

An Investigation of Pakistani L2 HI Writers' Perceptions of Previous Writing Experience in L2: Implications for Literacy Development in Pakistan for HIC

Ghulam Haider

*Department of Special Education
University of the Punjab, Lahore
email:haider038@gmail.com*

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n11p221

Abstract: Writing, unlike speaking, is not an ability we acquire naturally, even in our first language - it has to be taught. Unless L2 HI Writers learners are explicitly taught how to write in the new language, their writing skills are likely to get left behind as already their speaking skills are not naturally developed. But teaching writing is not just about grammar, spelling, or the mechanics of the Roman alphabet. Learners also need to be aware of and use the conventions of the genre in the new language. Case studies in second language (L2) writing with hearing students also reveal how difficult it is for non-native English-speaking (NNES) students to write in English despite their time and effort invested in writing and high English language test scores. Present study explored H.I students' needs and perceptions that would eventually lead to offer the right assistance. Extending the line of previous research, this study investigated the H.I students' perceptions and views of an academic writing course designed by the Punjab Text Book Board.

Keywords: Writing difficulties, Perceptions about L2, teaching of writing in L2, written expression, difficulties faced by Hearing Impaired Children, Process Approach in Writing.

1. Introduction

Writing especially in English which is taught as Second Language in Pakistan, seems to be one of the biggest challenges that many students face but it is often posited that the reading and writing of English are difficult for deaf children because they are tempting to read and write a language they "don't know" (Mayer, 1999). Writing is also one of the criteria used to measure progress and make major academic decisions (Leki, 2007). Writing has always been seen as an important skill for the achievement of academic grades in schools. Case studies in second language (L2) writing with hearing students also reveal how difficult it is for non-native English-speaking (NNES) students to write in English despite their time and effort invested in writing and high English language test scores (Belcher & Connor, 2001; Connor, 1999; Leki, 2007; Spack, 1997).

Writing is certainly an important element of learning English as a second language. This importance is eventually derived from the fact that it reinforces grammatical structures, vocabulary and idioms that we have been teaching to our students. Because many L2 writers, even those who possess adequate sentence-level knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, have difficulties writing well-organized essays just as Kaplan found in his L2 writing classes (Kaplan, 1966). Contrastive rhetoric (CR) has discussed this issue and explored written discourse beyond the sentence level or organization patterns of written texts. According to Matsuda, (2003) Kaplan's attempted to look into L2 texts to find out why NNES students write with a "written accent" at the discourse level. After a careful examination of essays written by L2 writers, Kaplan (1966, 1987) reported that different cultures and languages have their preferred ways of organizing texts and those culture-specific rhetorical preferences transfer to L2 writing making L2 texts look different from L1 texts written by native English speakers. That is why it is claimed that writing should receive more attention in ESL classes in order to prepare learners to cope with the academic demands. Undoubtedly, the purpose of teaching writing skill in Pakistan is to prepare learners to attain a better academic achievement and produce a well-structured piece of writing which is recognized and accepted in their academic departments. Exposing the learners to the writing process itself is then a better way for achieving this goal. Writing skills can be developed when the learners' interests are recognized and when they are exposed to situations where they can produce authentic piece of writing. Consequently, a writing program is expected to be structured in such an effective way to meet the expectations and needs of the learners. The literature has exposed a number of researchers addressed the need for ESL students (Hinkel, 2004; Hyland, 2004; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005). The Lahore Board syllabus of Inter class's English writing was found to mainly address classroom genres such as compare and contrast, cause and effect, and problem-solution, but it neglected writing for occupational

purposes such as helping students to develop competence in the specific genres that can assist them in their academic study, workplace and their lives in general.

Writing is really seen as a process of discovery as the writers try to find their way while they are struggling to think, compose and put their ideas together. In that way, it is not looked at as a static process but as a cognitive, social and dynamic one. Olive, Favart, Beauvais and Beauvais (2009) in their study to investigate the cognitive effort of students while writing, found that the cognitive effort interacted with genres. They indicated that students' cognitive writing effort decreased or increased when they were writing certain types of texts such as argumentative and narrative texts. During the process of writing you may discover an idea which is new to you and you have never thought of before. Zamel (1983) argued that writers discover and formulate ideas as they go through the process of writing. Worldwide, it is common knowledge that deaf children struggle with language and reading/writing although the fairly recent development of equipment such as digital hearing aids and cochlear implants has made a significant difference to those who have access to such technology. However, these developments too have introduced many challenges, notably the ongoing battle between those advocating the teaching of spoken language and those recommending that deaf children learn sign language. For example, according to Woll (1998, 58), "how normal development can be best achieved, and which language or languages should be learnt, is a continuing source of controversy." Another challenge is that in order for the acquisition of either spoken language or sign language to be most successful, detection and intervention for the deaf child needs to happen as early as possible (cf. Marschark 1993, 17; Pauw 2002, abstract; Schröder 2004, abstract). Many developed countries, such as the United States, have made strides towards early detection and intervention with universal newborn hearing screening (UNHS) (Downs 2007, 161).

However, in Pakistan, a developing country, advanced technology, such as cochlear implants, is not available to many, and UNHS is still not a reality countrywide. Instead of deafness being identified by screening, in Pakistan most identification of hearing loss happens passively when parents become concerned that there is something wrong with their child. In addition, deafness may go undetected for some considerable time. In Pakistan sometimes deafness is only diagnosed when the child is between four and eight. As a child develops language best in the first two years of life, late diagnosis means that many Deaf children start Grade R with "little or no language" and the "average Deaf school-leaver leaves school with a reading age of 8". Consequently, three quarters of Deaf people are "functionally illiterate" and 70% do not have work.

The writing levels that children develop while at school determine their academic and career potential after completing their education, it is necessary to establish the extent of the challenges facing deaf children. The lack of research on the written English abilities of deaf learners in Pakistan is also an issue that demands attention. Due to these deficiencies an entire grade of deaf learners fail every to pass their final year at school.

Thus, a genuine writing task should place a learner in situations that require authentic use of language to communicate. The Compulsory English Syllabus of Punjab Text Book Board for HSSC has failed to prepare H.I students to cope with such demands. Students in Pakistani community are expected to be able to produce an acceptable academic text by the time they start their academic courses in their colleges without exception of hearing impairment and without hearing impairment. However, many of them are found to fail to meet their examiners' requirements in producing an appropriate piece of writing which is both linguistically and communicatively valued by experts. Thus, exploring H.I students' needs and perceptions will eventually lead to offer the right assistance. Extending the line of previous research, this study investigated the H.I students' perceptions and views of an academic writing course designed by the Punjab Text Book Board.

2. The Purpose of the Study

L2 writing is a complex process which involves various factors such as the writer, the writing process, sociocultural contexts, the text as a final product, and so on. Researchers for example; (Hinkel, 2004; Hyland, 2004; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005) studied mostly texts, the final products, to find out why L2 texts differ from those written by native speakers. In these studies culture was viewed as the main source of the difference. However, culture is a complex notion to define and it might be dangerous to base a study on an uncertain concept. Thus, increasingly, there is need to look into more concrete evidence than culture to explain writing differences. Writing has been seen as the most challenging skill for number of Pakistani H.I students who have been studying English (compulsory) as part of the requirements of the HSSC. Hearing impaired children are always in the difficult position of having to learn the written form of English when they have only limited or partial access to the primary spoken code. Yet deaf students are required to read and write on a regular basis (Mayer, 1999) although the products and processes of all this activity have been widely studied, the attention to the H.I students' perceptions of writing in English as Second Language has been less well investigated.

Hence, the main objective of the present study was to investigate H.I students' perceptions of writing in English as Second Language.

As shown in previous studies, it is important for L2 educators to know their students perception of L2 Writing for effective teaching and learning. Writing is mostly learned in school, unlike other language skills. Since yet no research has investigated the perception of Pakistani H.I writers about L2 writing, the main objective of the present study was to investigate students' perceptions of writing in English as Second Language through a questionnaire with the following research question:

3. Research Questions

How do students with hearing impairment perceive writing in English?

4. Literature Review

In the past much of the research on the language development of children who are deaf or hard of hearing consisted of analysis of their written language productions (Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1978; Moores, 2001; Paul, 1998; Quigley & Kretschmer, 1982; Rose, McAnally & Qigley, 2004, cited in Paul, 2009).

According to Chomsky (1988, 2006) language performance or production does not provide a complete accurate picture of language competence. Likewise the studies for example (Everhart & Marschark, 1988; Marschark, 2005, 2007, cited in Paul, 2009; Marschark, 2007; Marschark, Lang & Albertini, 2002; Moores, 2001, 2006; Rose et al., 2004; Schirmer, 1994, 2000; Stewart & Clarke, 2003; Stewart & Kluwin, 2001) discussed educational issues including language and literacy involving children with hearing impairment. Researchers for example (Moores, 2001, 2006 and Paul, 1998) stressed upon the fact that lower writing skills are reflective of their (deaf students) reading skills. On the other hand Marschark, (2005, 2007) pointed out that the situation is much more complex than reading writing connection.

A compelling way to illustrate the writing problems of a number of deaf or hard of hearing students is to present a sample of their written language productions (Paul, 1999). These samples are drawn from the studies for example (Qigley & Kretschmer, 1982; Quigley, Wilbur, Powr, Montanelli & Steinkamp, 1976).

Despite a big variety of studies there is a tremendous amount of ambiguity involved in understanding and answering the questions about the perception of HI ESL student writers about writing in L2. Writing is not a unitary skill (Paul, 1999, pp, 322).

Researchers for example (Adams, 1990; Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998; Tierney & Pearson, 1983) stress upon the view that reading and writing share underlying processes.

Researchers (Adams, 1990; Chall, Jacobs, & Baddwin, 1990; McGuinness, 2004, Snowling & Hulme, 2005; Treiman, 2006) have demonstrated that poor readers are also poor writers.

Researchers (Moores, 2001, 2006; Paul, 1998; Rose et al., 2004) have reported that students with severe to profound hearing impairment are poor writers because they are poor readers.

Writing is not merely a representation of an individual thought (Paul, 1999). This is supported by Vygostky, 1962; Paul, 1998; Williams, 1994, 2004; Aram, Korat & Levin, 2006; Graves, 1994; Sulzby & Teal, 1987, 2003).

Further the studies of (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1983, 1987; Czerniewska, 1992) discussed natural instructional approach (Paul, 1999).

The emphasis of these and other contemporary approaches to writing is on generating meaning (rather than correctly recording or transmitting what already exists)..... (Laine & SCHULTZ, 1985, PP, 16, CITED IN Paul, 1999, pp, 328).

In short a big number of studies on writing with deaf or hard of hearing learners (mentioned above) have revealed that deaf or hard of hearing students have lower performance on written language than younger hearing students and their writings vary greatly from standard English. Using a transformational grammar framework, the findings have revealed that a number of deaf or hard of hearing students have great difficulty in understanding and producing complex structure in writing (Paul, 1999, pp, 356).

All of the above mentioned studies have comprehensively discussed writing, perspective on writing two major aspects of writing but none has discussed the perception of HIC towards writing in L2. So the major objective of this literature review was to provide a discussion of the development of writing and to relate this to the perception of HIC toward writing. As in the words of Paul (1999) writing is even more difficult than reading for a number of these individuals. And if it is in L2 it becomes even more difficult and complex process for such individuals.

5. Methodology

Participants

A total of 100 higher secondary school 1st year students responded the questionnaire. Twenty respondents were excluded from the study because they did not complete the questionnaire. The final data used for analysis came from 80 participants, of whom 52 (65%) were males and 28 (35%) were females. They were recruited from the same school and represented those students with no missing values. Most of the students had reached 17 years of age and had been learning English language for 11 years, since primary school, class one by the time the questionnaire was administered.

Procedure

Questionnaire Development

The pilot study. The first draft of the questionnaire was adapted from Kobayashi and Rinnert's (2001) study and piloted during summer holidays in 2009 with 50 higher secondary school HIC 1st Year students Lahore, Pakistan. The data gathered from the questionnaire containing 47 Likert-scale question items and seven open-ended questions was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the underlying patterns in the questionnaire (Brown, 2001). After running PCA several times with different numbers of components to get the clearest pattern without any complex items, a five-factor solution was chosen. The scree plot also supported the five factor analysis.

Based on the PCA, a final version of the questionnaire was developed. Some items were dropped because they did not seem to work with the HI students in the pilot study, given that they either yielded low mean scores or did not load on any factor. Some of the eliminated items were focus on handwriting, neatness, and spelling, writing poems or novels, and individual conferences with teacher. Answers to open-ended questions led to slight modifications as well. Finally, interviews with a ESL teacher, also helped refine the original questionnaire in modifying or discarding bad items.

The questionnaire

The final version of the questionnaire comprised a total of 39 closed-ended items organized into four subsections: reading and writing; text types; writing processes; and assessment criteria. Seven check-list types of questions and open-ended questions were included. The open-ended items consisted of student *other comments* for each of the four subscales of the closed-ended items, together with types of teacher feedback, frequency of short/longer pieces of writing, writing in other subject matters, and writing instruction inside/outside of school (see Appendix A).

Procedure

After the approval of initial research design by an expert ESL Teacher the researcher contacted a Higher Secondary Special Children (HI) School in Lahore, Pakistan and got consent from the school principal. Then the researcher showed all the materials (including the questionnaire and letters to the principal, teachers, and students) to the school for ethical considerations. The questionnaire was administered to 200 1st year students during a regular homeroom class period in September, 2009. It took approximately 40 minutes for students to complete the questionnaire. A total of 100 copies of the questionnaires were received and the final complete set of 80 respondents was analyzed.

6. Results

The results of this study are presented in two main sections: the responses to Likert-scale items and the responses to open-ended items. The quantitative data from Likert-scale items is presented in the following order: descriptive statistics, reliability estimates, and principal component analyses. The qualitative data from open-ended items is described in terms of the subsections that correspond to sections of the questionnaire as follows: student *other comments* for each of the four subsets of closed-ended questionnaires (reading and writing, types of writing at different grade levels, the writing process, and assessment criteria), types of teacher feedback, amount of writing, writing in other subject matters, and writing instruction inside/outside of school.

Reading and writing

In order to investigate how writing is taught in L2 classes, nine general questions about reading and writing were asked. Study results showed that, the two activities that the students were most frequently engaged in were reading/learning structures and language features of modern literary works and old/middle classics with high means of 2.31 and 2.28, respectively. The most common choice for both items was 3 (Often): 85% of the 80 (n=68) students responded that they did not learn text structures and language features of modern literary works and 15% answered they learn text structures

and language features of old/middle classics. Aspects of writing that were sometimes taught included considering authors' purposes and perspectives, evaluating content, and learning grammar and mechanics. Finally, activities related to writing texts such as learning how to organize texts and writing various types of texts are perceived as rarely taught.

Text types

Results show the types of texts that students usually write in L2 classes from grade 1 to grade 11. Diary seems to be the most frequently written genre in Pakistani Special schools with a mean score of 2.02 (note that 2 means sometimes on the Likert scale in the questionnaire). The mean scores of the other text types range from 0.51 to 1.79. Book reports, argumentative essay, summary, report, news report, and personal letter seem to be written once in a while with means ranging from 1.41 to 1.79. Text types that are rarely written include critique, travel narrative, reflection, explanation, and biography (autobiography) with very low mean scores ranging from .51 to 1.00.

Writing processes

According to the results, all nine items in this part had substantially lower means than those in the other three parts (Note that all nine items were positively skewed with a mode of 1 (Rarely)).

Identifying the audience and purposes of texts before writing is ranked first followed by revising (content, organization, editing, etc) and organizing ideas. The next three items were all related to actual writing: How to write appropriately for the intended audience and purposes, how to write a paragraph, and how to choose appropriate words or expressions. Self/peer feedback, how to generate ideas, and how to connect paragraphs using transitional devices seemed to be rarely taught in L2 classes in grades 1 through 11 with mean score(1.49, maximum and 1.19 minimum).

Assessment criteria

Results indicated that more than 90% of the respondents answered that formulating one's own opinions (persuasiveness) and clarity of main ideas are the important criteria in assessment with mean score (2.53). Ability to express personal impressions/feelings, logical organization of content, accuracy of information presented in content, accuracy in language use (grammar and word choices), and ability to write for the audience and purposes are perceived as moderately important. Effective use of stylistic strategies (e.g., imagery, metaphor, emphasis) and using information from outside sources (Citations) are perceived least important with low means and modes.

Student Other Comments on the Four Subsets of Closed-ended Items

Reading and writing (Literacy)

A total of 12 students (15 % of the 80 candidates) commented on reading and writing. Some of them added some reading and writing activities that were not provided on the questionnaire: 'tips for college entrance essay exams', 'making class newsletter', 'reading literary works of their choice', and 'keeping small-group diaries'. Three respondents expressed their wish to learn more about grammar. 25 students mentioned few opportunities to write: 'no opportunity to write', 'no composition', and 'learning about writing without actual writing'. *Other comments* on reading included: 'two much emphasis on literature', 'reading only for exams', and 'no real reading'.

Text types

A total of 09 respondents (11%) commented on the text types. Three respondents said that they had written such text types that were not on the questionnaire as 'newspaper reviews', 'free writing on given topics', 'speech scripts', 'poetry', 'advertisement', and 'short stories'. Four respondents mentioned that some types, for example, diaries and letters, were assigned more often as homework than as class activities. The rest of the comments are as follows: 'Diaries and letters are easy to write, but reports and travel narratives are difficult to write', 'I didn't get any feedback on my writing from the teacher', and 'Writing is supposed to be emphasized more in high school rather than in elementary school.'

Types of writing at different grade level

A total of 55 students (69%) responded to the elementary school section and 19 (23%) students to the middle school section. Only 13 (15%) students responded to the high school section. Diaries and explanations appeared to be the two most frequently written text types at the elementary school level. In middle school, paragraph writing, letters, applications, and summaries are the most familiar types to the respondents. Similarly, paragraphs, letters, applications essays, and summaries are frequently written in high school. In terms of the number of text types that students learn, there was not so much difference among the three grade levels with eight types in elementary school, 10 in middle school, and nine in high school.

Writing Processes

Only nine students responded to this section. Four students said that they learned 'grammar' and 'strategies for writing an interesting introduction'. The rest five respondents said that they did not learn anything about writing processes their L2 classes.

Assessment criteria

A total of 08 students wrote additional assessment criteria such as 'neat handwriting', 'meeting page limit requirements', 'meeting due dates', 'creativity', 'originality', 'making persuasive arguments with appropriate examples', and 'cheating' here the meant plagiarism by cheating.

Types of Teacher Feedback

In this section, the students were allowed to choose all options that applied. Of the comments 150 made by students, 90 (60%) were final grades, followed by credit/non-credit type of feedback n=20(14%). Comments on content, direct error correction and overall comments on strengths and/or weaknesses do not seem to be major types of teacher feedback in Korean language arts classes. Some of the student comments in the *other* category are as follows:

My teachers don't write any comment on my assignment, he just awards marks. (Participant 25)

Since my class 1 none of my teachers wrote any sentence on my paper except marks. (Participant 16)

I think teachers always give importance to grammar and correct sentences or hand writing (Participant 10)

I once asked my teacher to write a sentence on my paper he smiled and ignore. (Participant 55)

Amount of Writing

Results showed the overall patterns in the frequency of writing, regardless of length. The average number of short writing pieces (less than 2 pages) each school year in elementary school is much greater than that in high school: n=55 (68%) respondents answered that they wrote more than 3 pieces of short writing in elementary school whereas only n=10 (13%) did for grade 10 and n= 12 (15%) for grade 11. Similarly, the average number of longer pieces of writing (more than 3 pages) in elementary school is lesser than that in high school, n= 65 respondents (81%) answered that they did not write more than 3 pieces of longer writing in elementary school whereas most of the respondents did not seem to write anything longer than 3 pages during regular classes in grades 10 and 11 (notice more than half of the respondents chose 'Never' for grades 10 and 11, 45 (56%) and 49 (61%) respectively). These results indicated that writing is not an important class activity in grades respectively. Interestingly the number of the respondents who chose 'never' for each grade level considerably increased from high school to inter classes

Writing in Other Subject Matters

A total of 80 participants responded they had more writing assignments from Urdu language than English classes. The subjects include math, social studies, science and Islamiyat,. The text types of homework assignments included explanations, summaries, paragraph writing, and essays. The respondents perceived that the purpose of the homework assignments was to engage them in the content areas or to complete the syllabus by assigning them home assignment.

Writing Instruction Inside/Outside School

The results showed that 90% of the students answered that they had not taken any special writing classes in school because school did not provide them any special class for writing in L2. 80 percent said that they learned essay writing outside school either at academies or with tutors. The students commented that the course contents of English Compulsory in school and in academies are more or less the same.

7. Discussion

In this section the findings from the present study were discussed as follows: (a) instructional practices in L2 classes in terms of reading and writing, text types, writing processes, and assessment criteria, and (b) whether there are any noticeable instructional practices regarding writing that L2 writing educators for HIC at the post-secondary level need to know.

HI Students' Perceptions of L2 Writing Reading and writing

The results showed that reading literature is much more emphasized than writing in English classes. The two

predominant class activities are related to reading, not writing; learning textual structure and language features of old and modern Korean literature such as poetry, novel, short story, drama, and nonfiction and learning reading skills for interpreting the author's purpose and main ideas of texts.

Literature, reading skills and non literary genres are included in English compulsory syllabus for intermediate classes but focus is on reading skills in general. The examination board has designed an objective subjective paper pattern for intermediate exam. verbal section consists of a reading section, with varying types of reading comprehension questions, including grammar, language usage, and questions about short and long reading passages, but does not have a writing section. Perhaps it makes more sense for both teachers and students to spend more time reading than writing.

These reading-oriented classroom practices are dominant. It is interesting, however, that nonliterary genres such as summaries, letter writing, essays, application writing, dialogues and explanation with reference to the context, are not an important part of reading activity; rather, they are frequently assigned as writing homework without instruction or guidelines. As one student responded, 'applications and letters are easy to write, but paragraphs and essays are difficult. I don't know how to write them'. Perhaps students need instruction on nonliterary genres in order to write those texts.

As for writing, the students have few opportunities to generate texts, except diaries. They learn specific writing skills such as text organization. Even though the students have little experience of writing, they can still develop schemata for writing through reading. In the case of the students in the present study, it is likely that they have acquired the habit of cramming for all of the literary genres but know little about nonliterary genres. It might be said they find it difficult to convert construct idea into a real word. Lunsford (1979) references Vygotsky and Piaget, summarizing that students form concepts from day to day learning but can not think scientifically about these concepts by separating themselves, defining them, and drawing inferences on them.

With regard to academic writing at the higher-secondary level, if the students transfer their cramming habits to literary genres and experience of composing personal writing to academic writing L2, they would probably have difficulties dealing with academic writing demands in terms of organization, textual structures, language features, among others. In Pakistan there is still need to explore the negative impacts of L1 on L2. I intend to explore the impacts of L1 on L2 while writing. The text books and past papers indicate that literary genres are not the typical types of texts required at higher secondary school level in Pakistan. Considering the importance of writing at the higher-secondary level, this lack of schemata for academic genres can be a serious disadvantage to students in their academic lives. Therefore, our English course for intermediate needs to familiarize the students with textual structures and language features of nonliterary genres so that they can develop enough schemata for those texts to handle academic writing.

Text types

The results show that the students have done little writing in L2 (English) classes they were not exposed to various types of texts. The only text type that the students reported as writing sometimes is a diary; the other text types are rarely written. Paragraphs, essays, summaries, and letters are written more often than others. Only 03 students added in the *other* comments section of the questionnaire some other text types that are not included on the questionnaire, such as newspaper reviews, free expressive writing, speech scripts, poetry, advertisements, and short stories. All those text types except argumentative essays are usually assigned as homework and the purpose of the assignments is to either police students, i.e., checking whether students did assigned reading or have students practice sentence-level accuracy.

The result indicated that L2 essay is the most important text type for the students in this study. There is no arrangement for essay writing skills in schools. Of the 80 respondents in the study, 74(90%) said they did not take extra writing courses in school to learn essay writing in L2 and only 4 (5%) answered that they learnt writing in Academies. A L2 teacher interviewed for this study also reported that he provided tips for writing clear, logical essays in his regular classes as well as in specialized classes after school. This is an interesting finding that is opposite to previous research findings that Asian students, including Korean students, do not receive explicit writing instruction and have little experience with argumentative essays (Carson, 1992; Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1990; Liebman, 1992).

Writing processes

The students appear to think that they have learned little about the writing process as shown in the much lower mean scores of the nine closed-ended items in this subscale than those of the other subscales. Only one of the students had anything to add in the *other* comments section of the questionnaire related to the writing process. He pointed out that he could not remember learning anything about the process in L2 (English) classes. This lack of instruction on the writing process may be caused by the underlying assumption among teachers and students that writing expertise is not something to be accomplished through training. Moreover, writing is seen as generating a text as a final product for homework or grades once or twice a term. Writing as a product approach seems to make the teacher and students concerned more about accuracy than fluency or improvement in the whole process of writing. Results clearly showed that

classroom instructions are more focused on accuracy, such as grammar and editing, than the process, such as writing multiple drafts, giving and receiving feedback from peers and the teacher, revision, etc. This product-oriented approach to writing is also found in the types of teacher feedback on student writing: most of the comments reported (e.g., final grades, credit/non-credit, and error correction) are directly related to final grades rather than for revision or multiple drafts.

The aforementioned lack of writing experience is also shown in the low mean scores of the two items directly related to producing texts, especially essays: how to generate ideas and how to connect paragraphs using transitional devices. Even though the students occasionally write diaries, book reports, summaries, and reports, generating ideas and making coherent organization are not necessary skills in composing such texts. The results revealed students' interest in essay writing: three items regarding paragraph and text organization and two items regarding the audience and purpose. This is an important change in the attitude toward writing, although the awareness of the audience, purpose, and logical organization does not necessarily guarantee improvement in text quality (Casanave, 2004).

Assessment criteria

The descriptive statistics showed that the two most important criteria for the teacher are persuasiveness of arguments and clarity of the main idea. The next important criterion, ability to express personal impressions and feelings, reflects instructional practices that are focused on literature and personal writing. The least important criterion is how to use outside sources (citations). Considering high school students do not write research papers (note that of the 80 who responded to the amount of writing item, 53 (66%) students reported they never wrote anything longer than three pages in inter class part-1), there is no need to teach or learn using outside sources properly to avoid plagiarism.

The results showed similar pattern in that 'Ability to write for the intended audience and purposes', 'Accuracy of information included in content', and 'Clarity of main ideas' load heavily on component three (i.e., 'Assessment criteria'). This pattern makes sense because most of the writings the students have done in high school are informative writing, such as reports, class newsletters, and summaries. The other items that load moderately on this component include 'Logical organization of content', 'Ability to express personal impressions well', 'Persuasiveness', and 'Using information from outside sources'. It is interesting that the students seem to view citation as a matter of accuracy rather than a way of adding authority to their writing by using outside sources or giving credits to other people's ideas. In sum, the result gives a nice picture of L2 (English) classes: interest in essay writing due to marks oriented exams, emphasis on essay writing, and concern for accuracy.

Writing experiences outside the school

The qualitative data from the *other* comments sections and the open-ended items suggest that the students want more opportunities to write and have a practical need for learning how to write argumentative writing. However, most of the writing is assigned as homework without any clear guidelines or instruction. Also, the purpose of teacher feedback is not to improve writing in subsequent drafts, but to correct mistakes in grammar and mechanics. Some students may want more detailed feedback to improve their writing as a student mentioned.

Although regular L2 (English) classes do not seem to provide what the students need due to many constraints such as large class size, test-driven curriculum, and teacher training, some of the students have received coaching on essay writing in Academies or at home from tutors. Essay writing competitions held by the provincial government in Punjab and education board in the area where this study was conducted may trigger this interest in essay writing inside and outside of school.

Noticeable Instructional Practices in L2 (English) classes in Pakistan

First, reading old and modern literature is the predominant activity for writing skills, however, is not considered important because the exams measure only crammed ability of the students, not writing skills. Perhaps this lack of immediacy is the reason for little emphasis on writing in Pakistan. The high school students in this study have received little instruction on writing in general and had few opportunities to write various types of texts except personal writing, such as diaries.

Second, in regard with text types for reading, nonliterary genres are not taught whereas literary genres are stressed without considering textual structures and language features along with reading skills to understand the content. Nonliterary types of texts, such as reports, summaries, book reviews, reactions, and short essays, are assigned as writing homework. Thus, the students seem to deal with such writing demands just by doing without instruction or careful guidelines. If this finding is valid, it is likely that Pakistani higher secondary school HI students develop schemata for literature and personal writing and use those schemata when they write mostly nonliterary academic genres in college and university settings.

Third, little instruction seems to be provided on the writing process. The students seem to know the overall writing process from planning to generating texts to revising drafts. But they are not familiar with peer feedback, how to write a

paragraph, how to generate ideas, and how to connect paragraphs using transition words and phrases. Thus, it is likely that they have difficulty generating ideas at the beginning stage of writing or their ideas might be shallow. In terms of textual organization, their essays may not look logical because each paragraph is not well-organized with thesis statement and supporting ideas and overall essays may not be coherent due to inappropriate use of transition words. Also, they may not feel comfortable giving and receiving peer feedback and think that revision is editing at the sentence level, such as correcting grammar mistakes and word choices, rather than improving texts at the discourse level, such as organization and coherence.

Fourth, due to the lack of knowledge about the writing process, the students are not aware of envisioning the audience at the planning stage of writing. Writing for different audience expectations is not emphasized in textbooks designed for SSC & HSSC it seems that the teacher might be the only real audience for students.

Fifth, as for assessment criteria, two criteria are noteworthy: persuasiveness as the most important criterion and using outside sources as the least important criterion. It is interesting that both students and teachers seem to value persuasiveness and clarity of main ideas because the two are only indirectly related to the genres that the students frequently read and write (e.g., literature and personal writing). It is in essays that persuasiveness and clear argumentation play important roles. Also interesting is the finding that using outside sources properly is out of the question in Pakistani L2(English) classes. As presented previously, the students had no experience of writing anything longer than three pages, let alone research papers in which citation is a necessary skill. Although several students made comments on plagiarism in the assessment criteria section, most high school students are not familiar with plagiarism. They probably need to learn about several issues regarding plagiarism: intellectual property, academic integrity, how to use the language and ideas of other people properly, citation skills, and so on. They are probably aware of only cheating and use of unfair means in exams.

Finally, essay writing is especially taught in schools even in extra classes because essay writing pertains maximum number in question paper. Teaching of essay writing needs explanation because in a typical Pakistani class room teachers provide some basic instructions on essay being taught and then ask the students to cram it. Students cram the content and reproduce it without something new this so called activity is called essay writing instruction. In school as well, at home or at academies tutors ask the students to cram the content. Further the teacher translates the content for the ease of the students and students cram all these information. The attainment of grades in exams seems to lie at the very heart of this unusual interest in essay writing inside and outside of school. But this also some negative aspects because this movement has promoted cramming as well. The more stress on grades, the more cramming practices.

8. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to describe Pakistani higher secondary school HI students' L2 (English) writing experiences in school to better understand their knowledge about writing developed throughout formal schooling. The more L2 writing researchers and teachers know about their HI students' educational backgrounds, the better decisions they can make in the classroom. Just as small drop of water in a vast sea of research and practice, it is hoped that this study can help L2 educators and HI students to better understand L2 writing.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

First, the results of this study may not reveal the whole picture of instructional practices in L2 (English) classes without other sources of information such as teachers' perceptions or classroom observation.

Also, the questionnaire used in this study needs to be improved in order to get better results in future studies. The questionnaire was adapted from Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002) after a pilot study with a similar population to those in the main study. The questionnaire was initially developed for Hearing Students. But I adopted it for HI students. Several questions need to be modified to get a better percentage of variance. For example, the respondents had to remember what they had experienced in elementary school to answer most of the questions in the questionnaire.

Lastly, as many researchers in CR studies suggest, the results of this study should be interpreted without making stereotypes and overgeneralization because the sampling was not random or representative of the full population of higher secondary school HI students in Pakistan. It is not clear whether the writing instruction that the participants have received represent the average L2 (English) classes in Pakistan. Thus, for an improvement in the future, questionnaires need to be administered to a representative, random (stratified) sample of higher secondary school HI students in the country, including different geographical areas, different socioeconomic-level schools (public, private, high-achievement, vocational, etc.).

Implications

Although the findings of this study may not provide a clear cut description of Pakistani L2 (English) HI writers, some of the findings might help L2 educators expand their understanding of L2 writing and improve English writing pedagogy (Connor, 2002; Silva, 1993). Implications for English writing pedagogy at the higher secondary level are discussed below:

First, the findings suggest that Pakistani L2 (English) HI writers, are not familiar with nonliterary genres in terms of textual structures and language features. Considering that most of the academic writing is nonliterary genres, lack of schemata for such genres can be a serious disadvantage in their academic lives. Thus, L2 writing instructors need to teach different textual structures and language features of academic genres explicitly using various strategies, including sample texts and class discussions, or, at least, they need to provide students with ample opportunities to read a variety of academic genres so that they can develop schemata for academic writing (Hyon, 1996; Johns, 2003; Swales & Lindemann, 2002). Also, L2 writing teachers who are aware of CR approaches are likely to raise students' awareness of textual organization (Leki, 1991; Casanve, 2004). More direct instruction and guide on textual organization expected in the academia would benefit L2 writers, as shown in Oi and Kamimura (1995) and Yoshimura (2002).

Second, Pakistani L2 (English) HI writers, will benefit from learning specific strategies and skills in the following areas: generating ideas, paragraph organization, coherence, peer feedback, and revision. L2 instructors need to provide detailed instruction on those areas, e.g., strategies to generate ideas, how to organize a logical paragraph with a thesis statement and supporting ideas, how to make texts coherent by using transition words and phrases, and how to use peer feedback to revise drafts. Coherence seems to be the area to which L2 instructors pay more attention than the others because, as discussed previously, Pakistani L2 (English) HI writers do not know the importance of envisioning the audience before writing that is why they do not try to learn how to organize texts to meet the expectations of different audiences. Their awareness of audience expectations may not be useful without specific skills or strategies to make texts coherent (Hyland, 1999).

Third, there seems to be a clear need for teaching Pakistani L2 (English) HI writers, how to use outside sources properly in academic writing. L2 writing instructors should teach strategies to avoid plagiarism and familiarize students with important issues regarding plagiarism, such as intellectual property, academic integrity, how to use the language and ideas of other people properly, citation skills, and so on.

Lastly, L2 writing instructors need to develop lessons on the basis of Pakistani L2 (English) HI writers,' experience with essay writing in their L1.

As Cumming (1989) pointed out, L1 experiences are not necessarily considered as negative transfer to L2 acquisition, but as resources for writing teachers to draw on when designing a course or developing a teaching method. If writing teachers are aware of their students' previous writing experiences, they can build on the students' knowledge rather than teaching from scratch and help L2 writers make a smooth transition into academic writing (Carson, 1998). Also, it is good to know on the part of L2 writers that observed differences in L2 texts are not caused by only personal unpreparedness but by various other sources, such as L1 educational background and previous writing experience.

References

- Atkinson, D. (1999). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 625-653.
- Atkinson, D. (2004). Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: Why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conceptualization of culture. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3, 277-289.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Caron, J. (1992). Becoming biliterate: First language influences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 37-60.
- Carson, J. (1998). Cultural backgrounds: What should we know about multilingual students? *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 735-740.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. (1999). Learning to write academic prose in a second language: A literacy autobiography. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 493-510.
- Connor, U. (2003). Changing currents in contrastive rhetoric: Implications for teaching and research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 218-241). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric research: Beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3, 291-304.
- Connor, U. (2008). Introduction. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 1-8). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Costello, A., Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(7). Retrieved December 1, 2008, from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7>.
- Cumming A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81-141.

- Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication. In U. Connor, & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1989). Writing in a second language: Contrastive rhetoric. In D. Johnson, & D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 263-283). New York: Longman.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2003). Writing teachers as assessors of writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 162-189). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor, & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Holliday, A. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 237-264.
- Horowitz, D. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 445-482.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory coursebooks. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 3-26.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 693-722.
- Johns, A. M. (2003). Genre and ESL/EFL composition instruction. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 195-217). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, Y. (1995). Contrastive rhetoric in World Englishes. *English Today*, 11, 21-31.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In U. Connor, & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9-21). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 91-116.
- Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 69-100.
- Leki, I. (1991). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric: Text analysis and writing pedagogues. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 124-143.
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Liebman, J. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric: Students as ethnographers. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 7(2), 6-27.
- Liebman, J. (1992). Toward a new contrastive rhetoric: Differences between Arabic and Japanese rhetorical instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 141-165.
- Liebman-Kleine, J. (1986). Towards a contrastive new rhetoric: A rhetoric of process. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 963). Retrieved January 27, 2009, from ERIC database.
- LoCastro, V. (2008). "Long sentences and floating commas" Mexican students' rhetorical practices and the sociocultural context. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout., & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 195-217). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 45-60.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mauranen, A. (2001). Descriptions or explanations? Some methodological issues in contrastive rhetoric. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context: Implications and applications*. Edgbaston, UK: University of Birmingham Press.
- Melzer, D. (2003). Assignments across the curriculum: A survey of college writing. *Language and Learning across the Disciplines*, 6, 86-110.
- Mohan, B., & Lo, W. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 515-534.
- Moreno, A. I. (2008). The importance of comparable corpora in cross-cultural studies. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout., & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 25-44). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ostler, S. E. (2002). Contrastive rhetoric: An expanding paradigm. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 167-181). London: Longman.
- Scarcella, R. (1984). How writers orient their readers in expository essays: A comparative study of native and non-native English writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 671-688.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 657-677.
- Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language. *Written Communication*, 14, 3-62.
- Swales, J. M., & Lindemann, S. (2002). Teaching the literature review to international graduate students. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 105-119). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Uysal, H. (2008). Tracing the culture behind writing: Rhetorical patterns and bidirectional transfer in L1 and L2 essays of Turkish writers in relation to educational context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 183-207.

APPENDICES (A)

Higher Secondary School Students' Perception of L2 (English) Writing Questionnaire
Dear students! This questionnaire is part of a study exploring HSS Students' Perception about L2 (English) writing in Pakistan. It should take about 15 minutes to answer all questions and the results will remain completely confidential and anonymous. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much.

1-Background Information

Gender	<input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male
Have you ever lived/studied abroad?	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Please specify) _____ (month)/ _____ (year)
What kind(s) of writing do you usually do? (Check all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Journals/diaries <input type="checkbox"/> Email <input type="checkbox"/> Blog <input type="checkbox"/> Text messages <input type="checkbox"/> Messenger <input type="checkbox"/> Memos <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify): _____

2-Writing processes

How often do you receive instruction on the following areas in English writing classes?

0: Never 1: Rarely 2: Sometimes 3: Often

22.	Identifying the audience and purposes of texts before writing	0	1	2	3
23.	How to generate ideas (e.g., observation, interview, discussion)	0	1	2	3
24.	How to organize ideas	0	1	2	3
25.	How to write a paragraph (e.g., a topic sentence and supporting ideas)	0	1	2	3
26.	How to connect paragraphs using transition devices	0	1	2	3
27.	How to choose appropriate words or phrases	0	1	2	3
28.	How to write appropriately for the intended audience and purposes	0	1	2	3
29.	Self/Peer feedback	0	1	2	3
30.	How to revise (e.g., content, organization, spelling, editing)	0	1	2	3
Other (Please specify):					

2-Reading and writing

How often do you do the following activities in your English writing classes? (Please choose one).

0: Never 1: Rarely 2: Sometimes 3: Often

1	Learn new vocabulary	0	1	2	3
2	Learn grammar and mechanics	0	1	2	3
3	Learn how to organize texts	0	1	2	3
4	Read/learn text structures and language features of old/middle classics	0	1	2	3
5	Read/learn text structures and language features of modern literary works	0	1	2	3
6	Read/learn text structures and language features of nonliterary genres	0	1	2	3
7	Develop an understanding of the author's purposes, perspectives, and the context	0	1	2	3

8	Learn to analyze/evaluate the content of reading	0	1	2	3
9	Write various types of texts for different audience, purpose, and function	0	1	2	3
Other (Please specify):					

3-Types of writing

How often do you do the following kinds of writing in your English language classes?

0: Never 1: Rarely 2: Sometimes 3: Often

10.	Journals (Diaries)	0	1	2	3
11.	Letters	0	1	2	3
12.	Book reports	0	1	2	3
13.	Travel narratives	0	1	2	3
14.	Explanations	0	1	2	3
15.	Biography (Autobiography)	0	1	2	3
16.	News reports (Class newsletters)	0	1	2	3
17.	Summaries	0	1	2	3
18.	Reports	0	1	2	3
19.	Critiques				
20.	Reflections				
21.	Argumentative essays				
Other (Please specify):					

What type of writing did you do most frequently in each of the following schools?		
Elementary school	Middle school	High school

4-Assessment criteria

How important do you think the following features are in assessment?

0: Not at all important 1: Not very 2: Moderately 3: Very important

31.	Accuracy in language use (e.g., grammar and word choices)	0	1	2	3
32.	Clarity of main ideas	0	1	2	3
33.	Ability to express personal impressions/feelings	0	1	2	3
34.	Logical organization of content	0	1	2	3
35.	Accuracy of information presented in content	0	1	2	3
36.	Formulating one's own opinions (Persuasiveness)	0	1	2	3
37.	Effective use of stylistic strategies (e.g., imagery, metaphor, emphasis)	0	1	2	3
38.	Ability to write for the intended audience and purposes	0	1	2	3
39.	Using information from outside sources (Citations)	0	1	2	3
Other (Please specify):					

Which feature do YOU think is most important in assessing writing?
Please specify:

40. What type(s) of comments do you receive from your English language teachers?
(Check all that apply)

- Grades or marks
 Corrective feedback on word choices, grammar, punctuation, etc.
 Comments on the content
 Comments on overall strengths or weaknesses
 Other (Please specify):

Name of the class(es):
 Please specify what you learned:

41. Do you think writing plays an important role in academic success in our country?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Why (Please specify):	Why (Please specify):

42. How many pieces of short writing (less than 3pages) a year on average do you do in your English language classes?

Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
Middle	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
10th grade	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
11th grade	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more

43. How many pieces of longer writing (more than 3 pages) a year on average do you do in your English language classes?

Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
Middle	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
10th grade	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
11th grade	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1~2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3~4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more

44. Please specify the types of writing you have done in subject courses other than your English language classes (e.g. social studies, science, Urdu, Punjabi etc).

Subject	Grade	Topic/Content	Number of pages

45. Do you receive instruction on writing in any other classes in your schools other than English writing classes? (e.g., an extracurricular writing class)

<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Please specify)
-----------------------------	---