

## **The Voice of College Writing Instructors on the Academic Challenges of the Students in Preparatory Classes: A Case Study in a Turkish EFL Context**

Murat Ata (muratatadeu@hotmail.com)

Dokuz Eylul University, Turkey

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8822-5105>

Gülşah Tıkız Ertürk (gulsahatikiz@gmail.com)

İzmir Democracy University, Turkey

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5803-1270>

*Received: August 1, 2019*

*Accepted: October 15, 2019*

*Published: October 16, 2019*

**Abstract:** This study unearths the academic writing challenges of undergraduate students at School of Foreign Languages at a state university in Turkey from the perspective of English as a foreign (EFL henceforth) language instructors. Besides, it focuses on these challenges in terms of the variety and integrity. The article also sheds light on the implications of these challenges for students' academic development and it offers solutions to address these challenges. This is a qualitative study. Thematic analysis was conducted to analyse the data. The participants were selected through purposeful sampling method and data were collected via observations, semi-structured interview questions and students' documents such as exam papers and writing assignments. The results revealed that writing instructors face a number of challenges ranging from the mechanics of the lesson to students' individual perceptions. Additionally, the study offers some implications such as support from other skills and the need for encouragement of learners to write successfully for both teachers and curriculum designers.

**Keywords:** Academic writing, undergraduate, challenges, writing instructors

### **Introduction**

Writing as a productive skill encompasses a prominent position in the terrain of language teaching owing to the fact that it is considered as one of the two productive

skills in language learning. According to Harmer (2007), the term literacy, to be able to read and write, has gained a vital ground for the last two hundred years and it has started to be regarded as an imminent skill for the whole world. According to Byrne (1988), even though writing is assumed to be simple process, which is considered as marking papers on the surface, it is much more than the production of graphic symbols and “we produce a sequence of sentences arranged in a particular order and linked together in certain ways” (p.1). In this regard, writing is more than setting up one sentence over another and it requires efforts and endeavour. In terms of formal education, fostering students’ writing abilities requires assistance from professionals such as instructors and language educators (Anderson, 2013). On the other hand, learners’ readiness and presence to learn and adopt new skills is another considerable issue to be taken into account in the process of writing. Students' self-confidence and self-efficacies in writing influence their motivation as well as the outcome of their writing in language learning (Pajares, 2003). In the context of higher education, both instructors and learners are expected to collaborate together in order to be able to write efficiently in the target language. Silva (1993) defines L2 writing in language context as “purposeful and contextualized communicative interaction, which involves both the construction and transmission of knowledge” (p.18). Therefore, communicative strategies, mutual engagement and constructive partnership of both students and the instructors should be taken into account.

The way to teach writing in order to eliminate possible problems depends on the levels of the language readiness of the students. To illustrate, teaching writing at intermediate level presumes that students already fulfilled basic necessities and experience in writing, what they need is to assemble some additional strategies and skills together so that they can produce meaningful context based writing assets. The Common European Framework of Reference presents a ground basis for the inspiration of setting up language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, determining examination types and assessments as well as textbooks and materials. It deciphers a broad view of perspective that stakeholders of language education can get benefit from in order to apply the necessary strategies and skills needed to foster the target

language. Moreover, it offers references to follow up the current position of the learners and reveal the necessities to reach one more step ahead. Table 1 exhibits the descriptive and illustrative qualities that any intermediate student should have.

Table 1 *Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for languages: Writing descriptors for Intermediate level (The Council of Europe, 1999, p.1)*

<b>Descriptive and illustrative scales</b>	
<b>Overall written production</b>	Can write clear, detailed texts on a variety of subjects related to his/her field of interest, synthesizing and evaluating information and arguments from a number of sources
<b>Overall written interaction</b>	Can express news and views effectively in writing, and relate to those of others
<b>Correspondence</b>	Can write letters conveying degrees of emotion and highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences and commenting on the correspondent's news and views
<b>Reports &amp; Essays</b>	Can write an essay or report that develops an argument systematically with appropriate highlighting of significant points and relevant supporting detail Can evaluate different ideas or solutions to a problem Can write an essay or report which develops an argument, giving reasons in support of or against a view and explaining the advantages and disadvantages of various options Can synthesize information and arguments from a number of sources
<b>Creative writing</b>	Can write clear, detailed descriptions on subjects related to his/her field of interest Can write a review of a film, book or play Can write clear, detailed descriptions of real or imaginary events and experiences marking the relationship between ideas in clear connected text, and following established conventions of the genre concerned

Furthermore, the approaches and techniques applied in the process of language teaching have shifted into a more communicative domain in the 1980s. According to Byrne (1988), one of the most efficient ways of providing learners with what writing as a skill holds is to have them perform realistic and relevant tasks so that they can progress. Therefore, students can gain insights into the skills in order to write productively and efficiently. Additionally, they may get the chance of applying different kinds of and language structures for different communicative purposes. In

this respect, Pincas (1982) puts forward an approach of writing in which writing as a skill should be taught so as to carry out three purposes. According to her, writing helps to broaden the horizons of writing, it provides a communicative and functional domain and gives learners the chance of practicing various language structures. These principles should be integrated into writing teaching strategies and practices so that learners may get the chance of being actively involved to communicate in the process of writing. These varieties should be chosen considering normal communicative purposes or functions that writing is used for in everyday life. For example, learners may fill in a job application or write about a current event or they may even create invitation cards.

Another fundamental point of view which consolidates the communicative purposes of writing skill is to regard the whole learning as a single process consisting of many subparts. According to Seow (2002), the writing process, particularly in the classroom context, empowers the teacher with the role of moderating, guiding that is, on the other side gives the learner the chance of thinking critically and being autonomous. The point not to miss out is that the activities be prepared in accordance with the steps of the writing process. He goes on asserting that students are expected to generate who, why, what, where, when and how questions about a topic can go on indefinitely. Additionally, the sources of activities can be gathered from a wide range of materials, videos and even movies. Interviews, talks and surveys can be added in this source group.

This study discusses the writing challenges of preparatory class students at tertiary level from the perspective of the instructors at School of Foreign Languages at a state university in Turkey. In addition, this study will provide a framework that deals with the potential challenges that writing instructors may possibly confront with while teaching in an academic context. No matter which techniques and approaches the instructors are in favor of, teaching writing has been an intriguing skill to teach and be assessed in language classrooms. Within the context of this study, students in writing classes are expected to use their lower order skills to constitute the basis and

the basics of writing. In the meantime, they are required to exploit higher order skills so as to produce creative and meaningful products. While doing that, there are some challenges and difficulties resulting from the writing process.

### **Research Questions**

This study aims to investigate the challenges of language instructors' in a Turkish English as a Foreign Language (EFL henceforth) context. Additionally, the strategies and attitudes used by language instructors will be referred to. The following research questions are addressed in the study:

1. What are the challenges that college writing instructors face with while teaching writing?
2. What are the strategies employed by college writing instructors in tackling these challenges?

### **The Context of Preparatory Language Education at School of Foreign Languages**

With its globalization as a world language, the necessity of teaching and learning English has gained a prominent place in education particularly in Turkey and the number of universities whose medium of instruction is English is at increase (Kırkgöz, 2005). This shift has brought us into the language education context which is called preparatory language program in Turkey. Preparatory class education is implemented in the first year of university education with the aim of giving students a whole year of intensive foreign language training.

Additionally, preparatory language program is a compulsory program for some departments with a hundred percent (100%) foreign language in the curriculum as the medium of instruction. On the other hand, it is voluntary based for others which require 30% foreign language in their curriculums. At School of Foreign Languages at Dokuz Eylül University, the enrollment process for students starts by requiring students to take proficiency exam the beginning of the academic year and those who fail in this exam are required to study one-year compulsory preparatory language program. In the first week of the fall term, the failed students again are given a

placement test so that their levels of language proficiency are determined and they can be assigned in classes based on their grades. Preparatory classes run for five hours a day and twenty-five hours a week, the five hours of which are allocated to reading and writing classes. In the context of this preparatory language program, students are expected to take main course classes twenty hours a week. In main course context, a course book is followed depending on the levels of the students based on the common European framework of references. This is a whole year program which comprises four midterm exams as well as four quizzes. All students take the proficiency exam at the end of the year. During the whole term, students are expected to perform some tasks such as making presentations, taking part in debates and discussions. Additionally, an online homework system is run for students to practice what they have learnt in their classroom context. The main purpose of providing an online platform is to let students gain some autonomy while learning a foreign language. Students are also assessed at the end of the term for their performance on the online system. Moreover, students are supposed to participate in classes with the rate of not less than eighty-five percent (85%) of the whole academic year. School of Foreign Languages is a self-sufficient institution in which language instructors compromise the commission of assessment, resources, personal development and coordination. Each commission has its own specific purposes to serve for the teaching of foreign languages. Each year, three thousand students are involved in language education on average and in terms of facilities, School of Foreign Languages has fifty classrooms and it is equipped with three language laboratories as well as a technical resource room. Each class is equipped with state-of-the-art technologies which are applicable for all kind of teaching activities and practices during the class hours. Every class is shared by three or four instructors one of whom is responsible for teaching reading and writing while others share the main course classes. Every class has its own consultant who bridges the gap between students and the school board and this instructor helps them solve any problems and challenges stemming from the systematic regulations. At the same time, each class has at least two representative students who are responsible for making the connection between school, instructors and students and these people represent their

classes during the monthly meetings held by the school board before each midterm exam. As being multi vocal, School of Foreign Languages aims to consolidate not only teacher involvement but also student interaction and representation. At the end of each academic year, all students are given a questionnaire through which they can assess all the stakeholders at school including the language instructors. The feedback derived from the students are taken into account and problems are resolved prior to the next academic year.

### **A Typical Writing Class in an Intermediate Level Writing Class**

The idea of combining reading and writing skills while teaching a foreign language has been of debate since the integration of communicative approaches into language education. When the developmental stages of language acquisition are considered, Chomsky (1971) argues that children's developmental stages include readiness for writing before they feel prepared to read. Aulls (1975) and Applebee (1977) take the idea one step further by reporting that reading and writing, when integrated together, may have a positive influence for schoolchildren while they are learning a foreign language. Therefore, an integrative writing curriculum or program is an essential tool to complement reading. "Writing is not the only means of expressing ideas in written language... but it does appear to help the child to come to grips with learning to attend to the significant details of written language" (Clay, 1975, p.3).

Schools of Foreign Languages in Turkey have mostly been inspired by writing and reading integrity and this has been put into effect in the language curriculum. In the context of intermediate level, writing classes are scheduled starting from the paragraph writing and ending with different essay types. Every single student is required to obtain the writing booklet which is prepared by the materials and resources committee. During the fall term, students learn and practice writing in a structured and well-organized paragraph. In terms of paragraph structure, they learn writing topic sentences, supporting sentences and concluding sentences. The writing booklet contains sample paragraphs and activities with a bunch of different exercises to consolidate their knowledge and practice paragraph writing. Following a process



of practicing writing for one month, students are expected to write a paragraph about a given topic as first draft. This is checked by the instructor of the writing course and feedback is given to students to be able to correct the possible mistakes and offer some alternatives to help them write. As a second draft, students are supposed to correct their previous mistakes about mechanics, organization and vocabulary and they use the feedback given by the teacher and the process of teacher-student involvement is completed in a linear process. Meanwhile, reading passages help students see the use of target words and structures in a given context. At the end of the term, for intermediate level, the fundamental background information about how to write essay is given to the students with the purpose of getting prepared for the next term.

Teaching paragraph writing helps students to reduce the burden of the process of essay writing in many aspects. To illustrate, what students are expected to do in writing a paragraph is quite similar to the essay process as it comprises of at least three paragraphs as the basic components. After constructing the basis of essay writing, students practice every single paragraph (introductory, body and concluding) separately each week and they learn how to write them with the help of their teachers. During the activities, they are expected to create new ideas deriving from their thesis sentences. Besides, they learn how to combine them together with the help of the teacher and the guided activities in the booklet. In doing so, it is assumed that they gain the ability of writing in the target language.

When compared with other skills, the complexity of teaching writing needs close attention and consideration. As it is suggested by Silva (1990), "to be effective teachers of writing, English as a second language (ESL) professionals need an understanding of what is involved in second language (L2) writing" (p. 11). The main purpose of this study is to reveal the challenges and difficulties that writing instructors go through in the process of teaching and assessing writing in an intermediate level context.



## **Methodology**

As a conceptual term, method refers to the tools, techniques, or procedures used to generate data (Kaplan, 1964). To understand the challenges and difficulties of EFL instructors, to reveal the strategies and approaches they use, the qualitative research method is conducted as it enables a deep, interpretive and descriptive point of view (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Moreover, case study is adopted within the body of this study as a qualitative frame and it is used to reflect the voices of EFL instructors. The reason of this choice derives from the fact that case studies give researchers the possibilities of acquiring information and revealing the case in a more elaborate way (Schram, 2006). In this study, beliefs of language instructors are documented from an analytical perspective that prioritizes the description of writing tendencies of EFL learners so as to achieve a deep understanding about the process. From the perspective of a case study, the horizons of the target process that are researched are scrutinized in detail and the phenomenon that needs to be deciphered about how learner and teachers collaborate with each other are aligned.

In the current study, the process lasted 6 weeks and three different data tools were utilized throughout the process. The participants were selected through purposeful sampling as the target group was determined depending on the flow of the study. Typical case sampling method was used as the participants shared some common qualities and characteristics of teaching (Creswell, 2013). The participants were EFL instructors at School of Foreign Languages, at Dokuz Eylul University and they had been teaching English for more than 15 years when the data of this study were collected.

Data were collected from participants in three different ways. First, observation technique was used to collect data from the participants. Participant observation technique is adopted to get a deeper understanding of the field that is area of research. Second, participants were interviewed one by one through the interview questions that were prepared depending on the research questions. Finally, document analysis was conducted to take students' products such as exam papers,

writing assignments into account. Data were gathered and analysed systematically. This analysis was carried out step-by-step by classifying the types of feedback depending on the writing feedback code of School of Foreign Languages. Following this, the number of the same feedbacks were calculated as a whole and they were classified based on the writing evaluation rubric of the school. The categorization and frequency of the feedbacks were accumulated at the end of the process to have a holistic picture. In summary, three types of data collection tools were used in this qualitative study and two researchers actively took part in the process to consolidate validity and triangulation since the triangulation of data collection is of crucial importance to sustain consistency in the study (Creswell, 1998).

Thematic analysis was conducted to determine key themes existing in the data. In displaying the data, thematic analysis is probably the most frequently used technique. In a qualitative study, by analysing the data, the researcher generates a typology of concepts, gives them names or uses “native” labels then discuss them one by one, illustrating with descriptive detail” (Glessne, 1991, p.166). Coding was carried out by acknowledging what was stated in the transcriptions. Accordingly, themes were revealed regarding the frequency accounts. The themes interrelating with each other were assembled and layered accordingly.

### **Ethical Considerations**

In terms of ethical considerations, necessary permission was achieved from the school board to conduct the research. The participants were selected on a voluntary basis and they were not forced to become a part of the research and were informed that they had the right to leave to process at any stage of the study. Additionally, they were not obliged to reply to any question that they did not feel secure about. Moreover, in terms of confidentiality, the real names of the participants or any additional information about them were not shared and publicized.

## **Findings**

The themes and frequencies of feedbacks were classified and presented below. Each feedback was categorized under the relevant emerging theme. Additionally, the emerging themes were framed under two main groupings.

### *Challenges and Difficulties that college Writing Instructors Face with While Teaching Writing*

#### *6.1.1. Problems related to language and mechanics during the writing process*

Depending on the data gathered from this study, the instructors' responses indicated that students had some difficulties regarding language and mechanics in their writing classes as reported by their writing class instructors. The majority of students stated that they had difficulty in building sentences. Examples of the comments as presented by instructors are as follows:

Instructor 1:

*The main problem of my students while they are trying to write in the target language is that they are not able to build up accurate and appropriate sentences. They also have challenges with transmitting what they know into the target language. To put what they think and know into words is a real nightmare for them.*

Instructor 2:

*Making sentences in the target language poses a great challenge for them. Most probably this derives from the interference of their mother tongues. They even make mistakes in choosing the proper tense to express their ideas. They also have serious difficulties in doing exercises presented in their writing booklets. They, most of the time, fail to complete mechanical linguistic activities, which are presented to help them in the writing process. So, it is not surprising that they find it difficult to compose their own sentences.*

Furthermore, the percentage of the feedback provided for the students in terms of language and mechanics compromises more than  $\frac{3}{4}$  (79%) of the overall feedback given by the instructors.

### 6.1.2. *Problems related to practice and application during the writing process*

In the current study, it is also obvious that students had some problems regarding practice and application. Writing is a process which inherently requires students to put what they know into practice in their own words. However, the instructors participating in this study reported that students failed to express themselves and had great difficulty while they are trying to complete the writing tasks they are given. This is also palpable from what Instructor 1 quotes:

*“The main problem starts here as our students have strong prejudice against writing. They have some problems with writing. For example, they think in Turkish and write in Turkish. What I mean is that mother tongue plays a detrimental role while they are trying to write. Some students even attempt to write the whole paragraph/essay in their mother tongue and later try to translate it, which severely contradicts with the nature of writing process. ... They cannot compose good thesis statements”*

This view is also supported by Instructor 2 in the sense that students have difficulties with the basic requirements of writing. Instructor 2 quotes:

*Most of my students have difficulties with writing as they attempt to write in a manner that is compatible with the requirements of the writing process. This challenge may stem from the fact that they are writing in such a disciplined way the first time in their lives, which is not very familiar to them. What is more, some of my students do not have a holistic view about writing. They do not know the conventions, which probably plays a debilitating role on their production. To put something into practice, students should have a good grammar, vocabulary, knowledge of connectors as well as an organized flow of ideas etc. They definitely need more practice and they need to make outlines before settling down to write. They also cannot write proper thesis statements.*

### 6.1.3 *Problems deriving from the use of technology during the writing process*

The teachers participating in this study reported that technology may serve good purposes; however, the majority of their students fail to benefit from technology in a productive manner. This is obvious from the quotes:

Instructor 1:

*Unfortunately, most students in my classes use google translate and they even do not attempt to make their own sentences. They even do not attempt to compose their own sentences. They write for the sake of writing. Of course, it would be okay if they used some programs to find appropriate lexical items or confirm their hypotheses about the target language. However, what they do is that they just copy and paste.*

Additionally, the integration of technology into the writing process is apparent and the benefits of the technology seems to be surpassed by the harm and inefficiency it serves and this is echoed by Instructor 2 as:

*The worst side of technology involvement into the process is the immediate attempt of the students while practicing writing in my classes. Without provoking their minds into thinking and brainstorming, all they attempt to do is google translate what they mean to write in the target language. In doing that, they are in fact killing their ability to think in the target language and put it into practice. What I see in my classes, google translation pushes students into unproductive mood in which they save the current situation, however; they have no idea about the harm it gives to their learning process.*

What is more, the percentage of the feedback given to the students compromises 1 % of the whole percentage.

#### *6.1.4 Problems deriving from integration of other skills and courses*

Both of the participants reconciled on the fact that other courses such as main course and reading had an influential effect on the writing performances of the target group learners. The effects of other courses may sometimes fall behind the expected influence. For example, as it is quoted by Instructor 1:

*Although I strongly advise them to do so, my students have hesitations and reservations upon transferring the structures, grammatical patterns and lexical components into their writing classes. In theory, our writing classes go collaboratively with main course classes, the problem is the fact that our students have no tendency towards being challenged. They have the inclination in their mind as thinking all courses separately or they have no intention to bring them together. What is unfortunate is, whenever they feel this struggle, they opt for using google translation.*

The challenges stemming from the integration of other skills and courses is summarized by Instructor 2 as;

*“The fundamental problem of my students is the inability to make a meaningful sentence. Besides, some of my students cannot find the proper tense and word to use in their writing practices. All they need is to do more drills and exercise to make these components permanent and available when needed. This can be consolidated by the support of the other courses and skills. We the instructors, try to help them aware while lecturing other classes, however; how much they care for it is controversial. The practice of this structural and lexical exercises should be increased and made more publicized by us.”*

## **6.2. The Strategies Employed by College Writing Instructors in Tackling Challenges and Difficulties**

The analysis of the data collected from participants reveals some implications for the improvement of writing abilities for preparation class students. These implications and recommendations are folded under two main headings.

### *6.2.1. Support deriving from prior/concurrent courses*

The participants of the study agreed on the fact that writing classes should be supported by other concurrent classes and the continuation of the integrative collaboration in order to write in the target language should not be undermined. This is the finding supported by Instructor 1 as:

*The necessity of teaching writing in a class cannot be seen as self-dependent. That is to say; writing lessons are anticipated to be assessed as a mutual product of all other classes in which grammar, vocabulary and structure of the target language are taught. Such a steady support, as long as supported by the curriculum to go in concurrence with writing classes, will ease the process and help students gain the perception of the integrity of language teaching. One of our main purposes should be to let them see this integration better, practice better and learn together.*

The ideas declared by Instructor 1 are also supported by Instructor 2 in the same context. Instructor 2 describes:

*The outcome of the reading and grammar classes cannot be separated from writing classes. As I said before, since the main problems of our students are on the language structure level such as sentence agreement, tenses, I can easily spot the lack of those components in students' writings. To overcome this, no matter how much I try to teach in writing lessons, a scheduled and curriculum-based strategy has to be applied so that we may focus on more into idea flows and coherence of the essays. This problem can be eliminated via supports and backs up coming from the other classes. In doing so, students will be able to see the unity of the language as a whole.*

#### *6.2.2. Need for encouragement on the part of the students*

According to the finding of this study, it has become obvious that students strongly needed more motivation and encouragement on writing in the target language. Both participants in this study acknowledged that preparatory class students should be positively supported to free themselves from affective barriers they have while conducting writing in the target language. This is illustrated by Instructor 1 as:

*Each student has his/her own style, so does every single teacher. This may sound weird at the beginning, however; when we become used to each other, and when I support them to sharpen and polish their own unique aspect of writing, in brief when we accept each other as we are, we try to build on it. They try to create their own knowledge pool and take the necessary thing out when needed. In essence, directing our students into the right roads by understanding them and letting ourselves understood, the problem of writing can be resolved. One of the main constraints here is the time insufficiency. There has to be a prolong engagement and support for the students to produce better works.*

The finding derived from the quotation of Instructor 1 is also supported by Instructor 2 by emphasizing more emotional psychological point, as;

*"My students are afraid of writing too much; they feel extremely timid. What I do as the first thing is to help them overcome this nightmare. In my opinion the reason why we are here as instructors is to correct these mistakes and failures. It should be kept in mind that all these mistakes are instructive. Students are to be actively supported to make production no matter how much mistakes they do; all they need is a guide to show the right door to step in. they should be motivated to get the belief that they have the potential to do it. More practice is*



*needed to consolidate. One to one support, immediate feedback are privileged elements of writing classes. In order to accomplish this, the classes shouldn't go beyond the number of 15 students.*

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

An elaborate analysis of the case of writing instruction revealed the fact that both participants of the study emphasized the language use and mechanic problems they confronted with while teaching writing skills to language learners. This finding embodies some implications for the teaching of writing in preparatory classes at universities. To be more specific, it is obvious that writing lessons should be supported by language use and mechanical exercises which may have a profound influence on grounding the basis of writing skills because of the fact that writing involves devices such as structure, punctuation, capitalization or underlining, which helps convey meaning. These are some of the reasons making writing a skill which needs special attention (Byrne, 1988). As a second prominent finding, both participants reconciled on the fact that students are prone to the effect of mother tongue interference in the writing process. It would, therefore, be a significant factor for writing instructors take this problem into consideration. Instructors; thus, ma take necessary precautions such as the applications of certain activities and rearrangement of language teaching materials accordingly, as it is pointed out by Silva (1993) that students devote more attention to generating in L2 than in L1 and found production in L2 more difficult and challenging.

Gee (2008) defines technology integration as “using various tools, technologies, or props” (p. 161). However, in one of the themes emerging from the study, it is clearly observed that technology integration, to illustrate; using mobile phones has a negative effect on students’ writing abilities. As a result, it poses a significant challenge to tackle this problem for language instructors and educators given that “enthusiasm for the use of computer and other information and communication technologies in education is undeniable and widespread” (Trucano, 2012, p. 101). Teacher guided technology integration rather than letting students be alone could be

a long term solution as language instructors have the control and guidance of the relevant activities inside the classroom. As Davies (2004) points out, integrated dictionaries might be useful for intermediate learners who will not be overwhelmed by the variety of the alternatives. The language instructors may interfere in that point to decide the activities and exercises. This even may go in parallel with the textbook and the pacing schedule and also can be fitted into the curriculum.

Another point is the collaboration of the other skills with writing. For example, teaching reading can be easily integrated with instruction on writing and vocabulary, and oral skills (Hinkel, 2001; Lazaraton, 2001; McCarthy & O’Keeffe, 2004). The curriculum planners should consider such an integrative design in which learners are likely to get the chance of practicing what they learned in other classes. This will ease the process of learning and help students gain familiarity or even automatization in practicing their writing skill.

Students’ individuality and perspective upon writing classes have the power of affecting their performances in writing. To illustrate, depending on the findings of the study, most of the intermediate language learners have prejudice against writing in the target language which probably lowers their motivation in the process of action. The implication of the findings pinpoints that an urgent teacher interference is needed to solve the problem of motivation and enthusiasm. In order to consolidate their willingness and belief in writing, game based activities might be scheduled so that learners can feel themselves secure and productive while engaging with it. As Ellis (1994) clearly holds, motivation is by far one of the most significant individual assets which may bring success and brought by success as well. That clearly explains why such an encouragement is needed for students to have the capacity to write in the target language.

In conclusion, it seems essential for educators and stakeholders alike to reconcile on the challenges and difficulties and decide upon the strategies for eliminating individual biases and prejudices while teaching writing skills. This could help annex

the problem of writing difficulties and put forward new way outs both for the educators and students. Such investigations which prioritize the first person point of view, would shed light on the ways of Turkish ELT teachers, and the stakeholders of teaching can handle the problem of writing holistically so that it may come out as a no challenge.

## References

- Anderson, E. M. (2013) Preparing the next generation of early childhood teachers: The emerging role of inter professional education and collaboration in teacher education, *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 34(1), 22-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2013.758535>
- Applebee, A. N. (1977). Writing and Reading. *Journal of Reading*, 20, 534-537.
- Aulls, M.W. (1975) Relating Reading Comprehension and Writing Competency. *Language Arts*, 52, 808-812.
- Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skills*. Essex: Longman.
- Chomsky, C. (1971). Write first, read later. *Childhood education*, 47(6), 296-299.
- Clay, M. (1975). *What Did I Write?* London, England: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating*. W. Ross MacDonald School Resource Services Library.
- Davies, N. (2004). Not just how but why: EAL and ICT in the multilingual classroom. *NALDIC Quarterly*, 1(4), 12-19.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage.
- Ellis, R., & Ellis, R. R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Glesne, C., (1991). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. New York: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach Writing*. India: Pearson Publishing.

- Hinkel, E. (2001). Building awareness and practical skills for cross-cultural communication in ESL/EFL. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 443–458). Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Kaplan, A. (1964). *The conduct of inquiry*. New York: Harper & Row
- Kırkgöz Y. (2009). Students' and Lecturers' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Foreign Language Instruction in an English-Medium University in Turkey. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*, 81-93. doi: 10.1080/13562510802602640
- Lazaraton, A. (2001). Teaching oral skills. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 103–115). Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- McCarthy, M., & O'Keeffe, A. (2004). Research in the teaching of speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 26–43
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*, 139-158.
- Pincas, A. (1982). *Teaching English Writing*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Schram, T. (2006). *Conceptualizing and proposing qualitative research*. (2nd ed.) New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Seow, A. 2002. The Writing Process and Process Writing. In *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*, (Eds.). J. Richards and W. A. Renandya, (pp. 315–320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 657–677.
- Trucano, M. (2012). Information and communication technologies. In Petrinis, HA (Ed.), *Strengthening Education Quality in East Asia: System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results*. SABER/UNESCO/The World Bank UWA Publishing. Retrieved from [http://doc.iiep.unesco.org/cgi-bin/wwwi32.exe/%5Bin=epidoc1.in%5D/?t2000=031000/\(100\)>](http://doc.iiep.unesco.org/cgi-bin/wwwi32.exe/%5Bin=epidoc1.in%5D/?t2000=031000/(100)>) May, 19, 2019.