course was intended to revise students' basics of grammar and writing skills. For this purpose, weeks 3-4 were dedicated to revising the following topics: sentences structure (including sentences in English vs. sentences in Arabic), subject verb agreement, and paragraph structure. Within two weeks these issues were introduced and thoroughly discussed. Along with introducing and revising these topics, the students were requested to write texts as assignments for practice. Before the end of each of the four classes, students were required to write on topics given by the instructor. The students were then asked to revise them among themselves and then with the instructor before they were placed in the portfolio.

Linguistic aspects were also maintained later after introducing the main topics of report writing. In weeks 11-12 some classes were dedicated to revise students' basics of writing. The topics offered then were punctuation marks, conjunctions, articles, word selection, style, and cohesion. These issues were both discussed and practically reinforced in the written texts. These were intended to help strengthen learners' abilities of writing in general and writing reports in particular. During this stage students would write their reports and revise new issues at the same time. Every class was followed by an open discussion on the introduced topic with reference to their own previously written texts. Students were allowed to discuss their new and old texts with their classmates and the instructor, as well.

4.1.2 Preparation of Genre

The purpose of the Technical Report Writing course is to prepare students to write project reports (PRs) required before graduation. This major objective was introduced in the first introductory class. It was also enhanced throughout the course. The learners were made aware of the particular PRs needed by teaching them about reports in general with specific focus on PRs. During weeks 5-9, the course introduced a detailed explanation of the characteristics, types, structures (sections and subsections) of reports. This was done with reference to the required course reports, which are basically grounded on PRs. Students were further shown models of PRs and were directed on how to locate them in the college library. For familiarizing learners with the situation in which PRs were used, information about the readers of the reports and the expectations of these readers was introduced, along with the models. More focus on the significance of the readers was also emphasised when introducing the assignment of the course report.

4.1.3 Planning, Drafting and Revising

One of the earliest sessions in this course was about pre-writing particularly brainstorming (free writing, listing, and mapping). Two classes in week 2 were dedicated to introduce these items and practice exercises relating to them. Based on those topics, prewriting and planning in general was adopted as a technique that was used in various written tasks later. When reports were introduced in weeks 5-9, planning was both implemented and largely encouraged. When the course assignment of writing report was introduced, students were then given time to plan for their reports and prepare a short plan involving the topic, the sample and the method of collecting data.

To do that, they were encouraged to seek advice from the course instructor, PR supervisors, classmates and any other relevant experts. To help them plan well, they were given sample reports of PRs, to write and design their reports accordingly. These plans were later discussed with the instructor in an especially dedicated class (week 6, see section 4.1.4 below).

Drafting and revising have been introduced in week 2 and since that time these strategies, too, have been adopted in the written assignments. When any exercise was assigned, students would be requested to write it in more than one draft. In the earlier exercises, this was practised in the classroom, too. When doing the first draft of an exercise, the instructor would ask students to revise it and would give them time to redraft it. All drafts were then placed in the portfolio to be used and revised later. When the course reports were later requested, students were asked to write different sections of their reports in multiple drafts.

As mentioned above, students were given time to revise any assignment more than once. Indeed, revision has been employed throughout the process of designing, preparing and writing of course reports. There were two formal individual sessions with the instructor in which each student was allocated time to discuss his report (see 4.1.4 below). The students were also encouraged to show their work to others including their classmates.

4.1.4 Feedback

The course employed three main methods of feedback: peer feedback, teacher-student conferencing and formal feedback. The first feedback method employed was peer feedback. After every writing assignment done in class, students were given time to exchange their work with one another and give feedback on what they read. They were encouraged to look at language as well as format aspects. While students were discussing their work, the instructor would move around and respond to any inquiries. This, in many occasions, led to non-planned student-instructor conferencing.

Teacher-student conferencing formally planned out was conducted twice in this course. The first was in week 6 when students were required to discuss their proposals for course projects. In this session the course instructor met with every student individually in his desk at the front of the classroom. The discussion included student's brief plan of report, which included the topic and procedures to conduct it. The instructor would listen to the student, asking questions about his plan and responding to his questions and any difficulties he might have come across or expected to encounter. While the instructor was discussing with one student, other students were requested to discuss their work among themselves, before they come and meet the instructor. After that session, the instructor met with each student two times again later in weeks 8 and 10 in individual check-up sessions, which were dedicated to discuss students' progress reports. They were also held inside the classroom and with each individual student invited to the front desk. Besides checking progress, these sessions aimed also to offer help for learners while doing their tasks and to encourage them to do these tasks in the best possible ways. In these sessions, the instructor checked progress by asking questions about their work and responding to their queries. He also attempted to encourage them by highlighting their progress and guiding them on what they needed to do to complete their reports.

The formal written feedback was postponed to a later stage. The instructor did not give any formal written feedback until the students first drafted, revised and redrafted the text. Formal feedback was also given on the texts in the portfolios towards the end of the semester, as portfolios were finally collected to be formally marked and evaluated.

4.1.5 Teacher Roles & Scaffolding

Throughout the semester, the course instructor was keen to play various possible and useful teaching roles in order to assist his students. When any writing task was assigned, students were completely made informed about its nature by explaining that in front of the class and responding to any relevant questions. Before students started writing, they were advised to pre-write and plan well. During this step, the instructor would move around and provide help and guidance. When students started the writing task, the instructor was there also in order to give advice and provide any required assistance in structure, organization or vocabulary.

Students were also helped in understanding the project reports (PRs) which they needed to write by providing model reports and discussing them in class. The three individual sessions (see 4.1.4 above) conducted during the course were also intended to assist students and ease their learning difficulties. Students were also encouraged to approach the instructor in his office whenever they needed help.

4.2 Students' Views

Having discussed the implementation of the PGA above, this section proceeds in presenting the views of the student participants in the implementation. This section is divided into five parts based on the main categories of

the questionnaire. Data presented in the tables below show the percentages and mean scores of the five point Likert-scale (Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1, Disagree (D) = 2, Not Sure (NS) = 3, Agree (A) = 4, Strongly Agree (SA) = 5). This means that the least mean score should go towards 1, whereas the highest should go towards 5.

4.2.1 Writing Abilities

The first section in the questionnaire is dedicated to obtain participants' views on their general writing abilities. As stated earlier, EFL learners find difficulty in writing, therefore, it is useful for any writing course to start with reviewing and reinforcing the general writing abilities of the learners. To find out participants views in this regard, eight items, which were based on the topics discussed in this regard, were included. These involve sentence structure, paragraph structure, word selection, conjunctions, tenses, capitalization, punctuation, and style.

Table 1. Writing abilities

The Technical Report Writing course has helped me to:		SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	pay more attention to the structure of my sentences.	-	11.7%	5.9%	41%	41%	4.1
2	Write better-structured paragraphs (topic sentence...etc.).	-	5.9%	5.9%	52.9%	35%	4.2
3	use connection words (e.g. firstly, moreover, however).	-	11.7%	11.7%	47%	29%	3.9
4	consider grammatical issues such as tenses.	-	29%	11.8%	47%	11.7%	3.4
5	use punctuation markers in my writing.	-	17.7%	-	53%	29.4%	3.9
6	practically use capitalization.	-	5.9%	-	47%	47%	4.4
7	practically improve the style of my writing.	-	-	-	47%	52.9%	4.5
8	Use English style and avoid Arabic style.	-	11.7%	11.7%	53%	23.5%	3.9

As can be seen in Table 1 above, the percentages and mean scores demonstrated that the majority of students find these lessons helpful in their learning of writing. These items were suggested by Assaggaf (2010) to help EFL learners get prepared before they embark on learning to write about the specific genre needed in the specific context. Even though the result shows similar high mean scores, the item concerning grammatical issues such as tenses received the least mean of 3.4. This may be referred to the complexity that EFL learners face when writing tenses, as approved by Al-Quyadi (2016).

4.2.2 Report Writing

The second section in the questionnaire was intended to find out participants' views in relation to report writing abilities. Data shown in Table 2 below disclose positive attitudes towards writing reports based on the PGA implementation. With the exception of item no. 10 about writing good reports, the percentages and mean scores for most items were relatively high, which would indicate a favourable attitude towards knowledge of writing reports. This finding appears to be in agreement with what Pujianto et al. (2014) have found regarding genre knowledge.

Table 2. Report writing

No.	Questionnaire item	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean
		1	2	3	4	5	
9	I now have good command about reports.	-	23.5%	5.9%	41%	29.4%	3.9
10	I now know how to write good reports.	-	11.7%	41.2%	41.2%	5.9%	3.4
11	Writing a report has been an interesting experience.	-	5.9%	5.9%	47%	41%	4.2
12	I'm satisfied with my report and proud of it.	-	-	17.6%	64.7%	17.6%	4

On the other hand, students' responses concerning writing reports ranged between "Not sure" and "Agree". In spite of the participants' consent that they gained good knowledge on reports, they appeared to be unclear about their abilities of the actual writing of reports. This can be attributed to the difficulty that EFL learners encounter in writing, even when they are equipped with the necessary knowledge. Indeed, having knowledge about something does not mean that one can skilfully perform it. This indicates that EFL learners need to practise more in order to be competent in writing any particular text or genre.

4.2.3 Genre Situation & Purpose

This section is intended to obtain students' perception towards the methods and procedures undertaken to familiarise them with the purpose and situation of the genre they learn to write, which is project reports (PRs). As explained in section 4.1.2 above, these included acquainting students with PRs as genres and with the specific purpose of writing these reports. As shown in Table 3 below, the percentages and mean scores disclose highly positive responses. This indicates that the participants agree that they were able to figure out the specific objective of writing PRs.

Table 3. Situation and purpose

No.	Questionnaire item	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean
		1	2	3	4	5	
13	I have seen sample reports in this course.	-	5.9%	11.2%	64.7%	17.6%	3.9
14	The sample reports I saw could help me write my own report	-	-	-	64.7%	35%	4.6
15	I learned much about the kind of reports needed in the final year.	-	5.9%	5.9%	52.9%	35%	4.2
16	I can clearly see the link between the course and the final reports.	-	17.6%	17.6%	35%	29%	3.8

The responses above lay emphasis on what has been stated in section 4.1.2 about the endeavours made to familiarise learners with the specific genre of PRs. This matches with Kim & Kim (2005), who emphasise that PGA helps learners fully understand the features of the target genre.

4.2.4 Audiences & Feedback

As an important component in the PGA, considering audiences and obtaining feedback have gained a special attention in the implementation of the approach in this course (as stated in section 4.1 above), and hence it was reflected in the questionnaire. Data obtained uncover that the course enhanced the idea of audience and feedback among the students. As can be seen in Table 3 below, most mean scores in all items concerning these issues are high. This indicates that the participants agree on the lessons, procedures and activities concerning audience and feedback in writing the reports.

Table 4. Audiences & feedback

No.	Questionnaire item	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean
		1	2	3	4	5	
17	The course encouraged me to show my writing to others.	5.9%	5.9%	-	35%	52.9%	4.2
18	The course encouraged me to get more feedback from my teacher (correction of my writing).	-	11.7%	5.9%	35%	47%	4.17
19	The course encouraged me to get more feedback from my classmates and other friends.	-	23.5%	17.9%	41%	17.9%	3.4

This result is in agreement with Pujianto et al. (2014), who found positive responses from the participants regarding feedback in writing reports at the high school level.

4.2.5 Writing Processes (Planning, Drafting and Revising)

This section is intended to show the views of the participants with regard to the writing processes. Data shown in Table 5 below uncover that the participants agree on the role of the course in enhancing the processes of planning, drafting and revising. The questionnaire items shown below cover these three processes, which make an important component in the PGA. As explained in section 4.1 above, the course introduced all these issues of planning (free writing, listing and mapping), drafting and revising. Specifically, the result below demonstrates that drafting has gained the highest mean score (4.5), whereas listing, which is a planning strategy, has gained the least (3.5). Mean scores for items 26-27, show that the participants were more confident about the revising process and that they did much of it in this course (4.0, 4.3).

Table 5. Planning, drafting and revising

No.	Questionnaire item	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean
		1	2	3	4	5	
20	I have planned well for my writing.	-	11.7%	11.7%	52.9%	23.5%	3.9
21	I have used listing as a planning strategy in my writing.	5.9%	11.7%	23.3%	41%	17.6%	3.5
22	I have used mapping as a planning strategy in my writing.	5.9%	17.6%	11.7%	29.4%	35%	3.7
23	I have used free writing as a planning strategy for my writing.	-	-	17.6%	64.7%	17.6%	4.0
24	I have used more than one draft in writing the tasks for this course including the report.	-	-	-	64.7%	35%	4.4
25	Drafting has helped me improve my writing.	-	5.9%	-	29.4%	64.7%	4.5
26	I have edited (revising and reviewing) my writing in this course.	5.9%	-	-	76.5%	17.6%	4.0
27	Revising and editing my written work helped me improve my writing.	-	-	-	70.6%	29.4%	4.3
28	After working hard in my writing I like to show my final writing to others (teacher, friends.. etc.)	-	23.5%	5.9%	41%	29.4%	3.9

This result matches what Pujianto et al. (2014) who found positive responses from the participants regarding the writing processes when using the PGA at the high school level.

5. Conclusions and Implications

The first part of this study has described an implementation of the process genre approach (PGA) in teaching report writing to computer science Yemeni EFL students. The study then explored views of those students on the implementation of the approach. The findings demonstrated positive views of the students on implementing the PGA in the teaching of writing. For most of the participants the use of PGA in teaching report writing could help them comprehend project reports, be aware of the purpose of writing project reports, know how to write project reports, and improve their writing abilities in general. These findings are in line with the previous research conducted in this area (Gupitasari, 2013; Pujianto et al., 2014; and Babalola, 2012). These findings will encourage writing teachers in the Yemen to use this approach in their writing classes in order to help improve the writing skills. Teachers of writing in other Arab countries can also attest this approach particularly in EAP and ESP settings.

To conclude, it should be noted here that as one limitation of this study is the small size of participants, implementing the PGA with bigger classes should cautiously be tested first. Undeniably, the small number of participants in this study made it possible to conduct some of the essential components and techniques in the PGA such as teacher-student conferencing and peer feedback. Furthermore, as this study used one instrument in eliciting data from participants, further research can attempt other research designs to test the appropriateness of the PGA in the Yemeni and other Arab EFL contexts. Hence, any further research pertaining to this approach in the Yemeni and Arab EFL contexts will conceivably enlighten EFL researchers and teachers and will certainly contribute to the improvement of student writing in these contexts.

References

- Abbad, A. T. (1988). *An analysis of communicative competence features in English language texts in Yemen Arab Republic* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Al-Quyadi, A. M. (2016). Complexity level in the use of tense and aspect as perceived and experienced by Arab EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(1), 135-147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.1p.135>.
- Assaggaf, H. T. (2010). *L2 writing in an ESP context: Investigating the current practices and needs at a tertiary institution in Yemen* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National University of Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Assaggaf, H. T., & Bamahra, Y. S. (2016). The effects of portfolio use in teaching report writing: EFL students' perspective. *IJALEL*, 5(3), 26-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.3p.26>.
- Assaggaf, H. T., Stapa, S. H., & Mustafa, J. (2012). Investigating teaching and learning practices of second language ESP writing at tertiary level in Yemen. *Arab World English Journal*, 3(2), 48-75.

- Babalola, H. A. L. (2012). Effects of process-genre based approach on the written English performance of computer science students in a Nigerian polytechnic. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(6), 1-7.
- Badger, R., & White, B. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Bernard, H. R. (2006). *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5th ed.). New York: Altamira Press.
- Caudery, T. (1998). Increasing students' awareness of genre through text transformation exercises: An old classroom activity revisited. *TESL-EJ*, 3(3), 1-15.
- Chow, T. V. F. (2007). *The effects of the process-genre approach to writing instruction on the expository essays of ESL students in a Malaysian secondary school* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). London: Sage publications.
- Flowerdew, J. 1993. An educational, or process, approach to the teaching of professional genres. *ELT Journal*, 47(4), 305-316. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/47.4.305>
- Frith, J. (2001). A Process Genre Approach to Writing Transactional Letters. Retrieved from <http://www.DevelopingTeachers.com>
- Gao, J. (2007). Teaching writing in Chinese universities: Finding an eclectic approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(2), 285-297.
- Ghufron, M. A. (2016). Process-genre approach, product approach, and students' self-esteem in teaching writing. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(1), 37-54.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language and scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Gupitasari, H. (2013). The implementation of process-genre approach to teaching writing business letter. *Journal of English & Education*, 1(2), 23-30.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hasan, M. K. (2011). Approaches to the teaching second language writing at tertiary level in Bangladesh private Universities. *ABAC Journal*, 31(1).
- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. London. Pearson education.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667251>
- Johns, A. M. (1995). Genre and pedagogical purposes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(2), 181-190. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90006-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90006-3)
- Kim, Y., & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and the genre approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 68-89.
- Nordin, S. M., & Mohammad, N. (2006). The best of two approaches: Process/Genre based approach to teaching writing. *The English Teacher*, 35(6), 75-85.
- Prodromou, L. (1995). The backwash effect: from testing to teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 21(1), 1-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.13>
- Pujianto, D., Emilia, E., & Ihrom, S. M. (2014). A Process-genre approach to teaching writing report text to senior text high school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 99-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v4i1.603>
- Raimes, A. (1983). Anguish as a second language? Remedies for composition teachers. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle, & J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to write: First language/second language* (pp. 258-272). New York: Longman.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in teaching writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 407-430. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586978>
- Saito, S. (2010). *An Analysis of Argumentative Essays of Thai Third-Year English Majors Instructed by Integrated Process-Genre Approach* (Unpublished master thesis). Sarinakhathinwirot University.

- Saputra, H., & Marzulina, L. (2016). Teaching writing by using genre process approach to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 22 Palembang. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 2(1), 1-12.
- 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). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524551.005>
- Tuyen, K. T., Osman, S. B., Dan, T. C., & Ahmad, N. S. B. (2016). Developing Research Paper Writing Programs for EFL/ESL Undergraduate Students Using Process Genre Approach. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(2), 19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/hes.v6n2p19>
- Yan, G. (2005). A process genre model for teaching writing. *English Teaching Forum*, 43(3), 18-26.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).