



مجلة علمية نصف سنوية محكمة متخصصة في العلوم الإنسانية
تصدرها جامعة صبراتة بشكل الكتروني

Exploring the Writing Process of Libyan EFL Students at Faculty of Education –Janzour

استكشاف عملية كتابة الطلاب الليبيين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في كلية التربية بجنزور

هناة عبدالنبي علي الكالي

Assistant Professor at English Language Department, Faculty of Education- Janzour

University of Tripoli, Libya

أستاذ مساعد بقسم اللغة الانجليزية بكلية التربية بجنزور، جامعة طرابلس

elkalihana@gmail.com

رقم الإيداع القانوني بدار الكتب الوطنية:

2017-139

الترقيم الدولي:

ISSN (print) 2522 - 6460

ISSN (Online) 2707 - 6555

الموقع الإلكتروني للمجلة:

<https://jhs.sabu.edu.ly>

Exploring the Writing Process of Libyan EFL Students at Faculty of Education –Janzour

استكشاف عملية كتابة الطلاب الليبيين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في كلية التربية بجنزور

هناء عبدالنبي علي الكالي*

Abstract

Writing is considered one of the most complex skills for both English teachers and learners. Thus, the three stages of the writing process (pre-writing, while writing, and post-writing) play a vital role in producing a good writing outcome and eliminating the writing difficulties that will be confronted by EFL learners. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the writing process in writing the essay that was used by Libyan EFL university students at the Faculty of Education- Janzour, University of Tripoli. The participants were 81 students majoring in the English language who enrolled in the fourth semester of the academic year (2016-2017). The data was gained from the writing process questionnaire which was adapted from Al_Sawalha and Chow (2012). The results indicated that the writing strategies were not frequently used by Libyan students at the Faculty of Education –Janzour. The results also showed the most frequent process writing strategies by the participants were at the writing drafting stage.

Keywords: *writing difficulties - English language teachers and learners - university students.*

استكشاف عملية كتابة الطلاب الليبيين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في كلية التربية بجنزور

ملخص:

تعتبر الكتابة من المهارات المعقدة لكل من معلمي ومتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية. وبالتالي، فإن المراحل الثلاث لعملية الكتابة (ما قبل الكتابة، وأثناء الكتابة، وبعد الكتابة) تلعب دورًا حيويًا في إنتاج نتيجة جيدة للكتابة وللتخلص من صعوبات الكتابة التي سيواجهها متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. لذلك هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى التحقق من عملية الكتابة في كتابة المقال الذي استخدمه طلاب جامعة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بكلية التربية - جنزور - جامعة طرابلس. بلغ عدد المشاركين 81 طالبًا وطالبة في تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية التحقوا بالفصل الرابع من العام الدراسي (2016-2017). تم الحصول على البيانات من استبيان عملية الكتابة المقتبس من Al_Sawalha and Chow (2012). أشارت النتائج إلى عدم استخدام الطلاب الليبيين في كلية التربية بجنزور لاستراتيجيات الكتابة بشكل متكرر. أظهرت النتائج أيضًا أن استراتيجيات الكتابة الأكثر شيوعًا من قبل المشاركين كانت في مرحلة كتابة المسودة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: صعوبات الكتابة - معلمي ومتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية - طلاب الجامعة.

1. Introduction

Among the English language skills, writing is the most demanded and complicated one not only for the EFL/ESL learners but also for EFL/ESL writing teachers. Raofi, *et al.* (2017) Stated that “writing is a complex and multifactorial phenomenon; it is more challenging for learners who write in a language other than their first language”. This claim is in contrast with the findings of El-Aswad’s (2002) study which revealed that interestingly some participants made more errors in L1 than in L2. It could be explained this result is due to writing instructors, in the EFL context, still focusing on the writing product and emphasis on the error correction teaching method which in turn adversely impacts the student’s writing performance. Consequently, the writing teachers “failed to teach students that writing is essentially a process of discovery” Zamel (1982). In other words, “The whole notion of how

* Assistant Professor at English Language Department,
Faculty of Education- Janzour
University of Tripoli, Libya
elkalihana@gmail.com

writers write-where ideas come from, how they are formulated and developed, what the various stages of composing entail- was ignored.” Zamel (1982). Therefore, the students will not master the writing skill either in their mother tongue or a foreign language if they do not effectively employ the writing strategies. In order to assist the students to eliminate their writing difficulties, see themselves as EFL writing achievers, and raising their self-confidence, they should be taught how to use the writing process.

However, according to process-based approach, writing is defined as decision-making processes, strategies, and procedures that have been applied in order to write about the topic (Richards and Schmidt, 2002). Furthermore, they claimed that writing is a process that contains planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising stages. According to writing scholars, there are different divisions of the writing process some of them have 7 stages others have 5 or 3 stages. Petric & Czár (2003) claimed that in order to concern with writing, three writing stages of the writing process should writers go through pre-writing while writing, and post-writing. According to Manchón & Roca de Larios (2007), these writing process stages are recursive in nature and there is no fixed sequence or order in employing them so they may overlap and may use them frequently. According to previous studies, the students in the pre-writing stage (planning) generate and outline the ideas whereas in drafting (while writing stage) the students start writing their paragraph or essay from the beginning to the end. On the other hand, post -the writing stage (reviewing) is the last stage where the students review what has been written in terms of the structure and the content. Generally, the process-centered techniques enable EFL learners to comprehend their own writing processes and to construct their own repertoires of strategies for planning, composing, and revision (Hassan, 1994). Additionally, El-Ashri's (2013) concluded that students who have been taught by using the writing process were outperformed than those who have been taught by traditional writing methods.

On the other hand, the writing process, in general, plays a vital role in enhancing not only the students' writing performance, but also it changes their attitude towards the writing, in particular. Winer (1992) concluded that applying a process approach in composition contributes to changing the students' behavior and attitudes toward writing. Furthermore, using writing process strategies protects the students to have “the writer's block”, and they are “very much like planting seeds. Each time we write paragraphs, we lay down another set of ideas that help us to generate other ideas.” (El-Ashri, 2013). Moreover, Khosravi, *et.al.*, (2017) stated that “a better understanding of learning strategies will lead to more students' interest and motivation and lack of suitable strategies will lead to low motivation for students.” These desirable results of using the writing process approach led to the necessity of applying it in the EFL context.

However, in the Libyan context, not all the college instructors follow the new and effective writing methods in order to assist the learners to master this skill. And usually, almost Libyan university students in writing classes may just apply to choose a topic and writing stages without going through the other stages of the writing process. consequently, these unproductive writing strategies could contribute to a poor writing outcome. In some cases, the students might be aware of some writing strategies, but they do not know how to apply them effectively while they writing. These reasons encouraged the researcher to conduct this study. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the writing process of EFL learners at the Faculty of Education- Janzour. Furthermore, conducting such this could increase the awareness of Libyan writing instructors as well as the EFL students in writing

classes about the effectiveness of the writing process in order to produce a good piece of writing and to master this skill.

2. Research Question

What writing processes do Libyan EFL students at the Faculty of Education – Janzour use in their writing an essay?

3.Literature Review

The following paragraphs shed light on the process of writing stages and the previous related studies.

3.1 The Writing Process

The writing process is “the entire situation encompassing the production of the text beginning from the initial impulse to write something and ending when the writer has finished the work and no longer desires, needs or is able to make further change. In other words, it is everything from the origin of any form of writing nation to the completion of writing expression” Heuring(1984, 17). Accordingly, writing is a process that contains planning, drafting (composting), and reviewing stages (Richards and Schmidt, 2002 ; Emig, 1971).

3.1.2 Planning (Pre-Writing) Stage

The writer uses this stage before writing the task. This stage enables the writer to understand the writing task requirement and to generate ideas about the topic. In other words, “writers usually spend time thinking about the topic and also plan and organize the content of their essays” Elshawish (2014). However, the pre-writing strategies - according to Yu-wen (2007) - are “brainstorming, idea mapping, outlining, cubing, listing, free-writing, looping, track switching, classic invention, and the reporter ‘s formula.”

3.1.2.Writing (Drafting) Stage

The writing stage is the second process of writing stages after the pre-writing. After gathering the ideas and planning and organizing them, the students in this stage concentrate more on the content and not on the form where he/ she start their composing from the beginning to the end. In other words, the students start writing “without being concerned much about spelling, grammar, punctuation or usage”; furthermore, the emphasize “here is on how to prepare a draft, which may have modification in a second draft” Elshawish (2014) .

3.1.3 Reviewing Stage

In this stage the students will review what has been written in order to check the text in terms of coherence and cohesion and if there are any other mistakes such as grammatical or spelling mistakes. The drafts either may be constructed by removing unrelated or unnecessary ideas, or parts, or by extending with new ideas (Tompkins,2004). Flower and Hayes (1981: 376): “...we do not need to define —revision as a unique stage in composing, but as a thinking process that can occur at any time a writer chooses to evaluate or edit his text or his plans. As an important part of writing, it constantly leads to new planning or a —re-vision of what one wanted to say.”

3.2 Related Studies

In the following paragraphs, the previous studies that related to the topic of the current study will be discussed.

Hassan (1994) investigated the effect of the process-oriented quick writing technique as an alternative to traditional writing design on EFL students' essay writing. The results indicated that the quick writing group outperformed the traditional group on the essay writing task. The findings also showed the students concentrated on the content rather than worrying about form as they write non-stop for a set period of time. He concluded that the quick writing technique was effective in improving student performance on an essay writing task and this technique help them to generate ideas thus aiding them to start writing and to get feedback from their peers. Furthermore, Clark and Walker (1980) explored the effect of the speed writing technique on writing fluency. Their results suggested that quick writing practice contributed to enhancing students' performance in situations where time is limited, such as essay-type exams.

Twelve third-year Libyan university students majoring in English were involved in El-Aswad's study (2002). It aimed to investigate the writing processes and strategies in L1 (Arabic) and L2 (English). The study adopted a number of research methods: observation, interviews, think-aloud protocols, questionnaires, and written products in order to collect data in a triangulated case study. The findings showed that the subjects' writing process differences were manifested in planning, time, and content; writing time was shorter in L1 than in L2; reviewing in L1 focused on organization and content, but on form, grammar, and vocabulary in L2. Similarities were apparent in mental planning and reliance on internal resources as the subjects alternated between writing, repeating, and rehearsing. The L2 compositions gradually emerged with repetitions, pauses, and the use of L1, and seemed to be constrained by the subjects' linguistic knowledge and imperfect mastery of L2. He concluded that the composing knowledge and skills of L1 could potentially be transferred into L2 composing, and the subjects had employed many similar strategies deemed necessary for writing in both languages but were unable to apply accurately them in L2. In addition, the subjects used L1 to facilitate their composing in L2. Furthermore, he explained that poor writers tend to use L1 more frequently when writing in L2 than good writers.

Salem and Foo (2012) investigated how writing proficiency influences the writing process of 60 Jordanian EFL students at Yarmouk University in Jordan. The adapted questionnaire used by Petric and Czár (2003) was used to measure the writing strategies. Significant results were found in this study. First, writing processes, according to the overall mean (3.31), were seldom used among students at Yarmouk University in Jordan. Second, English proficiency affected the writing processes used among students at Yarmouk University in Jordan. The respondents, like most Jordanian university students, usually fail to express complex ideas in their writing as they lack the appropriate vocabulary, both general and technical, as is evident in the respondents' answers. The lack of appropriate vocabulary on the part of the respondents affects their writing process. Furthermore, the findings revealed that these low-proficiency respondents did not plan, edit or revised their written essays. The total mean (3.34) of strategies uses in the stage of revising appeared to be higher than that of the stage of planning and writing. The present study used a modified and translated writing process questionnaire by Petric and Czár (2003). This version was modified by Salem and Foo (2012).

El-Ashri's (2013) study aimed to figure out the leverage of a Proposed Post-Process Writing Approach program that required writing skills in English for first-year secondary institutes in Al-Azhar, Egypt. The results showed that the experimental group students made remarkable progress in their writing skills due to the use of the suggested program based on The Post-Process Writing Approach.

Elshawish (2014) conducted a study to explore the writing processes and writing strategies of EFL Libyan University students majoring in English in the fourth year. The data of this study was gained from multiple data collection tools: think-aloud protocols, semi-structured interviews, and observations. The participants of this study were 14 good writers, 6 poor writers, and 3 teacher informants. The results revealed that the writing process, of planning, drafting, and reviewing, was recursive in nature. And it also showed that various main writing strategies such as planning (global and local), rehearsing, drafting, scanning, and revising existed and occurred frequently throughout the writing process. However, El-Aswad (2002) and Elshawish (2014) researches were similar to the current study regarding exploring the writing process that was used by Libyan EFL university students when they were working on their composition.

Abas and AbdAziz (2018) conducted a study to investigate the writing process of Indonesian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. The participants were six proficient EFL students who were doing Postgraduate English Language Studies Program in Indonesia. The results indicated that the participants applied the following writing process: prewriting, planning, drafting, pausing, reading, revising, editing, and publishing.

However, these previous researches emphasized the effectiveness of applying the writing process and its contribution to have remarkable enhancement of writing skill. In other words, following these writing strategies could facilitate the writing-learning process for the teachers and the students. On the other hand, poor writing production could be a result of traditional writing strategies.

6. Methodology

In the following paragraphs, the research design will be discussed.

6.1 The Participant

The participants were 81 female students majoring in the English language who enrolled in the fourth semester (Autumn 2016) of the academic year (2016-2017) at the Faculty of Education –Janzour. Their ages were from 19 to 23 years old. Furthermore, they were studying Writing 3 whose main aim is the students in the subject will be able to write an academic essay at the end of the semester. Writing 3 is 4 credit hours, so the students should attend two lectures per week to have enough exposure to it. All the participants are Libyan, they have a similar educational background, and their first language is Arabic.

6.2 Instruments

This study is quantitative in nature. The data of this study was gained from the adopted questionnaire by Al_Sawalha and Chow (2012). This survey is originally created by Petric and Czár (2003). This original version was modified to be shorter and was translated into Arabic language by Al_Sawalha and Chow (2012). According to them, the purpose of the translation was to gain accurate responses and to avoid misunderstanding. Similarly, the translated version of the writing process survey was used in the current study for the same reason. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first section was about the participants' age and the second section covered the writing process (33) items which cover the three stages of the writing process: (8) statements for planning; (12) statements for writing; (13) statements for revising as illustrated in Table 1. The questionnaire was five-point like rating scale: never =1; seldom =2; sometimes =3; often = 4; always = 5. Additionally, the

mean scores of strategy use, according to Oxford (1990), were categorized into three levels: high (ranging from 3.5 to 5), medium (ranging from 2.4 to 3.5) and low (ranging from 1.0 to 2.4).

Table1: Writing Process Stages

Writing Process Stages	Number of Items
1. Planning	8
2. Writing	12
3. Revising	13

6.3 Procedures

The 81 writing process questionnaire sets were distributed to the participant during Autumn 2016 of the academic year (2016-2017) at the Faculty of Education-Janzour. The students were in their writing classes when the survey was distributed and they were informed that their responses would be used only to achieve the purpose of the study. In order to obtain better results, the subjects were inquired to read carefully the items before giving their answers.

6.4 Data Analysis

SPSS version 20 was used to analyze the data of this research. The descriptive statistical process was utilized to describe the data in an accurate way from each variable; “Descriptive statistics involve summarizing scores by developing tabular or graphical presentations. Descriptive statistics involve measures of the central tendency which is the mean, median, mode, square-root from, and standard deviation (Green, Salkind, and Akely cited in Vela, 2003). In this study, the means and standard deviation were computed.

7. Results of The Study

This part of the paper presents the results which were gained from the writing process questionnaire.

7.1 Writing Process Using in Each Stage

The writing process questionnaire, as mentioned earlier, consists of 33 items divided into three writing stages. **Table 2** illustrates the mean and stander deviation of the usage of writing process stages by Libyan EFL students at faculty of Education- Janzour. The overall mean use of writing process was (3.43) which revealed that the writing strategies were not frequently used by Libyan EFL students at the faculty of education- Janzour, and the level of strategies use by the participants was average. Furthermore, the highest frequently use among the three writing stageswere writing stage with a mean (3.93) and themean of strategy use in the planning (3.17) and revising stage (3.18) were quite similar.

Table 2: The Summary Of The Writing Process's Stages

Writing Process Stages	Mean	Std. Deviation
Planning	3.17	.538

Writing	3.93	.450
Revising	3.18	.473
Overall writing strategy use	3.43	.385

7.2 Pre-Writing Strategies at the Planning Stage

Table 3 shows the mean and the standard deviation of the first stage of the writing process which is pre-writing (planning). According to the prewriting total mean score (3.17) which was the fewest frequent use of writing strategy among the participants. Starting writing with revising the requirements ($m= 4.26$) was the most frequent strategy used by the participants. The second frequent strategy use was that the participants think about what they wanted to write but only in their minds and not on the paper ($m=4.04$). The participants noted down words or short notes related to the topic with a mean (3.64), and they wrote the outline of their paper in English ($m=3.27$). The results showed that the participants looked at a model written by a native speaker or more proficient writers ($m= 2.84$). The mean score for the strategy of starting without having a writing or mental plan was (2.52). There was the similarity between the mean score of the use of making a timetable for the writing process (2.43) and writing notes or outline in Arabic language (2.41) among the Libyan students.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Writing Strategies at Planning Stage

No	The Statements	Mean	Std. deviation
1.	I make a timetable for the writing process.	2.43	1.083
2.	Before I start writing I revise the requirements.	4.26	.978
3.	I look at a model written by a native speaker or more proficient writer.	2.84	1.344
4.	I start writing without having a written or mental plan.	2.52	1.441
5.	I think about what I want to write and have a plan in my mind, but not on paper.	4.04	1.030
6.	I note down words and short notes related to the topic.	3.64	1.352
7.	I write an outline of my paper in English.	3.27	1.508
8.	I write notes or an outline in Arabic.	2.41	1.403
Total		3.17	.538

7.3 While Writing Strategies at Writing Stage

Table 4 presents the mean and the standard deviation of the while writing strategies at the writing stage among the participants of this study. According to the total mean in this table ($m=3.93$), drafting strategies were the most frequent writing process used by the participants compared with the two writing process stages. Specifically, the findings showed that the most frequent strategy used by students is starting their writing with the introduction

($m= 4.65$). This is followed by the use of rereading what they have written to get ideas on how to continue ($m= 4.45$). There was not a big difference between the drafting strategies use for going for sure grammar and vocabulary ($m=4.39$), and the strategy of finding a similar English word that they know if they did not know a word in English ($m=4.37$). The mean scores for the frequent use of strategy 8 and strategy 2 were quite the same ($m= 4.27$) and ($m= 4.21$) respectively. Likewise, the mean scores of applying strategy 5, “I go back to my outline and make changes in it if necessarily.” ($m=3.57$), and the applying of strategy “11. If I don’t know a word in English, I stop writing and look up the word in the dictionary.” ($m=3.57$). While they were writing, the students stopped after a few sentences or a whole paragraph, covering one idea ($m=3.70$) and they write a word in Arabic and later tried to find an appropriate English word ($m=3.62$). Furthermore, the students asked classmates or English teachers to help out when they had problems while writing ($m=3.83$). the fewest students who wrote bits of the text in Arabic and then translated them into English($m=2.77$).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of While Writing Strategies at the Writing Stage

No	The statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	I start with the introduction.	4.65	.748
2.	I stop after each sentence to read it again.	4.21	1.126
3.	I stop after a few sentences or a whole paragraph, covering one idea.	3.70	.980
4.	I reread what I have written to get ideas how to continue.	4.45	.967
5.	I go back to my outline and make changes in it if necessarily.	3.57	1.274
6.	I write bits of the text in Arabic and then translate them into English.	2.77	1.434
7.	I go for sure in grammar and vocabulary.	4.39	1.080
8.	I simplify what I want to write if I don’t know how to express my thoughts in English.	4.27	.936
9.	If I don’t know a word in English, I write it in Arabic and later try to find an appropriate English word.	3.62	1.374
10.	If I don’t know a word in English, I find a similar English word that I know.	4.37	.941
11.	If I don’t know a word in English, I stop writing and look up the word in the dictionary.	3.53	1.152
12.	I ask classmates or English teacher to help out when I have problems while writing.	3.83	1.212
Total		3.93	.450

7.4 Descriptive Statistics of Strategies at the Revising Stage

As illustrated in Table 5, the total mean score of revising stage was the second most frequent use of the writing process among Libyan students at the Faculty of Education- Janzour. The most frequent use of writing revising strategies among the participants was checking the mistakes after getting back the paper with feedback from the teachers, trying to

learn from them (m=4.51), and checking if the essay matched the requirements (m= 4.18). Furthermore, the participants only read what they have written when they have finished the whole paper (m=3.96). They made changes in vocabulary (3.08), and they focused on one thing at a time when revising (m=3.07). When the participants revised their writing, they made changes in sentence structure (m=2.79) and made changes in the structure of the essay (m=2.60). The mean score of the strategy “I leave the text aside for a couple of days and then I can see it in a new perspective” was 2.67. The fewest frequent strategy use among the participants was handing in the paper without reading it when it has been finished (m=1.60).

Table5: Descriptive Statistics of Writing Strategies at Revising Stage

No	The Statements	Mean	Std. deviation
1.	I only read what I have written when I have finished the whole paper.	3.96	1.382
2.	When I have written my paper, I hand it in without reading it.	1.60	.996
3.	I make changes in vocabulary.	3.08	.965
4.	I make changes in sentence structure.	2.79	1.036
5.	I make changes in the structure of the essay.	2.60	1.114
6.	I make changes in the content or ideas.	2.91	1.109
7.	I focus on one thing at a time when revising (e.g., content, structure)	3.07	1.385
8.	I drop my first draft and start writing again.	3.00	1.405
9.	I check if my essay matches the requirements.	4.18	1.077
10.	I leave the text aside for a couple of days and then I can see it in a new perspective.	2.67	1.255
11.	I show my text to somebody and ask for his/her opinion.	3.53	1.305
12.	I compare my paper with the essays written by my classmates on the same topic.	3.51	1.185
13.	I check my mistakes after I get back the paper with feedback from the teachers, and try to learn from them.	4.51	.882
Total		3.18	.473

8. Discussion

The findings as presented in Table 2 revealed that the overall mean of writing process use among Libyan EFL students (m=3.43) was moderate. According to the writing strategies classification of Oxford(1990), the medium level is ranging from (2.4 to 3.5). It could be said that the writing process strategies were not frequently used by Libyan students at the Faculty of Education –Janzour. On the other hand, this level of writing process use conforms to that of Salem and Foo(2012) who investigated how writing proficiency influences the writing process of 60 Jordanian EFL students at Yarmouk University in Jordan. The adapted questionnaire used by Petric and Czár (2003), which was also used in the current study, was

used to measure the writing strategies. The results showed that the writing processes were seldom use among students at Yarmouk University in Jordan withan overall mean (3.31).

As illustrated in **Table 3**, the findings showed that the writing strategies in the planning stage were the least frequent use among Libyan students. Furthermore, the findings indicated that the students were depending more on usingmental planningrather than writing one. The logical explanation for this result might be because of being unfamiliar with the importance of written outline which avoid them from forgetting the importantideas, prevent them from the mental block and enable them to generate ideas that related to their writing. This justification receives further support by the claim of El-Ashri (2013) who stated that using writing process strategies protects the students to have “the writer’s block”, and they are “very much like planting seeds. Each time we write paragraphs, we lay down another set of ideas that help us to generate other ideas.” Furthermore, this finding aligns with those of in El-Aswad’s study (2002). His study aimed to investigate the writing processes and strategies in L1 (Arabic) and L2 (English) among twelve third-year Libyan university students majoring in English. His findings showed the similarities were apparent in mental planning and reliance on internal resources.

In terms of the writing stage (see Table 4), the total mean score ofthe writing stage (3.93) indicated that drafting was the most frequent writing process use compared to the other writing process stages. The rationale of this result may be due to the Libyan students might be taught by a product approach thatemphasizes the error correction teaching method which prevents them from mastering the writing skill. Therefore, the participants focus on the draft strategies in the writing stage rather than those of planning and revising. This justification can be associated withZamel’s (1982) claim that the teachers who employ the product approach “failed to teach students that writing is essentially a process of discovery”. However, this result contradicts with that of Salem and Foo(2012) who found that writing strategies in the writing stage were the least frequent use among Jordan students. Furthermore, the findings in the present study revealed that students interchanged between pausing, using L1, and repeating. This result echoes similar results reported in El-Aswad’s study (2002)which found that the L2 compositions gradually emerged with repetitions, pauses, and the use of L1.

According to the results of revising stage of the writing process, the students frequently employed strategies that related to reviewing the errors related to the vocabulary and grammar after getting back the paper with feedback from the teachers and trying to learn from them. Furthermore, the most frequent writing strategy use in this stage wasrevising if their compositions matched with the requirements. Furthermore, the results revealed that the Libyan students tended torepeat parts of the text concerning to the content or the structure of their writing. However, these results are compatible with those of El-Aswad’s study (2002).

Generally, the findings indicated that the writing process (planning, writing, and reviewing) of EFL Libyan students were generative, explanatory, and recursive process. This result lends weight to a claim made by Manchón & Roca de Larios (2007) who said that these writing process stages are recursive in nature and there is no fixed sequence or order in employing them so they may overlap and may use them frequently. Furthermore, This result is compatible with those of Elshawish (2014), Salem and Foo(2012), and Abasa and Abd Aziz (2018).

9. Conclusion

The study aimed to investigate the process of writing of EFL Libyan students at the Faculty of Education –Janzour. Eighty-one participants were involved to complete the writing

process questionnaire. However, it could be concluded that the Libyan students had a medium level of the writing process use, and they tended to employ the writing strategies stage more than those in the planning and reviewing stages.

Any research has its own findings and limitations, and this study is not an exception. This study was limited in the number of the instruments involved in this study. The present study findings had been obtained from just the questionnaire. Therefore, the results might have been enriching data about the writing process if other data collecting methods such as observation and interview had been applied. However, based on the findings of the present study the following implication for Libyan students will be provided:

The findings of the current study indicated that writing process strategies were not frequently used by Libyan students at the Faculty of Education –Janzour according to their medium level to use. Thus, the writing instructor should increase their awareness of applying the writing process approach in teaching writing due to its effectiveness in enhancing the students' writing outcomes. Therefore, the students who have been taught by applying The Post-Process Writing Approach made remarkable progress in their writing (El-Ashri, 2013).

Furthermore, the EFL writing teachers should employ a writing process approach with the students because will prevent the learners from negative affective factors such as anxiety, low self-confidence, and low motivation. Therefore, applying the process approach in composition contributes to changing the students' behavior and attitudes towards writing Winer (1992), and "a better understanding of learning strategies will lead to more students' interest and motivation and lack of suitable strategies will lead to low motivation for students." Khosravi, *et.al*, (2017).

Additionally, the findings also showed that the writing strategies in the planning stage were less frequently used by the participant and they depend on the mental planning rather than the written one. The students should be taught the beneficial impact of the planning stage in generating ideas, protecting them from mental block, and being fluent in writing (El-Ashri's, 2013 Clark and Walker, 1980, Hassan, 1994).

References

- Abas, I. H., and Abd Aziz, N. H. (2018). Model of the Writing Process and Strategies of EFL Proficient Student Writers: *A Case Study of Indonesian Learners. Social sciences and humanities*. 26 (3). 1-28.
- Binandeh, M. (2017). An Investigation into Writing Strategies and Writing Proficiency of University Students. *Journal of Laning guage Teaching and Research*, 8(1),191-198.
- Clark, D., and Walker, D. (1980). Speedwriting: A Technique for Improving Writing Fluency. *English teaching forum*. 20-21.
- Elshawish, M., F. (2014). *Investigating The Writing Strategies of Fourth Year Libyan University Students of English: Strategy Differences Between Good And Poor Writers Of English* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation), Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, UK.
- El-Ashri, I. (2013). The Leverage of a Proposed Post – Process Writing Approach Program. *International Refereed & Indexed Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 1(2), 167-194
- El-Aswad, A. (2002). *A Study of The L1 And L2 Writing Processes And Strategies of Arab Learners With Special Reference to Third-Year Libyan University Students*. PhD., University of Newcastle, Department of Education

- Emig, J. (1971). *The Composition Processes of Twelfth Graders*, Urbana, Illinois :National Council of Teachers of English.
- Flower, L.S., And Hayes, J. R. (1980). *The Dynamics Of Composing: Making Plans And Juggling Constraints*. In L.W. Gregg, And E.R. Steinberg (Eds). *Cognitive Processing In Writing*. pp.31-50, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc.
- Hassan, B., A (1994). *The Effects of Quick Writing Technique on EFL Student's Essay Writing*. *Mansoura Faculty of Education Journal*, 115-135.
- Hueuring, D. L. (1984). *The Revision Strategies of Skilled And Unskilled Writers: Five Case Studies*. Unpublished M.A Thesis. Honolulu: University of Hawaii At Manoa.
- Khosravi, M., Ghoorchaei, B. & Arabmofrad, A. (2017). *The Relationship between Writing Strategies, Self-Efficacy and Writing Ability: A Case of Iranian EFL Students*. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 5(3). 96-102.
- Manchón, R. and Roca de Larios, J. (2007). *Writing-To-Learn In Instructed Language Learning Contexts*. In E.Alcón Soler & M. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 101-121). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Oxford, R.L. 1990. *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle..
- Petric, B. & Czár, B. (2003). *Validating a writing strategy questionnaire*. *System*, 31(2), 187-215
- Raooft, S., Rahmani, S.,
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. Pearson press.
- Salem, A.M.A, and Foo, V.T.(2012). *The Effects of Proficiency on The Writing Process of Jordanian EFL University Students*. *Academic Research International*, 3(2). 379-388
- Tompkins, G. E. (2004). *Teaching Writing: Balancing Product and Process*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vela, R. H. (2003). *The Role of Emotional Intelligence in the Academic Achievement of First Year College Students*. Unpublished Ph, D. Thesis. Texas A and M University-Kingsville.
- Winer, L. (1992). *Spinach to chocolate: Changing awareness and attitudes in ESL writing teachers*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 57-79.
- Yu-Wen, W. 2007. *Evaluating writing strategy instruction in a Chinese EFL university context*. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 4 (2), 11-17.
- Zamel. V. (1982). *Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, (2).195-209.

Appendix

Writing Process Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out the writing process using by EFL Libyan students in writing an essay. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.

Part 1 :

Gender الجنس: Female انثى _____ Male ذكر _____ (please put X)

Age العمر: _____ years

Part 2 :

Instructions: in this part, you will find statements about three different stages of the writing process in English: before writing, 2. While writing, and when revising. Please read each statement carefully and tick (√) the answer indicating how true of you the statement is.

1. Before I start writing an essay in English

	Before I start writing an essay in English	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1	I make a timetable for the writing process. اضع جدول زمني لعملية الكتابة.					

2	Before I start writing I revise the requirements. قبل البدء في الكتابة أراجع المتطلبات					
3	I look at a model written by a native speaker or more proficient writer. اطلع علي نموذج كتابي من قبل متحدثين أصليين للغة أو علي نماذج كتبت من قبل الكتاب الأكثر مهارة.					
4	I start writing without having a written or mental plan. أبدأ بعملية الكتابة دون امتلاك خطة مكتوبة أو ذهنية.					
5	I think about what I want to write and have a plan in my mind, but not on paper. أفكر في ما أريد كتابته ولدي خطة في ذهني، ولكن ليس على الورق.					
6	I note down words and short notes related to the topic. أدون الملاحظات والكلمات القصيرة المتعلقة بالموضوع المراد الكتابة عنه.					
7	I write an outline of my paper in English. أكتب الخطوط العريضة باللغة الإنجليزية.					
8	I write notes or an outline in Arabic. أكتب ملاحظات أو خطوط عريضة باللغة العربية.					

2. while writing in English

	while writing in English	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1.	I start with the introduction أبدأ عملية الكتابة بكتابة المقدمة					
2.	I stop after each sentence to read it again أتوقف بعد كل جملة لقراءتها مرة أخرى.					
3.	I stop after a few sentences or a whole paragraph, covering one idea. أتوقف بعد عدة جمل أو فقرة كاملة لتغطية فكرة واحدة.					
4.	I reread what I have written to get ideas how to continue. أعد قراءة ما كتبت لتكوين أفكار لكيفية الاستمرار.					
5.	I go back to my outline and make changes in it if necessarily. أعود إلى الملاحظات والخطوط العريضة و اعمل علي تغييرها إذا دعت الضرورة .					
6.	I write bits of the text in Arabic and then translate them into English. أكتب قليلاً من النص باللغة العربية ومن ثم أترجم للغة الإنجليزية.					
7.	I go for sure in grammar and vocabulary. أناكد من قواعد اللغة والمفردات.					
8.	I simplify what I want to write if I don't know how to express my thoughts in English. أبسط ما أريد كتابته إذا لم أستطيع التعبير عن أفكاري باللغة الإنجليزية.					
9.	If I don't know a word in English, I write it in Arabic and later try to find an appropriate English word. إذا لم أعرف كلمة باللغة الإنجليزية أكتبها بالعربية وبعدها أحاول لاحقاً العثور على كلمة إنجليزية مناسبة.					
10.	If I don't know a word in English, I find a similar English word that I know. إذا لم أعرف كلمة باللغة الإنجليزية احاول ان أجد كلمة إنجليزية بديلة أعرفها.					
11.	If I don't know a word in English, I stop writing and look up the word in the dictionary. إذا لم أعرف كلمة باللغة الإنجليزية أتوقف عن الكتابة وأحاول إيجادها في القاموس.					

12	I ask classmates or English teacher to help out when I have problems while writing. أستعين بزملائي في الفصل أو معلم اللغة الإنجليزية للمساعدة عندما أواجه مشكلات في الكتابة.					
----	---	--	--	--	--	--

When revising

	When revising	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1.	I only read what I have written when I have finished the whole paper. قرأت فقط ما كتبت عندما انتهى من كتابة الموضوع بشكل كامل.					
2.	When I have written my paper, I hand it in without reading it. عندما انهي ما كتبت ورقتي، أقدمها دون قراءتها.					
3.	I make changes in vocabulary. أعمل علي تغيير في المفردات.					
4.	I make changes in sentence structure. أعمل علي تغيير في تراكيب الجمل.					
5.	I make changes in the structure of the essay. أعمل علي تغيير في تركيب الموضوع.					
6.	I make changes in the content or ideas. أعمل علي تغيير في المحتوى والمضمون..					
7.	I focus on one thing at a time when revising (e.g., content, structure) أركز على شيء واحد فقط في وقت في عملية المراجعة (على سبيل المثال، المحتوى، البنية)					
8.	I drop my first draft and start writing again. أعمل علي إسقاط النسخة الأولى وأبدأ بعملية الكتابة من جديد.					
9.	I check if my essay matches the requirements. أدقق في ما إذا كان النص حقق المتطلبات.					
10.	I leave the text aside for a couple of days and then I can see it in a new perspective. أترك النص جانبا لعدة أيام ومن ثم أستطيع ان أراه بوجهة نظر مختلفة.					
11.	I show my text to somebody and ask for his\her opinion. أعطي النص لشخص ما وأسأله عن رأيه.					
12.	I compare my paper with the essays written by my classmates on the same topic. أقارن موضوعي بالمواضيع التي كتبت من قبل زملائي في الفصل في نفس الموضوع.					
13.	I check my mistakes after I get back the paper with feedback from the teachers, and try to learn from them. أدقق في الأخطاء التي بعد مراجعتها و تقديمها من قبل المعلمين وحاول ان أتعلم منها.					