

## **Bridging the Gap between Filipino Students' Expectations and Teaching Approaches in ESP Class**

**Susana Melon-Galvez Ph.D (c)**

Research Coordinator College of Arts & Letters  
Bulacan State University  
Malolos, Bulacan Philippines

### **Abstract**

*What approaches do professors adopt to assist students with English writing? How can subject teachers help students understand the issues related to academic writing? How can we help students in the often-difficult process of writing itself? This study banks on text-based approaches to teaching general features of writing that characterize different text types; structure and rhetorical purposes of text types particularly at the aspects of writing that constitute register, including degrees of formality, the personal voice and linguistic accuracy process-based approaches to teaching writing, including the stages of prewriting, drafting and polishing a text. The researcher herself being a writing teacher found necessity to remediate students' difficulties and at the same time influence their writing behavior in and out of the class. This drove her to investigate students' involvement from active to less involvement to withdrawal or passive involvement to active involvement in writing assignments. This study examined the relationship and the gap between teaching approaches and the learning involvement of students from Bulacan State University, Philippines by examining students' behavior in writing assignments required for classes. Through observation, the researcher hopes to see the gap between these students' expectations on professors' teaching approaches..*

**Key Words:** bridging gap, students' expectations, teaching approaches in writing, ESP class& academic writing

### **Introduction**

ESL learners are required to work closely with the teachers to write correctly and not to write effectively (Pratt-Johnson, 2008). Observing grammar and vocabulary necessitate writers to organize their thoughts and construct academic texts (Hinkel, 2002). Neither correctness nor effectiveness is achievable when teachers fail to motivate students to participate in the process of thought organization. When a teacher gives negative feedback on learners' written output, they tend to withdraw if not show passive response by showing reluctance to write. Learners lose confidence and are afraid to write especially when teachers do not explain the reasons for the writers' failure in encoding written texts. Professors' teaching approaches therefore are very significant in encouraging them to do better in writing. These techniques play a great impact in students' attitude in learning to write. Mismatch occurs between professors' expectations with their students and the learners with their teachers. Such issue of connection between teaching approaches and student involvement in improving writing skills bring the researcher in examining teachers' markings to students written output. Explicit strategies should be provided to students to develop participative attitude. How this support from teachers motivates involvement and how learning will be achieved should be compromised in the teaching and learning process.

Ideas within a framework of domain or discipline knowledge engage the reader in technical discourses. Research studies revealed the absence of such background for students entering tertiary levels is dependent on successful academic writing (Kubota, 1999). It is undeniable that academic writing is the language of scholars and that the quality of an individual's written work determines his/her scholarship and acceptance in academia. Poor academic writing skills have often been alluded to as a key factor in the failure of ESL students in meeting institutional literacy expectations. The common scenario in a writing class is that the teacher tries to detect problems and marks errors without giving solutions to the problems (Bardine, 1999) that leads to students' frustration and loss of confidence in writing. Teachers most of the time neglect to realize how important these (negative or lack of comments) are to students that hinder the learners to involve themselves in bringing out the best in them.

When teachers trust the learners, learners try harder (King, 2000) unlike when there is lack of support especially with Asian learners who give high regards to whatever the teacher would tell them.

Students in the tertiary level specifically in the Philippines are influenced by their professors. They show obedience, loyalty, and dutiful attitudes toward teachers (Shin & Koh, 2007). When professors show limited expectations for them (Harris, 2000; Thomas, 1983), however, these students do not have a sense of belonging, and they feel alienated, excluded, and insecure (Nero, 2005). These attitudes of students and high expectations in teachers make teaching and learning easier among the Filipino students. Although many ESL students at university have basic understanding of grammar rules, many still consider writing a problem. In Hinkel's (2004) study, cognitive development, educational experiences, and overall proficiency in the second language were observed to problematize students' writing. To Myles (2002), students find difficulty in writing especially in expressing arguments. Many writers have called for conventions to be challenged while others suggest that some conventions should be maintained. Such convention or unconventionality needs discussion of intersexuality in writing discourses.

Kristeva in 1966 coined the word intertextuality which means combining past writing into original or new pieces of text. All texts are necessarily related to prior texts through a network of links, writers make use of what has previously been written, and thus some degree of borrowing is inevitable. This generally occurs within a specific discourse community, the ESP community. In this study, the researcher observed intertextuality in the students' output in an ESP class. In the researcher's class, writing was not simply creating ideas but new perspective and link between already established ideas. Gathering background information and having past knowledge is so important in ESP writing. What is framed for students' discourses were already established discourses from sources. To intertextualize is to be able to build a connection to join the 'conversation'. All of the research one reads is built on already existing texts instead of self-knowledge. From discourse to another discourse is intertextualizing ideas in writing. The researcher dealt with the two distinct type of intertextuality; inerrability and presupposition. Iterability is the capability of a text to be reiterated and repeated in various contexts explicitly seen in texts, as opposed to presupposition, which refers to assumptions a text makes or assumptions made without being specifically stated or explained within a text. Presupposition or otherwise known 'common sense' is applied when an obvious discourse is understood by a vast majority of the audience. The latter implies several facts giving the reader a chance to assume. Details can be added or removed to give readers more or less creative license to imagine the facts presented for further belief. Because the assumptions made by different readers can be drastically different from one another, it is important that the framework the author provides is sufficient to keep the assumptions that are crucial to the story itself constant between readers.

The researcher observed the insignificance of framing in ESP writing since technical students' discourses needed not inerrability and presupposition. Intertextuality in discourses in creative writing was different in technical writing. ESP framing did not call for 'mood setting' and did not initiate guessing. Language used in ESP writing were precise and distinct in all the techniques; definition, mechanism, process, and partition or classification, even with visuals or graphics. This paper was not about ESP intertextuality or framing itself since the researcher believes that no text stands alone. The research focused on how like a web related ideas were put together written in variety of ways. Without a frame, a writer is simply making a statement said throughout the history. One's frame is the author's way of looking at a statement to explain an idea. The frame allows one to establish the argument in a novel way. A frame is the section in an academic paper in which a perspective that has already been accepted by a specific discourse community is presented in order to blatantly explain to the reader the point of view from which the rest of the essay will be analyzed.

Frame allows the reader to see a topic from a particular angle. Because of the established framework, the reader will logically understand the progression of the writer's argument because the writer has legitimized his or her claim by citing an accepted theory (framework). When one uses an academic concept already has been accepted by the discourse community as a frame, this frame "forces you to offer both a definition and description of the principle around which one argument develops" (Greene, 2007). The frame does however allow the writer to focus the reader's attention in one specific direction. The framing concept that one chooses to use has already been accepted by the community and thus a part of their intertextual matrix. A well-developed frame is the doorway into an academic conversation. If one guides the members of a specific discourse through a paper using an idea that the community already holds as true, the new argument is more likely to gain acceptance from the audience as they understand where it is coming from (Burke qtd. in Greene).

## **Methodology**

This paper discussed students' expectations and the teaching techniques to bridge the gap between them. The study focused in particular on the challenges faced by students in ESP class particularly on the writing techniques in an ESL class. The research did not focus so much on certain weaknesses like common grammatical, structural, and syntactic errors made in writing tasks but on how discourses were linked to join in the conversation. The study was prompted due to the author's experiences in an ESP writing class. The researcher had encountered problem. She thought of; making her students involve in the writing process, and the techniques she would use to make them write specifically the writing of techniques in technical writing. There are five distinctive writing techniques in technical writing used by the respondents; definition, mechanism, process, and partition and classification. It should be understood that all these are considered types of reports. Learning to write technically is necessary to help students determine how details are arranged in the best way one can communicate his ideas to his audience. A piece of writing of any length usually employs a combination of two or three of these styles of writing. Students must be taught first to prepare the details for each writing technique. The following were the lessons understudied, where the teacher-researcher emphasized in teaching, and where the students expected techniques to bridge the gap between them. How the students framed (intertextuality) discourses were the subject of the study.

**For Definition.** Respondents must be familiar with the formal and informal definition. Informal definition is consists of one or more synonymous expressions substituted for the common terms used while the most preferred definition, the formal (or amplified definition) has three parts; the term (the word to be defined), the 'genus' (the group of class where the word belongs), and the 'differentia' (the distinctive characteristics of the term). Definition can also be done by comparing/differentiating the subject with another, or through analogy. A definer faces problem as to where the definitions are to be placed in his writing; in a special section in the introduction (when the term are of critical importance in understanding the discourses), or in the text itself (when there are too many terms to be defined).

**For Mechanism.** The respondents must be familiar with the assembly of the movable parts having one part fixed with respect to a frame of reference and designed to produce an effect. The respondents may give in detail the definition of a machine first, then the function/s, the principle governing its operation, physical description, the principal parts and the subparts, and how the entire mechanism works.

**For Process.** Respondents must be familiar with the simple presentation of the series of stages or steps of actions taken. Unlike description of mechanism which uses spatial or logical order, processes are based on the time of occurrence evident with the use of transitional devices. Process descriptions are either: directional or instructional (when instructions are addressed to the doer or agent of action marked by imperative sentences and the use of 2<sup>nd</sup> person point of view- e.g. lay outting or cooking); or informational (when declarative sentences are used, when sentences are addressed to the reader, written in the active voice, and using the third person point of view- e.g. computer data processing or newspaper publishing). Main steps are discussed first followed by the sub steps.

**For Partition and Classification.** It must be clear to the respondents that the two techniques are related but different in writing. While partition is the act of dividing a unit into its components, classification does a logical division. Partition deals with one unit unlike classification which always deals with two or more units. For partitioning, species is defined first than the guiding principle/s (one by one) as the basis for the writing technique then name all the parts and subparts without overlapping. To do classification, there are two subjects presented. For the initial step, present the subject and the bases for partition, identify if not define, discuss the various bases for another partitioning (the significance or the purpose of the division) then the subdivisions in the best order of presentation then present the analysis using outlines and visuals to give the best explanation.

## **The Procedure**

In ESL class, academic writing instruction has mostly moved away from "product" to "process" approach where instructors work with students on their written drafts. The process approach centers around on writing activities that engage learners in the process of writing; in generation of ideas, drafting, and revising. In the product approach, the instructor evaluates grammatical and language structures and content in general, and grades the work without opportunities for revisions. In the study, the researchers focused on process approach as a strategy in teaching writing in an ESP class. Hoped to bridge the gap between students' expectation and the teacher's strategy, the researcher strategize the teaching of writing by involving the learners to the process of writing itself.

### ***Participants***

The study participants were from the College of Engineering of Bulacan State University, Philippines specifically Second Year General Engineering students enrolled in the ESP class. Learners' behaviors during and after the writing were observed. Respondents were grouped as to the project each would like to work. Samples from the population from different groups became the basis of the study. From the 234 technical outputs, data were gathered to gain a thorough understanding of the gaps in academic writing, the challenges faced by the academic writers as well as the techniques used to help students with their writing problems. Using purposive sampling, the researcher selected random samples of the four techniques in writing; definition, mechanism, process, and partition and classification. In the study, process approach was used.

The researcher discussed the above techniques to the Second Year General Engineering students. Respondents were grouped as to the major they wish to take in Third Year; Mechatronics, Industrial, Civil, Mechanical, Electronics, and Electrical. After the groupings, each had a brainstorming exercise on the project for their feasibility studies. Each group was asked to bring the picture of the project they wish to discuss the following day. Each group of four members brought one (1) same picture each. The researcher assigned each a picture with A for the one member to work on Definition, B for Mechanism, C for Process, and D for Partition and Classification. Each was also asked to bring readings of their project for referencing. After giving random assignment, respondents did the writing. The teacher-researcher moved around giving further instruction while she observed students' attitudes before and during the writing activity. Respondents were asked to write one to two paragraphs depending on the speed in organizing ideas. Outputs were collected, checked, analyzed and returned for revision. During the revision, behaviors were observed as to how the learners accept marking and corrections. Openly, scores as well as markings were compared. The teacher-researcher asked the students to assist learners who got low scores to improve their written output while the teacher moved around.

### ***Results and Discussion***

The researcher randomly chose twenty (20) outputs, each from the different techniques; twenty (20) for definition, twenty (20) for mechanism, twenty (20) or process, and twenty (20) for partition and classification. A total of eighty (80) out of the two hundred thirty four (234) written outputs, those with at least eighty (80) to one hundred (100) words, were the subject for investigation. The researcher collected the academic output. The researcher read each respondent's discourses, did markings, and came out with the Themes, Subcategories, and Emerging Patterns.

**Table 1: For Definition**

Type of Definition	Transition (Flow)	Placement	Common terms used
Informal	Comparison of terms –enumeration of the subject’s process	Beginning	similarities, both, difference, first, second, but, lastly, then
Informal	Definition - comparison	second sentence	similar (2), different, difference
Informal	Differentia – comparison- function – definition - definition	beginning	similar, like (2), also,
Informal - formal	Differentia – features – features – formal definition	Beginning - conclusion	Defined as, if clause (showing similarity), and (enumerating qualities),
Informal	Differentia – features - features	Beginning	a.k.a., like, both, and (enumerating features)
Formal	Definition – component parts – another formal definition (part) – function (part) – comparison	Beginning	In comparison, both, in contrast (more)
Formal	Definition – definition (part) – comparison - features	Beginning	On the other hand, both (more)
Informal	Differentia – descriptions - comparison – comparison – features	Beginning	Like, unlike
Informal	Differentia – function – comparison -	Beginning	Also (comparing features of two subjects), similar
Formal	Definition – features – function – benefits	Beginning	Also (enumerating features of the same subject)
Informal	Differentia – features (disadvantages) – comparison – function - features	Beginning	Not just/but also – and many more (features), unlike
Informal	Differentia – features – features – comparison	Beginning	Similarities and differences, but (for distinct features), unlike
Formal	Definition – another definition – comparison – another definition – comparisons	Beginning	Than, unlike, while, on the other hand, not like, similarities, both, also both
Informal	Etymology – feature – comparison - features	Beginning	Compared to
Informal	Differentia –comparison – features – comparison	Beginning	Compared (2), not the same with
Formal	Definition – features – comparison – features	Beginning	As , also (called), similarity,
Informal	Differentia – etymology – features – comparison	Beginning	Also (called), also means (etymology-subject), then, after that, (enumerating features), unlike
Informal	Differentia – feature (another name) – definition (another subject) – comparison – features	Beginning & Body	Also (be called), also (used), instead of, in addition, another (feature)
Formal	Definition – features	Beginning	NONE
Informal	Differentia – features – comparison – comparison	Beginning	Also (called), while, similarities, both, and (same feature)

The above table reveals how students framed definition as a writing technique. Although most students are familiar with formal and informal definitions, there was difficulty in substituting the term with another word (genus). Most preferred informal definitions by describing the subject (features), giving the functions, or directly enumerating the parts of the subject instead of amplifying it. Only two started the output with ‘etymology’ hence, it was not considered out of intertextuality.

Informal definitions were done mostly with comparison or contrast or with analogy. But although writers were with references, ESP respondents did not know how to frame ideas to come up with formal definitions. It was a lot easier for the teacher-researcher to check the outputs since only one did not start with either a formal or an informal definition. Generally, definers did not consider this technique difficult especially as to where the definitions were to be placed evident in their outputs.

The best and the safest frames for definitions, either formal or informal, were in the beginning sentences or a special section in the introduction to easily present the subject. To most of the Engineering students, framing written discourses for definition was not a problem.

**Table 2: For Mechanism**

Transition	Word/s and Phrases used	Emphasis/Effect
Parts– function – features (parts)	is composed, used as, is consists of, are approximately (size), in the first floor, in the second floor, would benefit	composition, function & benefit
Formal definition –function (compared to) – parts - process	which is an, to reduce, is very effective, compared to, the primary parts, by which, to test/ a way of testing	Definition & parts, and process
Informal definition (functions), parts– features	the necessity, to/may improve, that provides, requires manpower, to properly work, should be put, mainly consists of	Functions
Informal definition (features) - parts – features(of the parts)– process	is a process, can perform by, is designed, to facilitate, the versatility, is facilitated, first, second, third, to do, is produced	Features & Process
Informal definition (features) – parts –features -	has parts with different functions, is divided into different parts, that can scan and print, whatever you want to print, can be used, to have a copy, will be used, can create, are used to make it work	Features
Informal definition (functions) – parts – functions (of the parts), features (of each parts)	be considered, must be used, first (to enumerate the features), are primarily used, to access, are implemented, which includes, which is, should be sufficient to prevent, have to be used carefully, because of the exposure, because of the exposure, is used to make, to attain	Functions, Parts & Features
Informal definition (functions)– parts - features (of each part)	enables us to be informed and to be guided, basically warns, could possibly happen, at some point, once it hits the critical level, would be responsible, another important parts, play a vital role, connect every single part, resulting to efficient flow of the mechanism	Function, Parts & Features (for the whole mechanism)
Informal definition – (features of the project)–parts – features (of the parts)	can be constructed, are extremely important parts, include the following, has advantages and disadvantages, is unique in appearance from the others	Features
Informal definition – (parts) – features (of the parts)	is consists of, which are connected, also has, are used, has also, is connected, to be powered, that flow through, is accepted, when these are met, now supplies power to	Features
Informal definition (features)– parts – functions (of the parts)	is designed for, is uniquely assembled for, is composed of, to help, that will effectively and efficiently help, will aid in detecting, is connected to, is located, are interconnected, to suffice, to detect, to alarm	Features
Informal definition (by comparison) – functions – parts - features (of the parts)	are inevitable, due to this, will be of great help, as a, to help, gives a warning through, to start (enumerate the parts), which plays, that detects, is also, connects to the other parts, connects to be fixed, not to be removed, one of the vital parts, all in all, will not function without the other	Features, Parts & Features of Parts (in relation to the whole mechanism)
Formal definition (functions)– parts – features (of the part) – more parts (toward the whole system)	is a type, that can consist, has different uses, when it is connected, when you start, can produce, will now be charging, with this, has connector on it, in making this mechanism, are the principal parts, that make up,	Functions, Parts, & Features (toward the whole system)
Informal definition (features)– parts - features (of the parts)	enables, to access, also, is capable of, uses, to account, are authorized, that handles, are settled, at the end, is presented, that has, has specific parts, that is capable, is read, an owner authentication, that is, that specializes, that is secured	Features & Parts
Informal definition (features - toward the whole system) – parts – (features of the parts)	allows, to turn, into an, allows, to charge, while you are on the go, to listen to music, while cycling, consists of, as a whole, in order to install, the necessary parts, of any kind, that fits, must be mounted, onto the handle bars, that is included, allows, in front of, protects, from any, due to its, takes, requires, should be placed, in front of, converts, of the wheel turning, into electrical energy, that can be used, to charge	Features, Parts & Features
Features – informal definition – functions - features	is through, is a process, that captures, that would otherwise be, is a process, uses, to enable, can be used as, of transforming, into electrical energy, that can be stored, use to power other, can provide, to traditional power, to operate	Features, Definition, Functions & Features
Informal definition (parts) - functions – comparisons	made up of, makes, through the, is made up of, is catchy, serves, than, also, is more important, than, would be one of the, that would make, more productive	Functions (Comparison)
Informal definition (parts) – features – functions	is made up of, becomes, to support, weighs about, can run and walk, when is not activated, can use as, that supports, to sit, use to create, because of, to produce, to help	Parts, Features & Functions
Formal definition – features – parts - process	is a, that sorts, separates, that sorts, is located inside, that will be operated, that actually separates, has different processes, will be brought, to begin the process, will sense, if it is	Features & Parts
Informal definition (parts) – informal definition (another name) – functions	is consists, also known as, are connected, is also an, can be used, to sense, so that the, will be cancelled, lastly, are used, to assure, that the entire, will be able, to withstand, will be able, to give, to passengers	Parts & Functions
Formal definition – parts – functions (of each parts) – features (of each parts)	is a, that can navigate through, for the machine to function are the following parts, are responsible, is the most essential, is the frame, is the, are inside, exceptional part is, that has, can navigate, through different areas, are the other parts of the, without these, cannot serve, is a, that controls, and other parts	Functions, Parts, & Functions & Features

Table 2 shows the manner of students' intertextualizing discourses for mechanism as ESP writing technique. Respondents found the method easier done with a definition of the subject. The transition shows the flow of discussion beginning with definition followed by the expected content. Emphasis of the technique was to frame the parts to produce an effect but students missed to merge the two. Writers only focused on the parts of the project. Although there were effects evident in the used of the above phrasal structures, most sounded 'important' if not 'beneficial' to the readers. Functions were mistaken effects where most respondents reiterated in their writing.

Why respondents failed to frame correctly mechanism as a technique in ESP writing were because of: their lack of knowledge of the relationship between the two (mistake proofing) and because respondents were unaware of the transitional devices to be used to mean effect or of the rhetorical functions in academic writing. Mistake proofing is the use of any automatic device or method that either makes it impossible for an error to occur or makes the error immediately obvious once it has occurred (Tague, 2004). This occurred in the study when respondents considered transitional devices used a minor error early in the process which caused major problems later in the process or when such consequence became a product of 'mistaken identity'.

**Table 3: For Process**

Process Description	Voice	Point of View	Transition	Transitional devices
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	has developed – features – parts – features (of parts)	before, then,
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	is the development – processes	first, second, third, after,
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	Processes	first, second, third, fourth, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject - features – processes	since (time), planning (first step), the second step, , this (3 <sup>rd</sup> process), all these (referring to all the processes)
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	parts –feature (2 methods) – processes (two methods discussed)	first , after (the second method)
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup> – 1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (feature) – processes- parts – features	first, next, and then, when clause (time)
Informational	active	1 <sup>st</sup>	Subject (compared) - processes	first, then, next, lastly
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (feature) – processes-	first, second, third, fourth, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (feature) - processes	first, then, next, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features)	NONE
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	processes	first step, second, third, then
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (formal definition) – features - processes- subparts	basic steps: (enumerated with v-ing: creating, ensuring, receiving), (generally include)
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features) - processes	solder (first step), Next, before inserting, place (the next step), arm (next step), hook (next step), once removed
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (function) – feature – process – parts (in the first process) - processes	first, when clause, then, after that, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (function) - processes	first, next, lastly, and then, and lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features)	go, to adjust
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features) – parts – processes	after (placing), now
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (background – the problem), processes	finding (first step), then, also
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (function) - processes	first, next, after v-ing, now
Informational	active	1 <sup>st</sup>	subject with its 3 main parts– processes	starting (referring to the first step), cleaning (second), stopping (third), after, when clause
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	processes	first, second, third, then, after, lastly

Table 3 is indicates the respondents familiarity with the simple presentation of the series or stages. Processes were based on the time of occurrences evident with the used of transitional device to mean time when the actions were taken. What seemed a problem for the respondents was framing the process description; half resorted to instructional (how-to essay) giving readers directions on how to do something generally written in the passive voice and the point of view was 1<sup>st</sup> person, while the other half opted for informational (explanation essay) telling readers how something was developed generally written in the active voice and with 3<sup>rd</sup> person point of view.

What was surprising on the teacher was the transition of the discourses. Some respondents started with the subject descriptions before moving toward the processes. This is because the researcher found the respondents' lack of knowledge on the description of time elements. Academic writers used 'fix time' over 'chronological time'. Fix time transitional devices indicate specific time like the ones used by the respondents.

Chronological time which were neglected to apply in writing as the term suggests is a description of time sequence of the order in which events unfold in time. First, secondly, then, next, after, before, after that, lastly, and the when clauses to mean before and after were the commonly used transitional devices for description of process. Main steps were enumerated but no one followed the major steps with sub steps.

**Table 4: For Partition and Classification**

Partition			Classification				
Definition	Division	Principle	Subject	Definition	Subdivision	Analysis	Explain
	☺	☺	☺		☺	☺	☺
☺		☺	☺	☺			
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺			
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺		
☺	☺		☺	☺			
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺			
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺		
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺		
☺	☺	☺	☺	☺			
☺	☺	☺	☺		☺	☺	
	☺		☺	☺	☺	☺	
			☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
			☺	☺	☺		
	☺	☺	☺	☺		☺	
☺	☺		☺	☺			
			☺	☺	☺		
			☺	☺	☺	☺	☺

Very obvious with the result of the study as shown in the above table, the respondents' definition of the specie followed by the division of either the main parts if not the subparts. In some cases, respondents missed to include the guiding principle/s (one by one) as the basis for such division/s if not in another case overlapping with one another. During the checking, what surprised the teacher was the manner of framing the ideas for this type of writing technique. There was no overlapping in the two tasks because it was noticed that when the partitioning is done, the other half is missed to be included and vice versa, when classification is done, there was no partitioning in the whole content.

The intertextuality of the respondents written outputs were seen as a meta discourse. Hyland (2015) considers this discourse analysis as the organization of the writer's stance in either its content or the reader's perspective. One reason thought of by the researcher for writer's scare to do initial divisions or further subdivisions is the scare to explain across languages. Using a second language to further writing hindered the respondents to extend discourses. The paper concluded after the discussion of the techniques in writing. With the instructional strategies employed, the researcher hoped to facilitate learning and enhance the academic writing skills among ESL students specifically on the techniques in technical writing.



The following analysis and conclusions were drawn in the study:

In the Philippines, most students have not engaged in creative writing during secondary school education. Moreover, they were not introduced to writing in different discipline but only at university. Writing to high school teachers is synonymous to teaching and learning grammar. At the university level on the other hand, students are expected to have better understanding of grammar rules although grammatical competence is not enough to withstand challenges in writing. Students are less involved to equip themselves with skills important in academic writing in college. Therefore, monitoring the development through the assessing and grouping of academic skill levels of learners can be arduous and challenging for ESL instructors. Process approaches focused on cognitive strategies applied to writing tasks were observed during the writing process. Respondents worked independently with their readings and the right instruction. Through this approach, the process allows the student to develop one's own voice and they become more self-directed (Matsuda, 2003).

Before the students were asked, constructivist or socio-cultural theories of learning were observed where the learners engaged with instructors and peers in social setting to develop academic thoughts necessary for academic writing. Before the engagement, communicating was an active process, the cognitive theory for skill development and gradual elimination of errors while respondents internalized the academic language (Myles, 2002). The notion of "scaffolding" emerged from Vygotsky's concept of "zone of proximal development" which refers to the distance between achievements of learners by their own efforts and what they can achieve through assisted interactions was noticed during the writing process. Pratt-Johnson (2008) suggests that ESL learners must be taught to write effectively and not just correctly, and to construct academic texts and organize coherent written academic discourses (Hinkel, 2002).

With students' behavior, coming up with ideas was a new concept to them.

Study participants were not familiar with the techniques in writing although discussion of the methods was made prior to the writing activity. This failure was probably caused by their lack of experience in writing such genres which were never offered in their previous subjects focused on grammar. Even though the professor explained some key elements of the assigned tasks in the class, study participants could not understand the nature of paper. They began writing a paper with a vague understanding of the required skill. In other words, when the respondents wrote, they did not know much about what they were supposed to write in the paper and how they were supposed to do it. They were given ideas and from the readings they have as references, they still did not know how to put the thoughts together to come up with a good conversation. Study participants who were asked to write had no ideas what it meant by "their own ideas." Writing in which a writer's own idea is usually a very important part in putting together in their writing knowledge/information they already have or they get from references. Another difficulty study participants faced was the way English texts were structured. There were many differences between in the ways of developing the paragraphs assigned to each and connecting supporting ideas. In English academic writing, there were specific formats that writers should follow and adherence to such writing individual technique gave each trouble understanding of the whole texts.

To the study participants, the most difficult part was how to put the thought together. They had to spend time following the structure to follow the techniques. They easily started the paragraphs; define the term for definition, enumerate the movable parts for mechanism, give initial step for process, and dividing a unit into its component parts for partition and classification. The succeeding parts of the paragraphs seemed awkward. They knew how to follow the format and tried to make sentences clear. But even with readings as references for writing, they still consumed so much time doing each task. The whole framing process was stressful to the respondent writers. Although there was the absence of inerrability and presuppositions, there were long frustrating moments in front of beginning sentences and more long moments rearranging and improving the whole paragraph. When writing critically, it is important to explain why something is the case. One needs to give reasons and explanations for any claims one makes (McElroy & Swanson, 1968).

To fix this 'mistaken identity', there is a need to consider the phrasal structures for mechanism as a writing technique in the academic field; results in, leads to, produces, causes, is the cause of, gives rise to, brings about, resulting in, leading to, producing, causing, giving rise to, bringing, about, leads to, produces, causes, is the cause of, brings about, one effect/ result of, one consequence of, caused by, due to, because of, results from, arises from, reason for, cause of, is that, could be that, owing to, results from, arising from, is due to, maybe due to, therefore, so, thus, hence, consequently, because of this, for this reason, as a consequence, as a result, as a result of which,

as a consequence of which, and with the result that. ESP writers in the study do not have control over the too much use of 'fix time' time transitions simply because they do not have the knowledge on when to intertextualize 'chronological time description' as time frames or time periods along with associated vocabulary such as: from . . . to, by . . . until..., during..., when . . . , by the time..., between . . . and..., in (month/year/period) . . . , (period: e.g. in June; in the 1900s; in the particular period), at (precise time of day, e.g. at 10 o'clock; at midday), on (day/date), before, subsequently, previously, at the same time, prior to, later (than), earlier (than), next, simultaneously, followed (by) preceded, in parallel X, preceded Y X, succeeded Y, concurrently, respectively, and later on.

### ***Teaching Approach***

There was a gap between what students expected from the teacher-researcher's teaching approaches. All participants worked really hard according to them and they expected the researcher to see their efforts and the strength of their written output for good markings if not minimal errors for revision. They did not mind even red-penned negative comments if the comments explained what problems their papers had and how they could be improved. (Giridharan, 2006). They wanted to receive feedback with details so that they could improve their writing skills. During the revision, comments like delete, replace, paraphrase, have in-text citation were problematic to the respondents. In addition, just underlining sentences without any comments did not help study participants. The worst part of the checking was when students received a 'change' comment since the respondents who had such comment had to make another paragraph for the writing technique prepared was wrong; a mechanism instead of partition and classification or vice versa. Both have the same attributes that confused the respondents. As to those who were assigned to write definition, most started with formal definition then moved to informal. What was not surprising was the writing of process. Most of the students assigned to writing such technique were mostly correct. It was easier for the writers to follow such format with the presence of transitional devices connecting each stage to the next.

### ***Teaching Approach and Its Impact***

The researcher found the revision most productive on the learners. During the revision, the researcher observed comparing of scores and markings. The teacher allowed the respondents to move around and exchange ideas with those who had the same technique. Involvement of students came in when peer assistance was tolerated. Part of the teacher's strategy was to let students check their mistakes with their peer outputs. Generally, respondents were not negative about the result of the checking although few were passive thinking that there was bias in the markings made. Despite much effort and time in doing the task, they perceived the critiquing was unjustly even when they compared their written works with others. Others felt disappointed at first but upon comparing, some became aware of their mistakes and confidently and independently revised the paper.

### ***Conclusions***

To students dealing with unfamiliar topics, much guide, and assistance is expected from the teachers. There will always be the feeling of being ignored when help is asked especially in a large ESP writing class. Strategies should be employed to minimize such negative thoughts, aid the students toward correct writing, and ease the burden of too loaded writing teachers. Although students need remediation in writing, several rounds of negative experiences with professors may lead study participants to hesitate to actively seek information needed for revision and sometimes completely withdraw from effort to improve their papers. Their engagements in learning were influenced to a great extent, positively or negatively, by their professors' attitudes toward them, and their interactions with professors motivated them to work harder or made them give up. Except for their own effort to learn, professors were the most influential factor for these students' learning (Leki, 2001). There may be some responsive professors to the needs of the students in writing and these supportive attitudes have a psychological impact on study participants. Professors' attitudes enhance or deter students' confidence and effort to learn. Their perceptions of their professors as supporters lead them to work harder.

Professors' duty is to help students learn what they do not know, not to find out students' weaknesses and blame them for the weaknesses. A good learning environment is one where all students are treated equally and get equal attention, but it seems that there are not many classrooms in higher education measuring up to this standard. Who is responsible for a positive or negative learning environment? They are the professors who create a learning environment, positive or negative, for their students.

When students are not able to meet certain standards, professors need to ask themselves, “What are other explanations for students’ difficulty meeting my expectations?” (Thonus, 2003). Professors play a great role in students’ learning, especially ESL students’ learning. Strategies employed in an ESL class are the most influential factor for ESL students’ enthusiasm as well as their involvement in learning. It is the responsibility of each individual professor to create an open environment so that ESL students learn in a more positive learning environment (Harris, 2000; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 2000). Teaching approaches and teachers’ attitudes toward their students show how they view them, and this in turn influences students’ learning behaviors (Elbow, 2000; Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Zamel, 2000).

When professors recognize and appreciate students’ capability in many other aspects, they try harder (King, 2000). Professors’ positive attitude may boost their enthusiasm for learning and confidence in themselves as learners.

### **The Author**

Susana Melon-Galvez is an Associate Professor at Bulacan State University. She finished her Master of Arts in Teaching with Specialization in English Language Arts at the Philippine Normal University (Manila). She is Ph.D candidate working for the completion of her dissertation in Educational Management at Bulacan State University. Her research interests are in strategies in teaching English Language, writing technical correspondence, applied linguistics, and ESP. She received a Diamond Award as Best Paper Presenter in an international conference held in Bacolod Philippines last February, 2013. She had presented in several international conferences; in Japan and in Thailand in 2014 and in Turkey in 2015.

### **References**

- Bardine B. A. (1999). Students’ perceptions of written teacher comments: What do they say about how we respond to them? *High School Journal*, 82, 239-247. Bogdan R. C., Green, J. (cited Burke, A.) (2007). Burke, Inc. Review Brand Atlas.
- Elbow P. (2000). Embracing contraries in the teaching process. In Corbett E. P.
- Giridharan, B. (2006). Identifying Gaps in Academic Writing of ESL Students\* Curtin University, Miri, Malaysia
- Harris J. B. (2000). Equity: Philosophy, practice, and policy. *Principal Leadership*, 1(4), 20-25.
- Hinds J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Connor U., Kaplan R. B. (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 test* (pp. 143-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers’ text*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. *Background report for Korea*. Seoul, Korea: Yemoon Press.
- Hyland, K. (2015). Meta discourse. Published Online: DOI: 10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi003 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All
- King K. P. (2000). The adult ESL experience: Facilitating perspective transformation in the classroom. *Adult Basic Education*, 10(2), 68-89.
- Leki, L. (2001). Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 197-209.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 65-83.
- McElroy, W. & Swanson, C. (1968) (Eds.), *Rhetorical functions in academic writing: Reasons and explanations*. Foundations of biology. Prentice-Hall.
- Miles M. B., Huberman A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Johnson D. M., Roen D. H. (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 207-219). New York, NY: Longman.
- Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ*, 6(2).
- Nero S. J. (2005). Language, identity, and ESL pedagogy. *Language and Education*, 19, 194-211.
- Olivas, M., & Li, C. (2006). Understanding stressors of international students in higher education: What college counselors and personnel need to know. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 33, 217-222.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. London: Sage Publications.

- Peet, K. (1997). Teaching academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 183-205.
- Pratt-Johnson, Y. (2008). Promoting acquisition of academic vocabulary in English-medium secondary education in the USA.
- Pratt D., Kelly M., Wong W. S. S.(1999). Chinese conceptions of effective teaching in Hong Kong towards culturally sensitive evaluation of teaching. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 18, 241-258.
- Punch, K. F. (1998). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Sage Publications: California.
- Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Reid J. M. (1989). English as second language composition in higher education: The expectations of the academic audience. In Johnson D. M., Roen D. H. (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 220-235). New York, NY: Longman.
- Rose, M. (1989). *Lives on the boundary: The struggles and achievements of America's underprepared*. New York, N. Y.: The Free Press, Macmillan, Inc..
- Shin S., Koh M.(2007). A cross-cultural study of teachers' beliefs and strategies on classroom behavior management in urban American and Korean school systems. *Education and Urban Society*, 39, 286-309.
- Simic, M. (1994). Computer assisted writing instruction. Retrieved October 20, 2010, from [http://www.indiana.edu/~eric\\_rec/ieo/digests/d97.html](http://www.indiana.edu/~eric_rec/ieo/digests/d97.html)
- Vélez-Rendón G., Wood S.(2003). Second language writing up close and personal: Some success stories. In Kroll B. (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 93-114). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sommers N.(1996). Responding to student writing. In Leeds B. (Ed.), *Writing in a second language: Insights from first and second language teaching and research*(Paper first published in *College, Composition and Communication* in 1982, pp. 155-172). New York, NY: Longman.
- Tague, N.r. (2004). *The Quality Toolbox, Second Edition*, ASQ Quality Press, pages 351–356.
- Thomas J.(1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.
- Thonus T. (2003). Serving generation 1.5 learners in the university writing center. *TESOL Journal*, 12(1), 17-24.
- Tucker D. L.(2003). Understanding learning styles and study strategies of Korean students in American colleges and universities. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 478616)
- Wiseman, D. C. (1999). *Research strategies for education*. London: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Youngs C. S., Youngs G. A. Jr.(2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes towards ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 97-120.
- Zamel V.(1996). Responding to student writing. In Leeds B. (Ed.), *Writing in a second language: Insights from first and second language teaching and research* (pp.155-172). New York, NY: Longman.
- Zamel V.(2000). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. In Corbett E. P. J., Myers N., Tate G. (Eds.), *The writing teacher's sourcebook* (4th ed., pp. 100-112). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (The paper first appeared in *College, Composition, and Communication*, 46, 1995, pp. 506-521)