

¹² Vygotsky, Lev S. Thought and language. MIT press, (2012):11-12

¹³ Cercone, Kathleen. "Characteristics of adult learners with implications for online learning design." (2008): 140

ⁱ<http://www.reading.org/Libraries/book-supplements/bk767Supp-Kintsch.pdf>

foreign language writing should be figured out seriously on how to deal with cognitive/affective restraints in teaching writing and develop their strategies and skills in foreign language writing. Writing teachers should handle this challenging task with positive reinforcement, generous praise, and providing learners with positive teaching environment.

Notes and References

¹Larsen-Freeman, Diane. Techniques and principles in language teaching. New York (2010) :16

²Flower, Linda, and John R. Hayes. "A cognitive process theory of writing." *College composition and communication*, (1981): 366

³Scardamalia, Marlene, and Carl Bereiter. "Literate expertise." Toward a general theory of expertise: Prospects and limits, (1991): 180

⁴ Scardamalia and Bereiter "Fostering the development of self-regulation in children's knowledge processing." Thinking and learning skills: Research and open questions 2 ,(1985): 563

⁵ Alamargot, Denis, and Lucile Chanquoy. Through the Models of Writing: With Commentaries by Ronald T. Kellogg & John R. Hayes. Vol. 9. Springer Science & Business Media, (2001): 160

⁶Alamangot, Denis, Patrice Terrier, and Jean-Marie Celliar, eds. Written documents in the workplace . Vol, Nweness, (2008) :66

⁷Maskowitz, Gertrude. Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Class. Massachusetts: Newbury House, (1978): 11

⁸ Scramali, Tullio. Entropy of Mind and Negative Entropy: A Cognitive and Complex Approach to Schizophrenia and Its Therapy. Karnac Books, (2008):312

⁹Rogers, Carl R., and H. J. Freiberg. Freedom to learn Merrill. Columbus, Ohio (1969):163

¹⁰ MacIntyre, P.D. and Gardner, R, C. MacIntyre, Peter D., and Robert C. Gardner. "The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language." *Language learning* 44.2 (1994): 284

¹¹ Kean, Donald K., Shawn M. Glynn, and Bruce K. Britton. "Writing persuasive documents: The role of students' verbal aptitude and evaluation anxiety." *The Journal of Experimental Education* 55.2 (1987): 97.

difficulties in every inch of writing construct and even develop a psychological resistance shown in their cognitive block (question 4, learner's questionnaire) or rearranging their structures in an acceptable framework. Third, the findings, related to the type of writing, display an ambiguous fact on whether to handle writing as a product-oriented or process oriented. Teachers seem not to master the principles of these two types. Their responses oscillated between product-oriented which are a free practice and a fellow up to teachers' instructions, and a process-oriented that is a collaborative and collective construct. Then, learners' achievements in writing are closely linked to teachers' beliefs and practices. The findings show that the overall informants involved in this study (i.e. teachers and students) reach a common ground on the weak proficiency level in writing which confirms our hypotheses.

5. Implications and conclusion

This study confirmed the hypothesis that EFL teachers are not efficient in their teaching writing practice. There is a gap between their beliefs and practices as they could not make progress of their learners' outcome. The results were consistent with studies showing that learners deficiency in acquiring strategies when they write. Moreover, this study shows that teaching practice is mainly based on cognitive factors, as teachers and learners indicate that in their responses. However, these teaching strategies and principles are not efficiently incorporated positively in learners' performance while writing.

Cognitive and affective factors in writing affect foreign language learners to do more practice and enhance them to be autonomous in writing in English. We believe that the rational use of these factors alleviates both teachers' struggle to improve learners' performance, and learners' apprehension and cognitive block in the skill of writing. It has been confirmed that cognitive and affective factors, when regarded as one framework, enhance teachers to develop new strategies that meet the needs of learners.

Nevertheless, taking in consideration these two factors, this study made contributions in raising the affective and cognitive issue for discussion in foreign language writing for Algerian teachers. This study also shed the light on the setbacks that exacerbate teaching practice and learners' performances, and the cognitive and affective factors among teachers of writing. Thus, new orientations in teaching

responses of 6 learners out 10 were in accordance with to the expected correlation. In the questions 1, 15 and 17, 60% of learners have ticked responses of coefficient 3 (2nd circle). For the question 16, the majority of responses were of coefficient 4 (3rd circle).

Conclusion: For the first set of questions in the questionnaire, learners' responses in almost all cases were close to the correlation of the hypothesis except in questions 1, 6, 15 and 17.

4.2.2. Learner apprehension when writing

We notice an average of 46% of learners have crossed responses closer to the typical correlation (majority) with an error of +/- 7%. The dispersion in this correlation case is weak regarding the standard deviation, as well with the maximum minimum averages, which are close to (64% and 32% respectively). More than 4 pupils out of 10 got this correlation with an error inferior to +/-1 pupil.

We noticed that the average of 18% pupils were close in their response to the expected correlation. This average varies from 9% to 27% (standard deviation 9%). Confining the maximum and minimum value (8, 33% and 35%), the dispersion is moderate, and thus, the average is representative. Between 1 and 3 pupils in 10 got a close correlation to the expected one. There are 4 questions (3, 5, 10, 13) where the responses are as expected (more than 3 pupils in 10 ticked the expected responses). Except these 4 questions, the average distance for the remaining responses is of 35% with a dispersion of 10% (moderate). The average distance varies from 25 to 45%, the maximum is of 50%. The typical correlation is, thus, distant in some way to the expected correlation for all questions. (Except in, 3, 5, 10 and 13).

We conclude that, in 70% of the questions, the typical responses are substantially and regularly distant from the expected responses.

The findings confirm that teaching practice and belief do not converge to improving learners' performance. First, teachers admit the difficulty of the task and the underachievement of their learners in both interviews and questionnaire, yet they do not invest by implementing effective techniques and strategies to overcome the persisting setbacks in learners' practice of the skill. Second, learners' perception of the skill is encouraging as they show willingness to write and jot down their ideas that reflect their learning. Learners, as revealed in the findings related to learners' questionnaire, face

4.2.Learner's questionnaire

4.2.1. Learners' inner feeling when they write

Q	E.R.	Frq	Distance
1	Always	70.00 %	66.67 %
2	Always	46.67 %	16.67 %
3	Sometimes	60.00 %	0.00 %
4	Sometimes	45.00 %	0.00 %
5	Never	33.33 %	18.33 %
6	Always	43.33 %	33.33 %
7	Sometimes	41.67 %	0.00 %
8	Sometimes	46.67 %	0,00 %
9	Always	45.00 %	20.00 %
10	Always	41.67 %	25.00 %
11	Always	35.00 %	0.00 %
12	Sometimes	40.00 %	21.67 %
13	Always	40.00 %	3.33 %
14	Always	41.67 %	8.34 %
15	Almost Always	58.33 %	45.00 %
16	Almost Always	36.67 %	18.34 %
17	Always	50.00 %	36.67 %
	Mean	46.00 %	19.00 %
	Standard deviation	7.00 %	14.0%

Table 4. **TOTAL TABULAR RESPONSES TO LEARNERS' INNER FEELING**

The average distance between the typical correlation and the expected is 19% with a dispersion of 14%. The distance between the response rates in questions 1 and 15 in the typical correlation and the expected one is higher than the others. To improve the analysis (reduce dispersion), we should eliminate these two responses. Hence, the mean becomes 14% and the standard deviation will be 11%. (The average ranges from 2% to 25%). In seven (7) questions: 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 14 the expected responses correspond to the typical correlation. (The average of 43 % learners responds according to the expected responses). In six (6).

questions: 2, 5, 9, 10, 12 and 16, the typical responses were almost alike to the expected responses the distance is 20%. (21% of students were close to the expected correlation). In four (4) questions: 1, 6, 15 and 17 the typical responses were not close to the expected responses. (90% of learners were too far from the expected responses). We conclude that the majority of questions (70%) of typical correlation were too close to the expected response and the

4.1.2.3 The affective factors in the teaching of writing

This section devoted to affective factors shows a diversity of teachers' responses when dealing with writing affectively. Though they understand how prominent attitude, motivation and anxiety are in writing, they diverge when using strategies and techniques to overcome the affective problems affecting harmfully learners' outcome. Attitude, either positive or negative, reflects in the teaching behaviour of teachers. It is positive when teachers believe in the success of learners' performance through rehearsing, rote drills, and continual trials. Attitude may be diluted when results of teaching practice are badly undertaken. When motivation drives are activated and enhanced, teacher yield good results. It is closely linked to learners' outcome; the better is the learning effects the more motivated teachers will be. Motivated teachers are never anxious as long as learning takes place positively. They believe that anxiety hinders the envy to teach as it is closely linked to learning performance. To cope with this fact, teachers try continuously to improve their techniques in the field of writing.

4.1.2.4 The cognitive-affective factors combined in the teaching of writing

The combination of both cognitive and affective factors reveals a great deal of information on teaching practice in writing. It is to be considered that affective and cognitive factors are bound to cause-effect relationship. Improving teaching practice is inherent to teachers' attitudes and positive behaviour whether through appraisal, or providing opportunities to learners to express their inner feelings. Teachers use positive feedbacks to enhance logical reasoning and appropriate methodology to cope with the target competence and learners' profile. Moreover, the use of strategies, whether cognitive or meta-cognitive, facilitates the access to relevant writing reflecting the teaching practice of experts. Teachers tend to favour self-reliance of learners to be autonomous and good writers; that is "stop teaching and let them learn". Learners' writing reveals not only the personality traits of learners but the teaching patterns of thought internalized by teachers.

their writing. Teachers (61.11 %) were trying to make their teaching of the skill more effective to avoid boredom and anxiety. Moreover, learners' performance is a stimulus for teachers to innovate and build up new strategies in the teaching of writing

4.1.2 Teacher interview

4.1.2.1 The nature of the writing task

The first set of questions was oriented to the nature of the writing task, the difficulties inherent to teaching it. The questions reveal to what extent teachers consider their teaching and their perception of their learners' behavioral attitudes. The results reveal teachers' ambivalent aptitudes undertaking the writing skill in general and their behaviour across the phases of writing. We noticed that there is no regular or standard model to follow for the sake of improving efficiency in the teaching of writing. The inadequacies continue to hinder the development of pupils' writing as many teachers of secondary school education raise the issue in seminars and casual meetings. Moreover, pupils with five years of linguistic background could not cope with the requirements of the syllabus of 1st year. Therefore, teachers should show the following characteristics not only to adjust their teaching but to provide opportunities for learners to perform better in writing: (1). Intellectual abilities (2). Knowledge of teaching content, and (3). Didactics.

4.1.2.2 The cognitive factors in the teaching of writing

The main aim of this set of questions was to mention the paramount importance of the cognitive factors in the teaching of writing. These factors are not visible processes. Also, no single learning strategy, cognitive style or learner's behavioural attitudes are sufficient to explain success in language teaching. The factors must be considered simultaneously to discover how they interact to affect success or failure in a particular language teaching situation. Obviously, there was no clear cut between the cognitive strategies used by these teachers, but apparently, they are divergent on the way they undertake the teaching of writing. The responses reveal, as well, inadequacies in methodology of writing. There is no clear model or teaching principles to guide teachers to install communicative competence by which learners achieve learning expectancy. Moreover, teachers follow religiously course books whatsoever the prerequisites of learners might be.

Q	E.R.	T.R.	FRQ
30	5	5	66.67 %
31	1	1	58.33 %
32	5	5	52.78 %
33	1	1	61.11 %
34	5	5	52.78 %
35	5	5	63.89 %
36	5	5	44.44 %
37	5	5	66.67 %
38	4	4	58.33 %
39	5	5	52.78 %
40	5	5	61.11 %
41	5	5	36.11 %
42	5	5	66.67 %
Mean			56.25 %
Standard deviation			7.00 %

Table 3. TOTAL TABULAR RESPONSES TO AFFECTIVE FACTORS IN TEACHING OF WRITING

We notice in the table above that the typical correlation is the same as the expected correlation. That is to say, more than 56% teachers ticked the expected answer with relatively slight error. We extend our analysis to the frequencies of teachers who ticked the 2nd most expected response, we note that overall responses of teachers 2 in 3 were close to, or exactly like the expected response according to the set hypothesis.

writing enjoyable which means they had positive attitude towards the skill. Moreover, 58.33 % of teachers claimed that the writing skill is more motivating than other skills; they invested in it. 52.78 % of respondents used strategies to overcome teaching constraints and toughness. Teachers showed readiness 52, 78 % as they prepare for the writing task. Teachers were extrinsically motivated (44.44%) which seems to be in contradiction with item 2 or even item 3. Whereas intrinsic motivated teachers (59, 33%) found teaching writing more challenging than other skills (listening, reading and speaking interaction). They (66.67%) developed good relation with learners to make them feel at ease when writing. As for achieving goals, the respondents 52.78% thought that learners should be involved in achieving goals, so that they feel secured and improve

	5	5	61.11 %
	1	1	44.44 %
21	5	5	50.00 %
22	1	1	63.89 %
23	4	4	38.89 %
24	1	1	61.11 %
25	5	5	52.78 %
26	5	5	58.66 %
27	5	5	69.44 %
28	5	5	55.56 %
29	5	5	61.11 %
Mean			55.8%
Standard deviation			6.74%

We notice in the table above that the typical correlation is the same as the expected correlation. That is to say, more than 50% of teachers ticked the expected answer with relatively slight error. We extend our analysis to the frequencies of teachers who ticked the 2nd most expected response, we note that overall responses of teachers 2 in 3 were close to, or exactly like the expected response according to the set hypothesis.

Table 2 indicates that learners were unable to write what they were assigned to reflect on the teaching practice 52.78 %. A little more

than half of the teacher respondents, 61.11 % agreed with the idea which claimed that in the teaching- learning process of writing, more focus should be given to teaching the writing strategies (thinking, planning, writing and checking). However, most respondents, 69.44 % of the total strongly agreed with the assumption that recursive writing promoted learners' aptitudes in writing. This fact is supported by either eliciting ideas from different sources 52.78 % of respondents strongly agreed or 63.89 % of respondents who enhanced writing through free practice, avoiding then time constraints. The striking point to note is that only 38.89 % of respondents strongly agreed on the use of rough papers, perhaps, because of time allotted to the task or of time consuming.

Mean	53.23 %
Standard deviation	8.00 %

Table1. TOTAL TABULAR RESPONSES TO THE NATURE OF THE WRITING TASK

The table reveals that the correlation type is the same as the expected responses, and therefore more than 50% of teachers have ticked the expected response with a relatively small error. We extend our analysis to the frequency of teachers who ticked the second most expected response, we note that overall responses of teachers 2 in 3 were close to, or exactly like the expected response according to the set hypothesis

Table 1 indicates that 61.11 % of the respondents strongly agreed with item 1; these teachers believe that learners are faced with the difficulty and forms specific to writing. Similarly, 52.77 % of the teachers strongly agreed that writing requires a synthesis of what has been dealt with in the previous sequences of the unit; teaching writing is not independent from the holistic unit frame. Besides, 44.44 % plus 61.11 % of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that writing requires consolidation of both language points of a specific topic and the whole unit as well. Teachers strongly agreed on the process-oriented writing with 69.44 % as compared to product oriented writing 44.44 %. The findings showed that teachers favoured dismantling paragraph writing so that learners would be able to integrate techniques in their building up expected outcome. For teachers' intervention and direct feedback, results displayed respectively 63.89 % and 44.44 % relative agreement on the way handling writing as far as errors are concerned. Using other skills for performance, the respondents mostly agreed on the importance of secondary skills in writing and basically reading with 55.56 %. In short, the teachers in focus did not seem to have problems in relation to the belief they held about writing. In addition, most respondents believed that teaching writing is difficult that should be of equal importance to other skills. Hence, the average mean reveals 52.2% that is synonymous to extra efforts must be done in this field of teaching.

Q	E.R.	TR	FRQ
20	1	1	52.78 %

writing. Within the same framework, both cognitive and affective factors shape the teaching practice and improve the learning process. Thus, neither can be separated from each other. (Brown 1971; Castillo 1973) stressed the need to unite to cognitive and affective domains so that teacher can facilitate access to writing when considering a learner as a “whole person.”¹³

4. Method

The current study investigates the cognitive and affective factors in improving efficiency in the teaching of writing. The data gathered, for this purpose, were taken from three basic sources: the teachers and pupils' questionnaires and the teachers' interview. The participants for this study were three qualified teachers selected randomly, with whom we conducted our interview. Seeking broad information on a long-term teaching, those teachers practised teaching for more than twenty years. As for the questionnaire, designed for teachers, Thirty six (36) responded to the suggested questions. They were all teaching in secondary school, and all of them were teaching 1st year or taught it previously. The questionnaire made for learners covered sixty (60) 1st year learners, selected randomly. As this study stands on teaching writing, we have focused mainly on teachers' perception and attitudes, and dealt with the issue on both dependent and independent variables. Moreover, we provide an interpretation of the findings obtained quantitatively through statistic measurements and qualitative via a deep analysis of the interview.

4.1. Analysis and discussion

4.1.1. Teacher questionnaire

Q	E.R.	T.R.	FRQ.
8	5	5	61.11 %
9	3	3	52.77 %
10	3	3	44.44 %
11	2	2	61.11 %
12	5	5	55.55 %
13	3	3	44.44 %
14	5	5	69.44 %
15	4	4	63.89 %
16	2	2	44.44 %
17	5	5	55.56 %
18	2	4	30.56 %
19	4	4	55.56 %

The originality of this study rests on the fusion of both cognitive and affective factors in a common conceptual framework; that is these variables are operating simultaneously on the behavioural attitudes of teachers. Since these factors are believed to affect pattern of thinking, personality, and social interaction (writing used for communication), in a usual manner, they have been dealt with as an educational factors that influence teaching classroom behaviour and subsequent achievements. Then, this study focused on these variables as operational in the teaching of process-oriented writing linked to how learners perform, how teachers behaves, and the way learners and teachers interact? Teachers vary in their extent of expressed objectives in interacting with learners. 'Affective' teachers tend to promote learners' participation in setting goals and directing learning, favour discussions and collaborative work, and establish a warm or personal learning environment. On the other hand, 'cognitive' teachers foster teacher-directed learning, structured class activities, involve less learner-teacher interaction. Despite these extent differences between teaching views, little evidence exists that either style, in and of itself, produce better all-around teaching and learning. Vygotsky may best portray what has been said:

...is a major weakness of traditional psychology since it makes the thought process appear as an autonomous flow of "thoughts thinking themselves," segregated from the fullness of life, from the personal needs and interests, the inclinations and impulses, of the thinker. Such segregated thought must be viewed either as a meaningless epiphenomenon incapable of changing anything in the life or conduct of a person or else as some kind of primeval force exerting an influence on personal life in an inexplicable, mysterious way.¹²

The paucity of references considering both factors, cognitive and affective, motivates us to design a framework that stands on the following principles:

1. Strategies to implement in the teaching of writing skill; we mean by strategies, the metacognitive and affective factors interrelated within the same framework.

2. Teaching principles to apply appropriately to meet the needs of learners

It is worth noting that affective factors, in the teaching of writing, are complementary to cognitive dimension; they are of equal importance with cognition when dealing with complex skills such as

outcome; moreover, research findings would provide evidence on teaching and learning unless they were taken in consideration within a holistic view. In fact, besides language learning competence, affective factors are considered to be the best predictors of foreign language achievement.

Lambert and Gardner (1972) distinguish several groups of attitudes connected to language learning motivation: attitudes towards the community whose language is being learned; attitudes towards the Foreign Language classes, towards the foreign language teacher, towards language learning as such etc. While Lambert and Gardner take the view that, of all the relevant types of attitudes, those that refer to the FL community and its speakers are the most responsible for FL learning motivation, other researchers (e.g., Dörnyei, 2001; Nikolov, 2002) stress that in FL learning contexts attitudes towards different aspects of the teaching situation take precedence.

3.2. Anxiety

Researchers believe that there is a causal relationship between anxiety and language achievement. They argue that negative reactions to learning performances are due mainly to the factor of anxiety (Horwitz, 2000; MacIntyre, 1995a, 1995b; Sparks & Ganschow 1995, 2000). This cause-effect relationship has postulated two directions: whether anxiety causes poor performance or poor performance causes anxiety. It has been proved, in numerous studies, that the language anxiety and language achievement correlation has pervasive “effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing”¹⁰ (e.g., MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). Anxiety manifestation is linked to self-related thoughts that compete with task-related thoughts for cognitive resources. Due to the fact that information processing capacity in humans is limited, the self-related cognition emerges as a distracter or hindrance during cognitive performance.

Since writing has been viewed as a demanding process, the teaching of writing is a skill to be handled with care to alleviate the psychological pressures on the learners while performing. According to the research, writing anxiety occurs because of language complexity in general and complexity of writing as a skill in particular. (Bruning & Horn, 2000; Schweiker-Marra & Marra, 2000).

The effects of writing anxiety on writing performance concern several variables. According to Kean, Gylmn and Britton (1987) “the effect of writing anxiety is most likely to be manifested when the apprehensive writer composes under different constraints.”¹¹

they may intellectually. Affect came to be considered as a very important contributing factor to success in learning. In her book *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Classroom*, Gertrude Moskovitz states that “*humanistic education is related to a concern for personal development, self-acceptance, and acceptance by others, in other words making students be more human. Humanistic education takes into consideration that learning is affected by how students feel about themselves. It is concerned with educating the whole person — the intellectual and the emotional dimensions*”⁷

Some even went so far as to stress that affect was more important than cognitive learner abilities because without, say, motivation to learn, cognitive learner abilities would not even start to be engaged in the process of learning.

Daniel Goleman (1995) believes that education and particularly learning stressed the rational functions i.e, “cognitive processes of the mind”⁸ to the detriment of the non-rational functions (emotions, motivation, attitude, and feelings). Goleman’s viewpoint is aligned with Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers who stated that by focusing so extremely on the cognitive side we have limited ourselves.

Thus educating becomes a futile attempt to learn material that has no personal meaning. Such learning involves the mind only. It is learning that takes place “from the neck up.”⁹It does not involve feelings or personal meanings; it has no relevance for the whole person.

Affective factors, describe individual characteristics relating to factors such as attitude and motivation. These factors subsume dependent variables that affect teaching as well as learning performances.

3.1. Attitude and motivation

A bulk of literature was devoted to these variables in foreign language research. These studies (e.g., Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 1985; Lambert & Gardner, 1972; MihaljevićDjigunović, 1998) have depicted the significance of these variables which help understanding the environment of learning foreign languages, whether individual involvement or external influence on the teaching and learning

2.2. Galbraith cognitive model (1999)

Through his knowledge-constituting model, Galbraith (1999) offers another version of content retrieval where effective writing depends solely upon “automatic activation”⁶. In presenting his model, Galbraith asserts that problem solving is not the only criteria through which the experiences of professional writers could be assessed. In order for them to stress the liability of their own writing experiences, writers tend to employ the conceptual meaning of *discovery* which is recurrent since new ideas flow spontaneously as they respond to fulfill the goals that underline the process of writing. Within the knowledge-constituting model, the ‘bottom-up’ process is so reliable to structure a conceptual planning for the retrieved ideas as well as it provides a cognitive network to fully elaborate the experience of discovery which is stressed through the implicit system that stores Knowledge as conceptual entity within a framed network (Hinton, McClelland, &Rumelhart, 1990) Different models of activation stems out from the restraints put on the input and the strong liaison that binds all the centering point of component parts within the network. Therefore, the use of multiple patterns for retrieval activation yields new and different ideas which add more to content generation. Galbraith maintains that skilled writing is made of a binary process, one of structured system, consciously planned, reviewed, and evaluated (knowledge transforming) and the other automatic and unconsciously planned (knowledge constituting).

While cognition and theory of knowledge prevailed centuries in the field of research and teaching in particular, the interest in affective factors came later. Cognitive factors are necessary in language teaching and learning, but relying on them to understand teaching writing efficiency is controversial. Teaching performances in recent years showed their limits as long as learners’ writing did not reveal expected progress or improvement. The need of complementary factors urged teachers in practice, linguists and researchers to dig in the matter for a better understanding of the writing skill to improve not only teaching performance, but learners’ outcome as well.

3. The Affective Factors in Teaching Writing

The assumption that knowledge construction is primarily a cognitive concern seems not to meet the teaching objectives. A growing interest on the contribution of affective factors feeds body research after realizing that the whole personality of learners needs to be involved. Learners do not automatically develop emotionally as

To implement new strategies in writing, Scardamalia, Bereiter designed a detailed cognitive analysis of model writing. This analysis shows procedural facilitation, designed to facilitate learners' information processing in complex tasks. For example, in their analysis, planning is broken down into five general processes or goals: (1) generating a new idea, (2) improving an idea, (3) elaborating an idea, (4) identifying goals, and (5) putting ideas into a cohesive whole. The above processes are generic headings, which means, they subsume a set of prompts to help learners in their planning writing. Learners follow specific directions of thinking by elaborating and refining their plans for writing. The option is compared to a set of prompts that have been developed for the revision process. (Scardamalia&Bereiter, 1983b, 1985)

In a further analysis, Hayes (1996) identifies the reciprocal relation between the cognitive processes of writing and the fundamental aspects of the working memory which acts as a "limited capacity system, allowing both the upholding and the processing of information of different natures: visuo-spatial and phonological, conceptual and semantic"⁵. Within this model, the function of text interpretation, reflection, and text production is prominent in the writing process as they provide the text with different but integral kinds of cognitive processes.

2.1. Kintsch cognitive model 1998

Many interrelated cognitive processes came to define text production. However, it is important to know the different conceptual meanings each process reflects. In dealing with these processes, we must realize whether we mean the successful implication and use of a strategic and consciously structured and planned rhetorical thought or the fully automatized production processes, namely the molding and development of a sentence after the content is fully structured and planned.

1. Surface representation : The first level of representation of real importance is the linguistic
2. Text base: Micro and macrostructure together form the text base.
3. Situation model: It is the reader's understanding in terms of his or her own goals, interests, and prior knowledgeⁱ

better performances, thereby alleviating the apprehension of the writing enterprise. Progress has been made in understanding the cognitive processes used in writing, and in particular in revision. With a profound understanding of how various cognitive competencies interact during the writing process, especially the role that evaluation skills and working and long-term memory play, it becomes much easier to determine what kind of instruction techniques will help learners develop effective revision strategies, and therefore, writing fluency.

Scardamalia and Bereiter (1985) investigated cognitive effects in writing and developed an approach to the teaching of this productive skill based on cognitive elements. This approach provides an explicit procedural supports to help learners adapt more effective writing strategies. Learners could grasp the ingredients of the suggested framework through explicit training of teachers. Teachers expose learners to a set of procedures through designed activities. Learners, engaged in the process, provide acceptable performances when emulating explicit modelling by their teachers. This fact leads learners to autonomous writing, enhances them towards writing, reduces their apprehension to writing and may lead to creative and genuine achievements.

According to Bereiter and Scardamalia learners use a "knowledge-telling"³ strategy in writing. Once set to write, they immediately produce text by writing the first idea they think of, then the next idea, and so on, until they run out of ideas, at which point they are done. This strategy can be controlled, adjusted, and may alleviate most of the difficulties in composing. In contrast, experts spend time not only writing, but also in planning what they are going to write and revising what they have written (Hayes & Flower, 1980). This "knowledge transforming," (p,180) not only incorporates the linear generation of text, but is organized around a more complex structure of goal setting and problem solving. Scardamalia and Bereiter (1985) argue that for experts, writing is a "compositional"⁴task in which goals are emergent, i.e., *"your knowledge of what you are after grows and changes as part of the process."* (p, 563) Emergent goals are products of the fact that *"there is a wealth of potentially applicable knowledge and potential routes to the goals."* (p, 563)

representation. That representation, the researchers suggest, is the spark that feeds the creation and organization of ideas.

2. Research Based on Cognitive Processes

Teaching writing requires a set of principles, competencies not only to achieve teaching objectives, but to facilitate its performance to learners as well. Teachers' awareness of the task should involve deep conceptual knowledge, when dealing with many different levels of writing proficiency. Teachers, in writing skill, the extreme variations learners aptitude and prerequisites and even learners differences in learning foreign languages. Learners, exposed to the task do not take much time to develop detailed plans before writing, and when confronted with the need for revision, they consider any rewriting as painstaking and frustrating tasks. Learners, then, develop a negative attitude toward their final draft, which means they focus on local errors only and neglect the content or the conceptual lay out of their ideas, or if they do global revision, often it is less effective than their original draft. Models of writing processes, on the other hand, incorporate an overall view into every aspect of the writing process, looking at it as a positive opportunity for discovery as they write and rewrite. Since they view the making of written discourse as a recursive activity, their revisions are representative to the whole framework of the performance. Researchers have provided exhaustive details, in descriptive and empirical researches, to single out the basic constituents of every distinctive model in writing.

In the 1980s', teaching composition shifted from language structure based model, i.e., language accuracy where the traditional linear sequence models were in vogue. These models recognized various steps taken during writing to process-based models. Cognitive actions were ranked and designed in a hierarchical format that reflected the recursive nature of writing; Flower and Hayes(1981) initiated an efficient and highly productive approach to composition research as a response to inadequacies in previous models. Dividing their model into three main parts, "the task environment, the writer's long-term memory, and the writing processes,"(p, 369) Flower and Hayes state that the suggested cognitive model would lead to a clearer understanding of the different stages and thought steps that occur throughout the writing process. Developing writing proficiency rests on the mastery of the process prompts and the specific strategies learners use in their writing. Acknowledging the virtue of composition research in process-oriented writing, learners can be fostered toward

audience as objective, collaborative, and creative process and autonomy.

For Hayes and Flower, the composing process needs a series of decisions and choices. Lloyd Bitzer argues that speech always occurs as a response to a rhetorical situation, which contains an exigency, an audience and a set of constraints. On the other side, Vatz claims that the speaker's response is determined by the imagination and art of the speaker. Linguistically, the writing process is bound to syntactic and lexical choices. It is tempting to think of writing as a process of making linguistic choices from one's repertoire of syntactic structures and lexical items. This would suggest that there is a meaning, or something to be expressed, in the writer's mind, and that he proceeds to choose, from the words and structures he has at his disposal, the ones that best match his meaning. But is that really how it happens? James Brown et al.

All these requirements – “aim”, “relationships”, “language structure, syntactic and lexical”- tend to govern the writer's process, but they do not show how they do so or how they interact. To elicit the nature of the choices in good and poor composition, we focus on the writing process itself.

The nature of the writing process leads us to consider theories on how the writer (the learner) deals with the writing framework. Hayes and Flower introduced a “theory of the cognitive processes”² involved in composing for more detailed study of thinking processes in writing. They suggest an analysis protocol which yields significant results and evidence on how the writing process occurs before the final outcome. This cognitive process theory rests on four key points:

The first key point is that there is a set of unique thinking processes that the writer selects and sorts during composition. In their study, they observed that writers began with the rhetorical problem of writing. Writers react to the problem by writing. The rhetorical problem, the audience, and the writer's goals provide motivation. Flower and Hayes point out that an individual's success in this process depends upon a writer's ability to define the problem. The text exerts an influence upon the writer as the work develops. The growing text continually narrows the writer's options for the text that is to follow. In addition, they identify the writer's long-term memory, which they define as his/her life experience combined with the writer's external sources, as being involved in the creative process. Finally, the writer plans how to accomplish the assignment by creating an internal

learning aptitude, personality factors are considered to be the best predictor of foreign language achievement.

A close survey of the literature shows that teaching of writing bifurcates into two distinguished models; the product-oriented and the process-centered designs. Traditional approach to writing stressed the structure of the writing itself; teachers prescribed the architecture of the writing and let learners shape their prerequisites (language points learnt during the different phases of the teaching units) within a piece of writing. This approach was mainly inspired by ancient methods in language teaching such as, Grammar Translation method, Direct Method, and Audio-lingual Method. It stood on some principles as mentioned by Diane Larsen-Freeman (2010) "*It is important for students to learn about the form of the target language.*"¹ In The direct Method, "*writing is an important skill, to be developed from the beginning of language instruction.*" (p, 28) Teachers used to drill their learners to write a paragraph using their own words or emulating reading text (a model). Moreover, "*The major objectives of language teaching should be for students to acquire the structural patterns...*" (p, 44) Then, the product approach to teaching writing was mainly based on Model text imitation, structure of model text is more important than ideas, one final product, individual, and focus on final product.

On the other hand, learners were not only used to simulate model text or practicing patterns of language (both features of traditional writing class) but they were engaged in the composing itself. Teaching environment was not favorable to incorporate recent ideas into teachers' pedagogy because time pressure, and the need to cover assigned syllabus hindered any improvement in the teaching of writing. Thus, writing was relegated to homework and took place in unsustainable conditions of teaching and learning. Actually, underachievers struggled alone and developed resistance for improvement in writing. Hence, they felt for themselves as failing learners. Unlikely, better learners failed to seize opportunities for development through discussion, collaboration, and feedback.

The product centeredness to writing led researchers to conceive new models to meet the needs for both teachers and learners in writing. Unlike product-oriented writing, the process-oriented models rest on: text serves as a means for comparing drafts, ideas as basic component in writing, writing as a set of drafts, theme, purpose, and

range of factors in the process of teaching and learning: the teachers' attitudes and aptitudes, teachers' perception of learners' prerequisites, the teaching environment, and the individual personalities of learners. In other words, various cognitive and affective factors feature the teaching of foreign language and the writing skill in particular. Then, the main inquiry is to probe into the factors that affect the teaching of writing and how to reinvest them in favor of improving efficiency in the teaching of writing skill.

The main purpose of this study is to describe and understand the affective, cognitive variables which affect secondary school teaching of English with a focus on their language teaching and learning goals, the learning strategies they are taught, their attitudes towards different teaching contexts and the English language, the types of motivation they have, the learners' levels of self-confidence and teachers' cultural beliefs about writing. This article, then, attempts to explore and investigate the nature, the causes, and possible solutions of the writing deficiencies that secondary school teachers have to face because of recent curricular changes. Once revealed, these drawbacks in the teaching of writing can be avoided and substituted by efficient strategies and techniques for both teachers and learners.

1. The nature of the writing skill

The complexity of the writing skill still fuels debates and holds results in suspense on which appropriate writing paradigm that meets the learners' needs in foreign languages. Volumes of research have been devoted to settle controversies, whether handling the teaching of writing as product-oriented or process-oriented as far as secondary school education is concerned. These divergent axes led scholars to consider this complex skill from the cognitive perspectives (Mann, 1970; Hayes and Flower, 1981; Feng, 2001) whereas others discussed the issue of the writing skill with regards to affective factors (C.R. Rogers 1951; Krashen, 2003, Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 1985; Lambert & Gardner, 1972). However; little focus has been noticed when the teaching of writing is regarded as a comprehensible framework comprising the cognitive-affective factors, (Krashen, 1987; McGroarty 1988; Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991; Richards and Rodgers 2001). We believe that these factors cannot be dissociated mainly when dealing with interwoven set of language points and learners' involvement in this productive task. In fact, besides language

الملخص:

تم تصميم هذه الدراسة للتحقيق في الممارسات التعليمية من خلال العوامل المعرفية والوجدانية لأداء المدرسين في مهارة الكتابة، مع الإشارة إلى نتيجة أداء المتعلمين. وهو يهدف إلى رفع مستوى الوعي بشأن تأثير إعادة استثمار متغيرات التدريس في إطار مفهوم واحد للعوامل المعرفية والوجدانية على المواقف السلوكية للمتعلمين في الكتابة.

واستندت طريقة البحث، التي أجريت لمعالجة استمرار الانتكاسات في التدريس/ التعلم في الكتابة، على الطريقة النوعية والوصفية. من أجل جمع البيانات للمتغيرات، قدم (لستة وثلاثين) معلما ومعلمة استبياناً مع أربعة أقسام للوقوف على المتغيرات التابعة والمستقلة الحقل المستخدمة في الكتابة. إلى جانب ذلك، أجريت مقابلات مع ثلاثة مدرسين بإتباع نفس المبدأ بما في ذلك العوامل التي تدخل في تصميم استبيان آخر للمتعلمين لربط النتائج مع نتائج الاستبيان والمقابلة لكل من المعلمين

نريد من خلال هذا البحث تعزيز الوعي لدى المدرسين في ممارستهم لمهارة الكتابة عند إعادة استثمار العوامل المعرفية والوجدانية في مخطط مفهوم واحد من أجل تحسين كفاءة تدريس الكتابة.

أخذت عملية جمع وتحليل البيانات عدة مراحل: البحث عن النصوص، والقراءة من خلال البيانات، وتجزئة وفقاً لسؤال البحث ومشتقاته، وتفسير البيانات والجمع. النتائج الرئيسية لهذه الورقة البحثية يمكن تلخيصها على النحو التالي: (أ) - تدريس الكتابة بفعالية يعتمد على كفاءة المعلمين في إنتاج كتابي، (ب) - آثار الاستراتيجيات المعرفية والوجدانية على أداء المتعلمين (ج) - مواقف ومهارات المعلمين السلوكية لتحسين أداء المتعلمين في الكتابة.

الكلمات المفتاح: تعليمية الكتابة. العوامل الذهنية. العوامل الوجدانية.

Introduction

It is common sense that teaching writing to foreign learners is painstaking for both teachers and learners. The task of writing requires an imbricate system that includes not only language components but a commitment of teachers and learners as well. Language teaching is not an abstract practice in supplying definitions, or developing vocabulary through lexical expansion, and teaching grammatical rules, implicitly or explicitly as revealed by previous teaching methods. Such view simplifies some acts of teaching and learning that involve a

Résumé

Cette étude vise à étudier les pratiques de l'enseignement de l'écrit par le biais des facteurs cognitifs et affectifs des performances des enseignants dans la production écrite, en référence aux résultats des apprenants. Elle vise à sensibiliser sur l'impact du réinvestissement des variables d'enseignement dans un ensemble uni, et même sur les attitudes comportementales des apprenants dans l'activité de rédaction.

La méthode de recherche menée a pour but de remédier les déficiences qui persistent dans l'enseignement / apprentissage dans la production écrite. La méthode descriptive- qualitative a été choisie pour répondre à notre objectif de la présente recherche. Afin de recueillir des données sur les variables, les enseignants (trente six) ont reçu un questionnaire de quatre sections pour comprendre l'usage des variables dépendantes et indépendantes au cours de la production écrite. En outre, trois enseignants ont été interviewés selon le même principe des facteurs impliqués dans l'écriture. Pour croiser les données, un autre questionnaire a été conçu pour les apprenants afin d'interpréter leurs résultats avec les résultats du questionnaire et de l'entretien des enseignants.

Nous voulons exprimer à travers cette recherche nos croyances sur la sensibilisation des enseignants dans leur pratique de la production écrite quand ils réinvestissent les facteurs cognitifs et affectifs dans un schéma compréhensible afin d'améliorer l'efficacité de l'enseignement de l'écrit. La collecte et l'analyse des données ont eu lieu en plusieurs phases: scripts de la recherche, la lecture à travers les données, la segmentation selon la question de la recherche et ses dérivées, l'interprétation des données, et la sommation. Les principales conclusions de ce document de recherche peuvent se résumer comme suit: a) - l'enseignement de l'efficacité repose sur les la compétence des enseignants dans la production écrite, b) - effets des stratégies cognitives et affectives sur la performance des apprenants, et c) – Les attitudes comportementales et les compétences des enseignants pour améliorer la performance des apprenants dans la production écrite.

Mots clés : L'Enseignement de l'Écrit – Facteurs Cognitifs – Facteurs Affectifs

Cognitive and Affective Factors to Improve Efficiency in The Teaching of Writing

SAAIDIA Bachir *

Abstract

This study is designed to probe into the teaching practices through cognitive and affective factors of teachers' performance in the writing skill, with reference to learners' outcome. It is aimed at raising awareness of the impact of reinvesting teaching variables into one comprehensible framework on learners' behavioural attitudes in writing.

The research method conducted, to remedy persisting setbacks in the teaching/learning in writing, was based on descriptive qualitative method. In order to gather data for variables, (thirty-six) teachers were given a questionnaire with four sections to find out the field dependent and independent variables used in writing. Besides, three teachers were interviewed following the same principle of including the factors involved in writing. Another questionnaire was designed for learners to correlate the results with both teachers' questionnaire and interview findings.

We tend to express through this research our beliefs on enhancing awareness among teachers in their practice of the writing skill when reinvesting cognitive and affective factors into one comprehensible schema in order to improve efficiency of the teaching of writing. Data collection and analysis occurred in several phases: scripting the research, reading through the data, segmenting according to research question and subsequent ones, interpreting the data, and aggregating. The major findings of this research paper can be summed up as follows: a) - teaching efficiency in writing relies on teachers' competence in writing skill, b) – effects of cognitive and affective strategies on learners' performances, and c) –teaching behavioural attitudes and competence to enhance learners' performance in writing.

Key words: teaching writing- cognitive factors- affective factors

* Maître assistant 'A' Mohamed Liamine Debaghine University, Setif 2