People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia - Jijel

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English language and Literature



Investigating the Implementation of Communicative Language Activities in Teaching EFL Writing at the Department of English, University of Jijel

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Didactics of Foreign Languages

Submitted by:

Amel BOUSSENANE

Hind LAHRECHE

Supervised by:

Dr Samira CHAIBEDDRA

Board of Examiners:

Supervisor: Samira CHAIBEDDRA, University of Jijel

Chairperson: Nadia MAHALLEG, University of Jijel

Examiner: Salma BOUHALI, University of Jijel

Academic year: 2024-2025

Declaration

We hereby declare that the dissertation entitled “Investigating the Implementation of Communicative Language Activities in Teaching EFL Writing at the Department of English, University of Jijel.” is our own work and all the sources we have used have been acknowledged by means of references. We also certify that we have not copied or plagiarized the work of other students or researchers partially or fully. In case any material is not documented, we shall be responsible for the consequences.

Ms Amel BOUSSENANE

Ms Hind LAHRECHE

Dedication

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful,

I dedicate this work to:

My beloved father ***"Abderazak"***, my source of strength, thank you for your unending love, patience, support, and guidance. Your endless sacrifices have shaped who I am.

*M*y precious mother ***"Nabila"***, my source of motivation and inspiration, thank you for your truthful prayers, unconditional love, caring, and support.

*M*y dear brother ***"Yacine"*** and dearest sister ***"Meriem"*** for their encouragement, kindness, laughter, and belief in me. I appreciate your constant presence.

My cherished grandfather, ***"Ayache"*** for his care and pieces of advice, and

My aunt ***"Messouda"*** for her motivation and encouragement.

My loved ones.

Myself for believing in me. I am proud of overcoming all what I have experienced and I am pleased that I have succeeded in completing the path to its end. May this symbolize the beginning of the journey not its end.

Amel

Dedication

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful,

With my infinite love, I dedicate this work to:

The 17-year-old girl I once was, the one who thought she could not make it. Thank you for holding on, and for believing in something more, be proud of yourself.

My special **mother**, through every encouragement, every sacrifice, every support and non-stop prayers, she has given me nothing but unconditional love.

The memory of my beloved **father**, thought you are no longer with me, your love, sacrifice, and strength continue to inspire me every day.

My lovely **brothers**, thank you for filling my life with support, encouragement, and laughter even in the most stressful times.

My best **cousins** and **friends**, for standing by my side, for your kindness, laughter and support, your presence has made the hard days easier and the good days even better.

All my **family** and everyone who loves me.

Hind

Acknowledgements

First, we would like to thank Allah for giving us strength to complete this humble work. All praise is to the Most Gracious and the Compassionate the Almighty Allah who supplied us with strength, guidance, courage and blessing in time to accomplish this modest work.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to our supervisor **Dr Samira CHAIBDDRA** for her constant support and guidance throughout the research course. Thank you, Miss, for offering your precious time, valuable comments and sharing your knowledge and experience.

Sincere thanks go to the board of examiners **Mrs Salma Bouhali** and **Dr Nadia Mahalleg** for devoting their precious time and expertise to examine this piece of research. Their insightful comments during the viva will undoubtedly add greatly to the worth of this humble work.

We would like to thank all the teachers of Written Expression at the Department of English at the University of Mohamed Seddik Benyahia, Jijel, who kindly accepted to help in the data collection procedure.

Abstract

This research study investigated the implementation of Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) in teaching English as Foreign Language (EFL) writing at the Department of English, University of Jijel. It particularly aimed to examine whether the teachers implement CLAs in teaching EFL writing, what type of activities they use and how they integrate these activities in their writing classes. To achieve this, a descriptive research method was adopted and data were collected through a classroom observation of 13 writing sessions during the second semester of the academic year 2024/2025 and a teacher questionnaire administered to eight (08) Written Expression teachers at the undergraduate level at the department. Some discrepancies were detected in the results of the two data collection tools. The observation findings clearly demonstrated that although certain principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are recognized in writing classes, the teaching practices as a whole fell short of reflecting the main objectives of communicative language teaching. The findings revealed limited use of communicative activities as far as group work, dialogues, and role plays are concerned, with little focus on real-world audiences or purposes. Teachers prioritized accuracy over fluency, and interactive feedback was infrequent in their writing classes. The questionnaire revealed that Written Expression teachers believe CLAs enhance EFL students' writing and support their use in EFL writing classes despite the fact that various problems affect these' activities implementation such as class size, time constraints, and classroom management challenges. For a more successful integration of CLAs into writing education, many recommendations have been set forth based on the analysis of the classroom observation and teacher questionnaire such as increasing the use of communicative language activities (CLAs) in writing classes, and conducting experimental study on the effectiveness of such activities in developing the writing skill.

Key words: Communicative Language Activities (CLAs)**,** EFL writing classes**,** Classroom Observation

List of Abbreviations

CBA: **C**ompetency **B**ased **A**pproach

CLAs: **C**ommunicative **L**anguage **A**ctivities

CLT: **C**ommunicative **L**anguage **T**eaching

EFL: **E**nglish as a **F**oreign **L**anguage

ELT: **E**nglish **L**anguage **T**eaching

ESL: **E**nglish as a **S**econd **L**anguage

Q: **Q**uestion

List of Tables

Table1. Writing Tasks with a Clear Communicative Purpose……..…..... 39

Table 2. Real-Life Context Writing Activities……..……...… 39

Table 3. Pair and Group Interaction Before/during Writing……..... 40

Table 4. Engaged Discussions before/during Writing.…… 40

Table 5. Motivating Students to Share Opinions……..……. 41

Table 6. Role Play Activities or Dialogues Used in the Writing Class …….....……...…41

Table 7. The Use of Task Completion Activities Used in the Writing Class ……..……..…….41

Table 8. Information Gathering Activities Used in the Writing Class …….……....…..…42

Table 9. Information Transfer Activities Used in the Writing Class……..……..……42

Table 10. Interactive Feedback on Students' Writing……...…….. 43

Table.11 Encouraging Autonomous Leaning …….…….. 43

Table12. Teacher as a Facilitator…….……...…44

Table 13. Empasis on Fluency over Accuracy …….……. 44

Table 14. Teachers' Qualifications ……47

Table15. Teachers' Experience in Teaching English ……...48

Table 16. Teacher's Experience in Teaching Writing ……..…48

Table 17. Levels of Teaching Writing.....……...…….49

Table 18. Frequency of Encouraging Students to Write in The Classroom……..…49

Table 19. Teacher Asking Students to Set Their Writing Learning Goals.…….……50

Table20. Approaches to Teaching Writing……..……...50

Table 21. Familiarity with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)……..……51

Table 22. Teacher's Use of CLT For Writing……..……51

Table 23. Teacher's Integration of Communicative Language Activities in Writing…….52

Table 24. Inclusion of Real- Life Situations in Writing Instruction……53

Table 25. Types of Communicative Activities Used in Writing Classes……53

Table 26. Modes of Students' Work Assigned by Teachers……...54

Table 27. Encouragement of Peer Interaction in The Classroom……55

Table 28. Use of Task- Completion Activities in Writing Classes……..55

Table 29. Use of Information-Gathering Activities in Writing Classes……..56

Table 30. Use of Information Transfer Activities in Writing Classes…….56

Table 31. Teachers' Perspectives on the Importance of Communicative Activities in Developing writing……57

Table of Contents

Declaration……. i

Dedication…….…… ii

Dedication …….…….…… iii

Acknowledgments……..…….…. iv

Abstract……...……...… v

List of abbreviations…….....……... vi

List of Tables ……...…….. vii

Table of contents…….……...…. ix

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study……...……1
2. Statement of the Problem……. 3
3. Aims of the Study……..……... 4
4. Research Questions ……..……..……..... 4
5. Research Methodology...……..…… 5
6. Structure of the Study ……..……..……... 5

Chapter One: Literature Review

Introduction……7

Section 1: Communicative Language Teaching…….7

1.1. Communicative Language Teaching……...…..…….....7

1.1.1. Definition of Communicative Competence.…….…….…….....8

1.1.2. Definition of Communicative Language Teaching…….....9

1.1.3. Background of Communicative Language Teaching……..……..…10

1.1.4. Key Principles of Communicative Language Teaching…….…….11

1.1.5. Communicative Language Teaching Application in Language Teaching……...13
1.1.6. Teacher's Role in the Communicative Classroom…….……...……..16
1.1.7. Communicative Activities…….……...18
1.1.7.1 Definition of Communicative Language Activities …….…….……...18
1.1.7.2 The Importance of Using Communicative Language Activities in classroom……...18
1.1.7.3 Types of Communicative Activities ……...……..……..……..20
1.1.7.4 Group/Pair Work...……..……...……...20
1.1.7.5 Role Play……..…….…….21
1.1.7.6 Dialogues…….. …….……...21
1.1.7.7 Discussions……...…….22

Section 2: The Writing Skill…….23
1.2. The Writing Skill…….. 23
1.2.1. Definition of Writing……...…….……..……23
1.2.2. The Importance of Writing in EFL Learning……..…….……. 24
1.2.3. Approaches to Teaching Writing……..…….……26
1.2.3.1. The Product Approach…….…….26
1.2.3.2. The Process Approach…….…….28
1.2.3.3. The Genre Approach…….……29
1.2.4. Challenges in Teaching EFL Writing…….…….30
1.2.5. Communicative Approach in Teaching Writing…….…….31
Conclusion…… 33

Chapter Two: Fieldwork

Introduction…….……..…….……..35

2.1. Research Design…….....35

2.2. Population and Sampling…..……..……...36

2.3. Research Instruments…….……...36

2.4. Classroom Observation……..……...37

2.4.1. Description of Observation……...……...37

2.4.2. Analysis of the Observation…….……...…….39

2.4.3. Discussion of the Observation Results……...…….44

2.5.The Teacher Questionnaire ……..…….……46

2.5.1. Description of the Teacher Questionnaire …….……46

2.5.2. Analysis of the Teacher Questionnaire ……..…….……47

2.5.3. Discussion of the Teacher Questionnaire Results…….…….59

2.6. Overall Results Discussion…….……...…….……60

2.7. Limitations of the Study ……...…….....……62

2.8. Recommendations for Further Research……...……...…..……63

Conclusion……..……..65

General Conclusion……...…….....…..66

References…….……...……68

Appendices…….……...…...……73

Rèsumé

الملخص

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study……...…….……1

2. Statement of the Problem…….……. 3

3. Aims of the Study……...……4

4. Research Questions ……..……...……. 4

5. Research Methodology...……...…… 5

6. Structure of the Study ……..……...…….. 5

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

Writing is one of the fundamental skills that needs focus when learning English as a foreign language. In any EFL learning context, students are required to complete a variety of writing tasks, including essays, reports, and research papers, and to complete these tasks, one needs to be able to communicate meaningfully and effectively. Many students find it difficult to organize, generate, and explore ideas when writing a text, which makes writing difficult for both students and teachers (Nurlatifah and Yusuf, 2022). Furthermore, educators find it difficult to encourage students to engage fully in writing activities. Hence, developing writing proficiency requires not only mastering grammar and vocabulary but also engaging in meaningful communication.

In teaching writing, there was a shift from traditional methods of writing instruction toward more communicative approaches. Traditional writing instruction has often been dominated by the product approach that emphasizes form over function, which means there have been few opportunities for students to participate in real-world practices (Hyland, 2003). However, the rise of CLT has emphasized the need of making writing instruction more interactive, dynamic, and communicative (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In other words, it has supported the development of more interactive and learner-centered teaching methods, which encouraged teachers to develop tasks that emphasize meaningful and practical communication. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), language learners should be actively encouraged to engage in tasks that simulate authentic, real-life communication; interact with others, and negotiate meaning. That is to say, the CLT promotes the integration of communicative tasks that emphasizes the process of writing as well as the final product, and that these tasks give students the chance to exchange ideas,

receive feedback, and enhance their writing skills through the negotiation of meaning and collaboration.

Although the theoretical support for communicative approaches, the application of communicative language activities in writing instruction is still limited due to various educational factors. Research has shown that in the field of writing instruction, teachers often ignore the significance of integrating communicative activities in the classroom (Ramies, 1983). In other words, they often emphasize traditional methods, focusing on form and accuracy rather than meaning and interaction. According to Hyland (2003), the communicative aspects of the language are frequently overlooked in teaching writing, which is considered as a noticeable restriction in writing instruction. Moreover, students may find it difficult to understand the intended message they attempt to express, which can have a major effect on their writing ability (Long, 1996). Nunan (1989) also highlighted the importance of including communicative tasks in language learning. In addition, Celce-Murcia (1991) maintained that in order to ensure that communication in the classroom supports a defined learning objective; teachers are required to develop activities that are meaningful for students and encourage them to stay involved.

In EFL classes, CLT has gained widespread acceptance, but it is mostly used for speaking and listening activities. On the other hand, traditional teaching approaches that emphasize form over meaning are frequently used to teach writing. According to researchers like Richards (2006), Littlewood (2007), and Savignon (2002), writing is more challenging to be taught using communicative methods because it is frequently taught in traditional methods. Research on the implementation of communicative language activities in EFL writing classrooms is therefore lacking.

Some studies have investigated the effect of CLT on enhancing students' writing abilities, for instance, Samiullah et al (2018) carried out a quasi-experimental study in

Pakistan high schools and found that the CLT approach is recommended for teaching English, especially the writing skill. Another research study by Liunokas (2021) explored the impact of CLT in teaching Indonesian EFL students in descriptive writing. According to the study's findings, CLT improves students' ability to write descriptive texts that are both cohesive and appropriate for their environment.

Despite the recognized importance of CLT, limited research has explored its application in teaching EFL writing within the Department of English at Mohamed Seddik Benyahia University, Jijel. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which communicative language activities are used in this department.

2. Statement of the Problem

One of the main concerns in foreign language teaching and learning is to be able to communicate in the target language. It has long been influenced by the concept of communication and its various derivatives, such as communicative language teaching (CLT) and communicative competence. CLT emerged as a response to earlier methods of teaching English as a foreign language by stressing the importance of the ability to communicate effectively. However, implementing communicative language in English language requires integrating its principles across all language skills which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Writing, in particular, is an essential communicative skill that students are required to master to succeed in other areas of English learning. Teaching writing in an EFL context involves various writing approaches to understand the writing process and identify the key elements of proficient writing. This skill does not only encompass word choice, sentence structure, punctuation, and other linguistic tools for cohesion and coherence, but also the ability to structure and develop arguments. Despite its significance, applying CLT to English writing instruction presents challenges, as EFL learners often struggle to develop the academic, professional, and personal writing skills.

Since there is no previous research on the implementation of this approach, particularly in teaching writing at the Department of English, University of Jijel, this study aims to fill in this gap through exploring whether communicative language activities are used in writing classes and how they are used.

3. Aims of the Study

This study aims to investigate the extent to which teachers implement communicative language activities (CLAs) to develop EFL students' writing skill at the Department of English, university of jijel. Additionally, the study seeks to explore how teachers incorporate these activities into the writing classroom and identify the most commonly used types. For students, integrating communicative activities into the EFL writing process may enhance their writing performance. For teachers, this can offer valuable insights that may serve as a guideline for teaching writing, ultimately helping students improve their writing skills.

4. Research Questions

The present study addresses to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent are Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) implemented in the teaching of EFL writing in the Department of English in Jijel University?
2. What types of Communicative Language Activities are used in EFL writing instruction at the University of Jijel?
3. How do EFL teachers integrate Communicative Language Activities into their writing instruction?

5. Research Methodology

In order to achieve the research aims and answer the research questions, a descriptive research design was adopted. The data were accordingly gathered through an observation of 13 EFL writing classes at the Department of English, University of Jijel during the

second semester of the academic year 2024/2025 using a checklist consists of 13 items based on the CLT principles to assess the extent to which teachers incorporated communicative tasks and to identify the specific types used by teachers when to undergraduates. In addition, a questionnaire was administered to eight Written Expression teachers at the undergraduate level to investigate their views about communicative language activities and how they use them in writing classes. The questionnaire was employed as a complementary tool to the classroom observation in order to compare teachers' actual classroom practices with their reported views. The data obtained from the structured observation and the teacher questionnaire were tabulated, analyzed, compared and discussed in relation to the research questions of this study.

6. **The Structure of the Study**

The present study is structured into two main chapters: a theoretical part and a practical part. The first chapter presents a literature review on the topic and consists of two distinct sections. The first section covers an overview of communicative language teaching (CLT), including its definitions, historical background, key characteristics, the importance of teaching English through communicative language activities, and the types of communicative activities. The second section focuses on the writing skill, beginning with its definition, importance, approaches, and procedures of teaching writing under communicative language teaching. It also explores the application of writing activities in the classroom. The second chapter constitutes the fieldwork of the study, presenting the methodology, data collection, and an analysis of the findings obtained from the classroom observation and the teacher questionnaire.

Chapter One: Literature Review

Introduction

Section One: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

1.1. Communicative Language Teaching

1.1.1. Definition of Communicative Competence

1.1.2. Definition of Communicative Language Teaching

1.1.1. Background of Communicative Language Teaching

1.1.2. Key principles of Communicative language Teaching

1.1.3. Communicative Language Teaching Application in Language Teaching

1.1.6 Teacher Role in Communicative Classroom

1.1.7 Communicative Activities

1.1.7.1 Definition of Communicative Language Activities

1.1.7.2 The Importance of Using Communicative Language Activities in classroom

1.1.7.3 Types of Communicative Activities

1.1.7.4 Group/Pair Work

1.1.7.5 Role Play

1.1.7.6 Dialogues

1.1.7.7 Discussion

Section Two: The Writing Skill

1.2. The Writing Skill

1.2.1. Definition of the Writing Skill

1.2.2. The Importance of Writing in EFL Learning

1.2.3. Approaches to Teaching Writing

1.2.3.1 The Product Approach

1.2.3.2 The Process Approach

1.2.3.3 The Genre Approach

1.2.4. Challenges in Teaching EFL Writing

1.2.5. Communicative Approach in Teaching Writing

Conclusion

Chapter One: Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter aims at presenting the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach and attempts to relate it to teaching writing. First, it provides the definition of communicative competence and the definition of communicative language teaching. Then, it covers a historical overview of this teaching approach followed by its key principles of communicative language teaching and its application in language teaching, emphasizing the teacher's role in the communicative classroom. It also looks into the definition of communicative activities; the importance of using them in the classroom, along with a reference to their types. The second section of this chapter presents the writing skill's definition and its importance in EFL learning. In addition, it sheds light on the main approaches to teaching writing, the challenges faced in teaching EFL writing and finally the communicative approach in teaching writing.

Section 1: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

1.1. Communicative Language Teaching

The twentieth century marked a significant paradigm shift in language instruction with the emergence of communicative language teaching (CLT), and its effects continue to be discussed until today. The general principles of communicative language teaching are nowadays widely accepted around the world (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), Over the past few decades, most scholars in the field of teaching and learning have observed that the majority of earlier approaches to teaching foreign languages ignored the value of communication and conversation. Researchers such as Littlewood (1981) noted that traditional methods primarily emphasized language learning as a process of mastering grammatical structures rather than fostering communicative competence. In contrast, other researchers such as Canale and Swain (1980) and Hymes (1972) claimed that the main goal

of learning a target language is its use in real communication; expressing opinions, exchanging information, and engaging in meaningful interactions in different contexts.

1.1.1 Definition of Communicative Competence

Before looking into the definition of communicative competence, it is crucial to differentiate between the concepts of competence and performance, which were first presented by Chomsky in 1965. For Chomsky (1965), competence refers to "the speaker-hearer's knowledge of the language", and performance is "the actual use of language in concrete situations" (p. 4). In other words, competence is the speaker's understanding of grammar or the language system, whereas performance is the actual utterance or speech production that demonstrates a speaker's competence. Defining competence only in terms of grammatical knowledge ignores other aspects of language, especially the understanding of rules of language use, which influence the appropriateness of utterances. As a response to Chomsky's (1965) notion of competence, Hymes (1972) introduced the broader concept of communicative competence. Hymes (1971) and Campbell and Wales (1970) claimed that the competence-performance difference does not account for the sociocultural importance of an utterance or its appropriateness for the situational and verbal context in which it is used. They developed "a broader notion of competence and that is communicative competence, which includes not only grammatical competence or implicit and explicit knowledge of the rules of grammar but also sociolinguistic competence (knowledge of the rules of language use)" (Canale & Swain 1980, p. 1). Defining competence only in terms of grammatical knowledge ignores other aspects of language, especially the understanding of rules of language use, which influence the appropriateness of utterances. As a response to Chomsky's (1965) notion of competence, Hymes (1972) introduced the broader concept of communicative competence. Hymes (1971) and Campbell and Wales (1970) claimed that the competence-performance difference does not

account for the sociocultural importance of an utterance or its appropriateness for the situational and verbal context in which it is used. They developed “a broader notion of competence and that is communicative competence, which includes not only grammatical competence or implicit and explicit knowledge of the rules of grammar but also sociolinguistic competence (knowledge of the rules of language use)” (Canale & Swain 1980, p. 1). According to Hymes (1972) communicative competence refers to individuals' ability to engage in meaningful interaction within specific social contexts. In other words, it includes both "grammatical competence which is knowledge of the rules of grammar and sociolinguistic competence which refers to knowledge of rules of language use". Allen (1978), Candlin (1978), Munby (1978), Stern (1978), Morrow (1977), and Wilkins (1976) stated that communicative competence leads to the integration of both grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence in syllabus design, teaching methodology, and assessment or the actual demonstration of knowledge in real-life situations and for authentic communication purposes. To put it another way, being able to communicate effectively is to know what to say, what not to say, and how, when, and where to say it to various people.

1.1.2 Definition of Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can be viewed as a set of principles on the objectives of language teaching, the method by which students acquire a language, the kind of classroom activities that promote learning and the roles that teachers and students play in the classroom. The scope of Communicative Language Teaching has expanded and it is regarded as an approach, rather than a method, that aims to" make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication.” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 155). It addresses the set of assumptions

regarding the principles of language teaching. The primary focus of CLT is on the characteristics of language rather than on grammar. That is to say, this approach, which stems from "a multidisciplinary perspective" that encompasses linguistics, psychology, philosophy, sociology, and education, emphasizes language use, fluency development, learner-centeredness, and the ability to communicate in a range of contexts (Savignon, 1991).The CLT is the current movement founded on the notion that the main focus of language is its use in real communication; CLT is a learner-centered approach shifting the teacher's role away from being the sole provider of knowledge and learners are seen as active participants rather than passive receivers of information within the aim of developing learners' communicative competence through a variety of classroom tasks and activities. CLT is a modern approach that focuses on the success of the ability to use the language appropriately and effectively, rather than accurate grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary lists.

1.1.3 Background of Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching emerged in the late 1960s due to the changes in the method of English language teaching and as a result of the widespread dissatisfaction with earlier approaches, particularly Situational Language Teaching in the United Kingdom. The latter was the main British method of teaching English as a foreign language, where basic structures were practiced in meaningful situation-based activities to teach language. Similarly, in the middle of the 1960s, the linguistic theory that supported audiolingualism was rejected in the United States. These two approaches failed to prepare students for authentic interaction outside of the classroom, focusing primarily on mastering lexical items or grammatical structures (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1997). According to Howatt (1984), the situational approach was discontinued by the end of the 1960s; it led to a change of focus toward examining language use in general and observing

the speaker's intention as key to meaning. The reaction to traditional language teaching approaches coincided with the criticisms from Noam Chomsky. In his classic book Syntactic Structures (1957), Chomsky stated that structural theories of language were incapable of accounting for “the fundamental characteristic of language, the creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences” (Richards & Rogers, 2001, p. 153). Furthermore, this response demonstrated the need to focus on communicative proficiency in language teaching rather than on mere mastery of structures that was emphasized by British applied linguists such as Christopher Candlin and Henry Widdowson. In other words, there was a great need to develop alternative approaches because the methods used to teach languages at the time were ineffective and mostly focused on mastering grammatical structures rather than the communicative and interactive aspects of a language. In addition, the need to create a methodology that could address the language requirements of foreign workers and immigrants in Europe led to the creation of a syllabus by the Council of Europe based on "functional notional concepts of language use" (Savignon, 1991) .This syllabus, along with the necessity to create alternative approaches that could address the communicative needs of students and what previous approaches had been unable to do, started the process that resulted in the creation of the Communicative Approach, also known as Communicative Language Teaching (Richards & Rogers, 2001).

1.1.4 Key Principles of Communicative language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an approach that mainly focuses on learning the language through communication. In order to achieve the goal of improving students' communicative language competence, the CLT approach is based on a number of principles. Richards and Rogers (2001) argue that there is no universally accepted model or authority on neither Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), nor a single text or authority that supports this approach leading to varying interpretations. Some view CLT as

an integration of grammatical and functional teaching while others see it as a problem-solving method involving pair or group work. This subjectivity in CLT interpretation is crucial. First, CLT entails systematic consideration of languages' functional (communicative) and structural (grammatical) aspects. As stated by Littlewood (1981) "one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language" (p. 1). Second, task-based interaction involves using procedures where students solve problems in groups or pairs while applying available linguistic resources in these tasks. Third, as cited by Richards & Rogers (2001), teaching language through its communicative functions is given priority in a communicative-based English syllabus, which means that students focus more on the purpose of language than just its grammatical structure. Also, interactive conversations involving at least two participants are essential for effective communication. When one person shares an idea or intention, the other person provides a meaningful response; this emphasizes how crucial authentic communication contexts are for learning a language.

Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983, as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001, pp. 156–157) enumerate twenty-two characteristics of the Communicative Approach that set it distinct from the Audio-lingual Method. Among the essential components of CLT are its emphasis on meaning, communicative functions, context relevance, opportunities for communication, fluency, and effective communication. The list also highlights the utilization of pair or group work to enhance learning, the necessity of using one's mother tongue, the limited amount of drilling permitted, and the role of teachers as facilitators in the teaching and learning process.

1.1.5 Communicative Language Teaching Application in Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has emerged as a dynamic approach in language teaching, placing more emphasis on using language as a tool for meaningful communication than just mastering grammatical patterns. It is used in language instruction through interactive, learner-centered methods that immerse students in real-world problem-solving activities, role-plays, and discussions. The purpose of such activities is to enable students communicate information, negotiate meaning, and use language in ways that are appropriate for the context. Since the 1980s, the use of CLT in EFL contexts has expanded significantly from Western nations like the UK and the USA, where English is learned and taught as a second language (i.e., an ESL setting), to non-Western ones like China, India, Korea, and Japan, where English is regarded as a foreign language (i.e., an EFL setting), due to its significant influence on the English Language Teaching (ELT) methodology (Littlewood, 2007).

In English language teaching, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has become widely accepted since its introduction in the 1970s. While it initially expanded rapidly in ESL settings, its adoption has also extended to EFL contexts. According to Littlewood (2007), many EFL countries have updated their national language education policies to encourage CLT in an attempt to increase learners' communicative competence in English, especially since the 1990s. Traditionally, as few people had the opportunity to use English for real life interaction in EFL contexts, traditional methods like the Grammar Translation Method and the Audiolingual Method which are often used for teaching English were approved at the time. However, the increasing demand for English use in global commerce, travel, and technology has shifted the focus toward communicative competence. As a result, traditional methods have become less effective in meeting learners' current needs.

Research on the adoption of CLT in EFL contexts around the world shows that the implementation of CLT has encountered numerous challenges, including resistance from students and teachers, teachers' lack of knowledge, class sizes, a lack of teaching resources, the impact of grammar-based tests, and other culturally related factors (Littlewood, 2007).

CLT is helping to enhance all language skills. According to Wang (1990, as cited in Farooq, 2015) who carried out his research in a Chinese foreign language school, teachers and students acknowledged this despite challenges, and teachers recognized improvements in their communicative teaching (p.182). Similarly, Fang (1996) claimed that contextual factors such as classroom conditions, can have a significant influence on teachers and may influence the way they teach. Li (1998), in a study from Korea, indicated that the traditional way of teaching English as a second or foreign language needed to be modified in response to the challenges encountered by English teachers when implementing CLT. He noted that the prevalence of text-centered and grammar-centered practices in Korea was the reason why teachers were having difficulties implementing CLT in their classrooms. Gorsuch (2001), in a study in Japanese high schools, found that while teachers' support for CLT activities was only moderate, they faced several challenges when attempting to include them into their lessons. In China, CLT implementation expanded as a result of educational policies that prioritized improving students' communicative competence. Hu (2005, as cited in Farooq, 2015, p. 183) explained that "despite a lack of consensus among researchers regarding the appropriateness of CLT for China, the Ministry of Education was impressed by the high profile that the methodology enjoyed internationally and was convinced that it would provide the best solution for the wide spread problem of students' low competence in using English for communication even after years of formal instruction in the language". According to Wei (2011), most countries should carefully examine their English teaching situations and determine how CLT may fulfill the needs and interests of

their students, given the gap between the CLT approach and the difficulties facing EFL teaching and learning.

Several studies investigated the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in teaching English in Algeria, especially in higher education. El Aggoune (2023) in her research titled "Teaching through the Adoption of the Communicative Approach: EFL Students' Reflections on the Experience" examined how students perceived adopting CLT. This study focuses on issues and classroom practices in relation to the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching approach (CLT). It revealed that students consider CLT an effective instructional method that provides learners with opportunities to communicate appropriately and correctly in the target language. Another study by Nasri (2020) on "the use of some aspects of the communicative language teaching for effective linguistics instruction". This research seeks to examine the impact of the effective selection of specific aspects of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)—specifically interaction, communicative activities, and group work on effective linguistic education. It indicated that students were positively affected by communicative activities and that their engagement helped in implementing diverse classroom activities and enhancing understanding. Similarly, Bousbai (2016) in his research entitled "A Communicative View to Teaching English Literature at the Algerian University" emphasized the integration of CLT elements to adapt literature teaching to current demands and promote real-life communication as a suggested literature teaching model based on a communicative perspective in consistent with the national needs of the Algerian students to help literature teachers adjust and improve their teaching performance. Saadi (2016), in her research "Teaching the English Article System Using the Communicative or Structural Approach", presented the teachers' views about the usefulness of incorporating the Communicative/Structural Approach in the teaching of articles as well. This study showed that the approach played a major role in

improving students' grammatical competence. Finally, Hezbri and Goui (2021) highlighted the importance of addressing implementation issues in "Key Issues in Implementing CLT in EST" by identifying the reasons why CLT failed to develop a high level of English language speaking proficiency among EFL students in Oral Expression classes.

In the context of research from the University of Jijel, Benbrika and Lalili's (2021) study examined Labani Ahmed Secondary School's use of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. The purpose of this study was to gain insight on how the communicative approach is being used at the school and how knowledgeable the English language teachers are about its principles and techniques. The findings of the study showed that teachers did not fully apply Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in practice, even if they had favorable perspectives of it and had received training in its techniques. Teachers encountered multiple challenges while implementing these principles and practices, including logistical, technological, class size, and student competency issues, as well as limited instructions from the ministry to apply the CBA. Also, most of teachers mainly relied on textbook tasks and only when time allowed used communicative activities like role-plays, discussions, group and pair work, and games.

1.1.6 Teacher's Role in the Communicative Classroom

One of the principles of communicative language teaching is that of the role of the teacher in the communicative classroom. According to Richards (2006), the role of the teacher in the language classroom is that of a facilitator, who creates a classroom climate conducive to language learning and provides opportunities for students to use and practice the language and to reflect on language use and language learning (P.20). Breen and Candlin (1980) stated that there are two main roles of the teacher. The first is facilitating communication among all students in the classroom as well as between them and various texts and activities. The second is being an autonomous participant of the learning teaching

group; this role emerges from the first role and closely related to its objectives. These roles indicate a set of secondary responsibilities for the teacher: first, as a resource and resource organizer, and second, as a facilitator of classroom activities and procedures. An additional role for the teacher is that of researcher and learner, with much to offer in terms of organizational abilities, real world and observable experience with the nature of learning and relevant knowledge and skills.

The teacher who uses communicative language teaching also takes on the roles of a group process manager, a needs analyst, and a counselor. First as a group process manager, they are expected to guide group activities and facilitate communication in order to manage their classrooms in a less teacher-centered way. According to Littlewood (1981) and Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983), the teacher should encourage, monitor, and suppress the need to fill in vocabulary, grammar, and strategy gaps during an activity while noting them for future communicative practice. Additionally, they play a key role in facilitating post activity discussions that encourage reflection and self-correction. Despite these recommendations, some researchers claim that non-native English teachers may find it challenging to use these methods without targeted training. Furthermore, researchers such as Porter (1983) demonstrated that students can still contribute meaningful and effective communicative input, despite concerns that peer interactions may result in inappropriate language use. Second, the teacher also plays the role of a needs analyst. The CLT teacher is in the position of identifying and responding to learner language needs either informally through one-to-one sessions with students which are referred to as personal discussions, or formally using needs assessment tools such as those demonstrated by Savignon (1983). These assessments often attempt to determine one's motivation for studying a language. Third, counselor is another role for the teacher in CLT where the teacher is expected to be

an effective communicator, who uses feedback, paraphrasing, and confirmation to improve the speaker's intention and the listener's interpretation. (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

1.1.7 Communicative Activities

With CLT, there was a shift away from traditional lesson formats that emphasized mastering grammar through controlled activities. In the English classroom, communication activities are crucial for encouraging students to communicate with one another. Depending on the students' skill level, these activities should range from easy to more difficult. (AL-Garni & Almuhammadi, 2019)

1.1.7.1 Definition of Communicative Language Activities

Communicative language activities (CLAs) are tasks and activities designed to facilitate learning and encourage students to engage and communicate with one another in particular contexts by creating a natural learning environment. According to Richards and Rogers (2001), there is no limit to the variety of exercises and activities that are appropriate for a communicative approach, as long as they enable learners to meet the curriculum's communicative goals, encourage communication, and require the use of communicative processes like interaction, meaning negotiation, and information sharing. According to Littlewood (1981), there are two primary types of activities in communicative language teaching: "functional communication activities" and "social interaction activities" (p. 20). In other words, functional activities are those that use the language to solve problems or exchange information, and interactional activities are more closely related to communicative contexts and prioritize social and functional meaning.

1.1.7.2 The Importance of Using Communicative Activities in Classroom

The importance of communicative activities is found in their ability to achieve important educational objectives. Littlewood (1981) highlighted the importance of communicative activities in language instruction by stating their four main goals. First,

they provide whole-task practice. It is frequently helpful to distinguish between (a) training in the part-skills that compose the performance and (b) practice in the total skill, also referred to as “whole-task practice” when considering how people learn to perform different types of skilled performance, which means helping learners in the actual integration and application of various language skills. Second, they improve motivation. The learners’ ultimate goal is to engage in communication with others. If students can see how what they are learning in class relates to this goal and helps them reach it with more success, their motivation to learn is more likely to be maintained. Additionally, most learners naturally view language as a means for communication rather than a structural system; they are more likely to understand what they are learning if it confirms rather than contradicts this idea. This highlights how communicative activities make learning more engaging and meaningful, which is essential for sustained learning. Third, they allow natural learning. Language learning occurs within the learner and teachers are often frustrated to realize that many components of language learning are outside their pedagogical control. In fact, many aspects of language learning likely occur naturally as one uses the language for communication. Therefore, the entire learning process relies on communicative activities, whether they take place inside or outside of the classroom. Fourth, they can create a context which supports learning. Positive interpersonal relationships can grow between students and between students and teachers through communicative activities. These relationships can “humanize” the classroom and foster an environment that encourages each student to pursue his learning goals. In other words, this contextual support highlights the social and emotional significance of learning environments, where cooperation and confidence are fostered by communication (Littlewood, 1981).

1.1.7.3 Types of Communicative Activities

In foreign language teaching and learning, communication activities are important to help students interact with each other in the class. According to Littlewood (1981), "learners must still aim to convey meanings effectively, but must also pay greater attention to the social context in which the interaction takes place" (p.20). These activities enable learners to experience real-life communication, allowing them to assess their comprehension strengths and weaknesses and actively participate in discussions Therefore, the teachers are required to explore some useful communicative activities that can be incorporated into his/her language teaching strategies to foster a more engaging and interactive classroom environment. Group work/ pair work, role plays, dialogues and discussions are the common activities that can be used in the EFL classrooms.

1.1.7.4 Group Work/ Pair Work

Group and pair work activities involve collaboration between two or more students to solve problems, provide services, complete projects, or write essays. These activities greatly support both teachers and learners in effectively achieving educational goals. They also emphasize the importance of interaction in enhancing students' learning. Through such collaboration, shy students can reduce anxiety and nervousness, as they have the opportunity to share ideas and opinions with each other in a supportive environment. Richards (2006) explains the benefits of group and pair work as follows:

> Learners can learn from listening the language used by their peers during group discussion. Learners will use more language than they would in activities are led by the teacher. Learners will probably get more motivated. Learners get the opportunity to improve their fluency (p.18).

1.1.7.5 Role Play

Role play is a significant communicative task that can be used to help students to practice their communication skills in different social contexts. It encourages students to interact and express themselves by using the English language. Richards (2006) described role play as “a task where students are assigned different roles and they have to act out a scene based on the situation they are given” (p.18). In role play activities, students are given a scenario and various roles to play that might encounter in real life situations. According to Harmer (2007) “students can act out the simulation as themselves or take on the role of a completely different character and express thoughts and feelings they do not necessarily share” (p.352). It is also an enjoyable activity that allows most of the students to have fun while learning together and reducing their fear of speaking and shyness of performing in front of others.

1.1.7.6. Dialogues

Dialogues serve as a valuable and practical tool in teaching and learning a foreign language that assists both teachers and students develop skills in thinking, listening and speaking in an organized way. Pilleux (1969) defines dialogues as “we usually understand it, is a natural conversation to be presented either orally or in writing, practiced, and drilled in class” (p.203). They refer to the fact that it is a realistic type of conversation between two or more students in the class either in a spoken or written way and it can be based on memorization and repetition, or it can be improvisational as a tool of learning. Through dialogues, students can express their ideas, values, cultures and feelings in a respectful way, acting as teammates rather than competitors. It also motivates them to actively interact and participate without hesitation.

1.1.7.7. Discussion

As a key communicative language activity in the CLT approach, discussions play an important role in helping students to improve their communication skills by having meaningful interaction with others. A discussion is an oral conversation on a particular topic between two or more persons with the goal of reaching a conclusion or exchanging different perspectives. Discussions can be organized in various ways, such as through buzz groups, instant comment, formal debates, unplanned discussions, or reaching a consensus (Harmer, 2007). Students are given opportunity to use the foreign language to express their personal experiences and ideas through class discussions. Littlewood (1981) claimed that "conversation sometimes is a source of relief from more 'serious' language work. This should not prevent us from recognizing the important functions it can perform in helping to develop communicative ability" (p.46). In this regard, a discussion is a more relaxed activity that plays a powerful role in improving language proficiency, as the teacher can separate students into groups to engage in problem-solving tasks.

According to Richards (2006, p.18) there are other types of communicative activities such as:

- **Task-completion activities:** at these activities, students focus on using their own language resources to accomplish tasks, for example puzzles, games and map-reading.
- **Information gathering activities:** these activities make students use their language resources to collect information through surveys, interviews and searches.
- **Opinion-sharing activities:** in such activities, students are required to compare values, opinions and beliefs. For example, students are given a ranking task to list six qualities in order of important to choose a date or spouse.
- **Information-transfer activities:** at these activities, students grasp information that is presented in one form and represent it in another way.

Section Two: The Writing Skill

1.2. The Writing Skill

1.2.1. Definition of Writing

Writing is a means of communication between people to express their ideas and feelings. It is also one of the four skills that should be-mastered by students when learning English. It is, in fact, a challenging skill for students to acquire, as it is a complex process that requires practice and effort. Writing has been surrounded by controversies for centuries, some of which have survived through time. One of the most important challenges has been establishing a definition of writing. In this regard, Powell, B (2012) argued that "writing is all around us, yet not many people talk about it or truly understand it. Writing is a challenging topic to explore because any discussion about it relies on the very act of writing itself" (p. 11).

Hyland (2003) stated that "writing is a way of sharing personal means and writing courses emphasize the power of the individual to construct his or her own views on a topic" (p. 9). Writing is an opportunity for individuals to share their own point of view and perspectives and it needs thinking strategies to show their ability in other languages. In addition, writing is a visual representation of thoughts, emotions, and ideas, using language to communicate or convey a specific message or purpose as Daniels and Bright (1996) explains, "writing was devised for the purpose of communicating at a distance- in order to send messages that did not rely upon the memory of the messenger" (p.5). Through writing, human beings can communicate to others in written form to pass information, contents, purposes, suggestions. It is also a great process to generate ideas for readers. According to Wray, (2004) "writing involves the creation of meaningful symbols on paper, screen, and so on, in their teaching of writing, prioritise the technical aspects such as handwriting, spelling and grammar" (p. 1). In this context, Heaton (1990) revealed that the

“writing skill is complex and sometimes difficult to teach because it entails not only control of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgment considerations” (p. 135).

Writing is, therefore, a means of communication for students to state their feelings and ideas and to organize their knowledge and beliefs into persuasive points, and to present meaning through well- structured texts.

1.2.2. The Importance of Writing in EFL Learning

In learning English, students are taught four skills namely speaking, reading, listening and writing. According to Harmer, (1998) “writing is a basic language skill, just as significant as speaking, listening and reading” (p.79). Through writing, one has the ability to share knowledge, feelings, and desires and convey ideas to other people by using appropriate and correct language. The majority of knowledge which people have acquired so far comes from reading written sources, such as books, articles, and papers, produced by individuals who express their ideas through writing. Harmer (2004), claimed that “writing is tool used to communicate by expressing thoughts, feelings and perspectives” (p.31). According to Byrne (1993):

> It is useful to keep in mind some the many uses we are likely to make of writing. For example, on a personal level, most of us use writing to make a note of something and to keep records of things we want to remember. We send messages and write letters to friends, and few of us keep diaries (p.2).

Writing skills are particular abilities that enable a writer to express their thoughts clearly and meaningfully through words, allowing them to engage with the message mentally. They serve not only as a medium of communication but also as a means of conveying information. Students engage in writing activities daily, such as sending

messages via mobile phone, primarily to share information. In this regard, Powel (2012) argued that "writing is the most significant technology in human life, it is not easy to study and to think about. Therefore, we use it every day in our lives" (p. 1). In addition to this, Raimes (1953) emphasized the importance of teaching writing as:

> …writing helps our students to learn. How? It reinforces the grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary that we have been teaching our students. When our students write, they have a chance to be adventurous with the language, to go beyond what they have just learned to say, to take risks. Also, they necessary become very involved with the new language; the effort to express ideas and the constant use of eye, hand, and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning. (p.3)

Moreover, writing is an important cognitive process whereby students often have more time to think than they do in speaking activities. Students can mentally recall what they know in their minds and even use resources like dictionaries, grammar guides, or other reference tools to help them. In this context, Bell and Burnaby (1998, as cited in Nunan, 1989,) said "writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which is required to demonstrate control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling and letter formation" (p.36). According to Harmer (1998) "the main reason of teaching writing for EFL students includes reinforcement, language development, learning style and writing as skill in its own right" (p. 79). Nonetheless, the purpose of writing contributes to determining a specific tone or style; for instance, is the student writing to entertain, provide information, or offer an explanation. As Harris (1993) noted "helping pupils understand the purpose and processes of writing should, therefore, be part of every teacher's aim" (p. 15).

This study aims to investigate the implementation of communicative language activities by teachers to enhance the writing skills of EFL students, given the essential role of writing in language learning and communication. Since, writing is essential for language learning and cognitive development, understanding how communicative activities are used in teaching writing is also important. Thus, investigating these practices at the Department of English, University of Jijel, can shed light on how effectively are being used to enhance students' writing performance and engagement.

1.2.3. Approaches to Teaching Writing

When teaching writing, different approaches and methods have been implemented throughout the history of language teaching and each has contributed to major changes in the field. In recent years, the main approaches that have been widely used in EFL classrooms are the product, the process and the genre approach. Badger and White (2000) claimed that "over the last twenty years, process and product approaches have dominated much of the teaching of writing that happens in the EFL classrooms. In the last ten years, genre approaches have gained adherents" (p. 153). There have been debates on the differences among the three major approaches.

1.2.3.1. The Product Approach

From the early 20th century to the mid-1960s, the product approach was the primary method used in teaching writing. It is considered as a traditional approach in which learners focus on correcting grammar and word choice rather than on how the text is developed or written. In this approach, writing instruction for EFL students involve imitating a model text given by the teacher and focusing on grammar and sentence structure, then their work is assessed and corrected at the end. In this point, Badger and White (2000) asserted that the "product- based approaches see writing as mainly concerned with knowledge about the structure of language, and writing development as mainly the

result of the limitation of input, in the form of texts provided by the teacher" (p. 154). Moreover, the product approach is "the emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the strong concern with usage and with style; and so on" Young (1978 as cited in Matsuda, 2003). Gabrielatos (2002) defined the product approach as "a traditional approach which students are encouraged to mimic a model text, usually is presented and analyzed at an early stage" (p. 5). According to Pincas (1982, as cited in Badger and White, 2000), this approach sees writing as "a linguistic knowledge, with attention focused on the appropriate use of vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devices" (p.153).

Badger and White (2000), outline four stages for teaching writing using the product approach. The first stage is familiarization, where students recognize a certain element of a model text provided by the teacher, i.e. students make attention to the grammatical and lexical points of a given text. In controlled writing stages, EFL students acquire new structures by mimicking the model text given by the teacher, i.e. if students are learning about formal letters, they might be asked to practice the language used for making formal requests. The next stage is guided writing, which is the most crucial style because the organization of ideas is more important than the context where students organize the information and practice writing while utilizing the target grammar and vocabulary. The last stage is free writing, where the teachers give their students to write independently, each student have the opportunity to select previous writings that are similar to write. In addition, Badger and White (2002) noted that "the disadvantages of product approaches are that they do not put enough emphasis on process skills like planning text, and the undervaluation of the information and skills that learners provide to the classroom" (p.157).

1.2.3.2. The Process Approach

In the mid-1970s, the process approach emerged as a response to the limitation of the product approach as Gee (1997) said that "the process approach generally represented a reaction against the product-based approach" (p. 25). This approach emphasizes how a text is written instead of the output of writing and view meaning and ideas as an essential element of the writing process. It provides less importance to the focus on grammar and vocabulary. It focuses on the importance of the techniques and actions that students use while developing a piece of good writing. The process-based approach encourages students to express their ideas freely instead of relying on a model text, teachers allow their students to share their own thoughts. In this regard, Badger and White (2000) explained that "writing in process approaches is seen as predominantly to do with linguistic skills, such as planning, drafting, and there is much less emphasis on linguistic knowledge, such as knowledge about grammar and text structure" (p.154). According to Murray (1972) "what is the process we should teach? It is the process of discovery through language. It is the process of exploration of what we know and what we feel about what we know through language. It is the process of using language to learn, to evaluate, and to communicate what we learn about our world" (p. 4). Kroll (2001) defines process approach as follows:

> Process approach serves today as an umbrella term for many types of writing courses …. What the term captures is the fact that student writers engage in their writing tasks through a cyclical approach rather than a single-shot approach. They are not expected to produce and submit complete and polished responses to their writing assignments without going through stages of drafting and receiving feedback on their drafts, be it from peers and/or from the teacher, followed by revision of their evolving texts. (pp. 220-221).

In this point, a process approach leads the teacher to focus on the classroom tasks that can be designed in a manner to allow the learners to start writing in the classroom itself. It is similar to a helpline for the student by which they can feel comfortable while writing, and become a master of this tedious skill by exposing themselves to the various steps of writing. However, this approach views writing as a complex and recursive and not a linear process. Thus, the process approach focuses on the significance of a recursive procedure of prewriting, drafting, evaluating and revising.

In this context, White and Arndt' diagram (1991) tries to ensure that the process approach is not a linear but an unpredictable process of writing. According to Murray (1972), "the writing process can be divided into three stages: prewiring, writing and rewriting" (p.4). In the first step, students start to plan and search for ideas about what they are going to write by making notes. In the next step, it is the fastest one in which considered as the act of producing a first draft. Students engage in writing the information which is related to the topic. The last step is the re-searching, re-thinking, redesigning, rewriting and finally, line by line editing.

1.2.3.3. The Genre Approach

The genre approach comes as a reaction to the process approach in the mid of 1980s. The process approach emphasizes writing through specific steps, whereas the genre approach centers on models that consider the audience. The genre approach is likely considered as an extension to the product approach as noted by Badger and White (2000) "there are strong similarities with product approaches and, in some ways, genre approaches can be regarded as an extension of product approaches" (p. 155). This approach emphasizes the construction of the knowledge items such as knowledge building awareness and knowledge of community; these are necessary for learners to enable them to produce texts that successfully communicate to others in the same community of

discourse. Swales (1990, as cited in Tribble, 1996) defines the term genre as "... as a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes" (p. 46). In other words, it was developed to enable writers to use particular kinds of writing to achieve their social purposes and fulfill their communicative desires. Therefore, it is important to clearly teach relevant genre in the language classroom. However, Dudley-Evans (1997) divided genre- based approach in three stages: "First, a model of a particular genre is introduced and analyzed. Learners then carry out exercises which manipulate relevant language forms and, finally, produce a short text. This parallels product approaches very closely" (p. 154). This approach has several benefits as well as shortcoming as, Badger and White (2000) claimed that: the disadvantage of genre approaches is that there is less emphasize on the essential skills involved to produce a text and regard learners as largely passive" (p. 157). Thus, it is complex for students who do not have experience in writing and they like to depend on teacher model text.

1.2.4. Challenges in Teaching EFL Writing

Writing is considered the most challenging and difficult skill for foreign language students to master, even for a native speaker it is hard for them to produce a good piece of writing. As Nunan (1999) said that "in terms of skill, producing a coherent, fluent, extended piece of writing is probably the most difficult thing there is to do in language. It is something most native speakers never master" (p.271). There are many reasons why students still tend to have difficulty in the writing process. Usually, it takes a lot of time to produce a correct and well-organized writing assignment, as students often struggle with using words, sentences and spelling in English as a foreign or second language. As Raimes (1953) claimed that:

> "When students complain about how difficult it is to write in a second language, they are talking not only about the difficulty of

> "finding" the right words and using the correct grammar but about the difficulty of finding and expressing ideas in a new language. The problem is with communicating and not just writing" (pp.12-13).

This means that students can find difficulty in the skill of using language to accomplish communicative purposes, such as sharing information and ideas to others. Furthermore, learners are not able to write English well because their language knowledge is limited, which includes grammar, vocabulary and spelling. Grammar is the most problematic issue in learning foreign language. According to Ellis (2008), "grammar's difficulties into two types; difficulties of understanding the rules, and difficulties of their use and application" (p.418), while the problem with vocabulary is that the learners misuse the correct and the appropriate words and sentences. Duigu (2002) noted that "simple, correct English is better than experimenting with sophisticated vocabulary, and getting it wrong! You may try out unfamiliar vocabulary if you have a helpful teacher" (p. 39). As the students face problems in EFL writing, teachers also experience difficulties in teaching it. They may provide unfamiliar topics, making it hard for the students to generate ideas and familiar vocabulary. Cerbin & Beck (2001) argued that "Students very often have to write about unfamiliar subjects. And, typical of novices in any subject area, their understanding as they write tends to be incomplete and naïve". Thus, learners are expected to produce good writing, but they are not taught how to achieve it. If teachers do not focus on how to enhance student's writing abilities, they are going to use their own techniques and strategies.

1.2.5. Communicative Approach in Teaching Writing

Based on the challenges described above, the teachers attempt to integrate teaching writing with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in order to solve students' difficulties, faced in the writing process both inside and outside the classroom. According

to Raimes (1953), “traditionally, the teacher alone has been the audience for student writing, but some feel that writers do their best when writing is truly a communication act, with a writer writing for real reader” (p. 9). This means that students usually write only for their teacher, who provides feedback on their writing. But some people believe that learners write well when they have actual readers who can communicate with them in real-life situations. Bowkett (2014, cited in almuslahi, 2023) argued that “teaching and studying grammar in foreign language is insufficient. This actual way needs to be changed to provide non-native students with spacious writing practice” (p. 2). In this regard, the communicative approach emphasizes that learning grammar is not enough especially for students who are learning a new language and have more opportunities to practice writing. This approach encourages involving the community, which helps making students’ writing better and produce more written work. As Chuquimarca (2020, cited in almuslahi, 2023) said that “community involvement is promoted by CLT, which improves writing effectiveness. It's important to engage pupils' interest and help them do more written work” (p. 2).

When teachers attempt to enhance their students’ writing skills, they create different communication learning strategies such as information gap, pair work, group work, role plays and presentations. As Samiullah (2019) claimed that “the most effective way to teach writing is by using different activities in which students get engaged in different situations and communicate with other students” (p.563). Writing functions as a tool of communication, and teachers are required to provide topics that reflect real-life situation. Those situations need to be relevant to actual circumstances that students might encounter at home, at work, at school, or any place where they are involved. In this context, Jeffery (2009) claimed that “using examples from the real world might assist students’ writing abilities. Students’ communication skills should be enhanced through writing. The message

that is conveyed through the writing can be used to gauge its quality" (cited in Almuslehi, 2023, p.5). In addition, Begibaeva (2020) noted that "text created by learners seems to be an only written reflection of their oral speech that can be good evidence of students' transformation of their speaking to writing though" (p.62). This means that many students tend to write the way they speak, without really thinking about the rules or structure of formal writing. It shows they are starting to make the shift from speaking to writing, which is important step in developing strong writing abilities. According to Liunokas (2021, p.603) "the researchers further observe that teachers' role in CLT approach is more dynamic. They not only facilitate communication among students but also participate in all class activities". Teachers play a crucial role in improving students' EFL writing. In CLT, they are facilitators and correctors rather than lecturers where they encourage students to actively participate and motivate them to enhance their writing.

Conclusion

This chapter attempted to provide an overview about the effectiveness of communicative activities and teaching writing in foreign language classrooms. At first, it started by exploring the definition, background, and main principles of communicative language teaching, along with its application in the classroom. Then, it shed light on various types of communicative activities that allow the learners to use language in a meaningful context. The chapter also focused on the importance of writing presenting its main teaching approaches, along with the benefits of integrating a communicative approach to make writing more interactive.

Chapter Two: Fieldwork

Introduction

2.1. Research Design

2.2. Population and Sampling

2.3. Research Instruments

2.4. Classroom Observation

- 2.4.1. Description of the Observation
- 2.4.2. Analysis of the Observation
- 2.4.3. Discussion of the Observation Results

2.5. Teacher Questionnaire

- 2.5.1. Description of the Teacher Questionnaire
- 2.5.2. Analysis of the Teacher Questionnaire
- 2.5.3. Discussion of the Teacher Questionnaire Results

2.6. Overall Results Discussion

2.7. Limitations of the Study

2.8. Recommendations for Further Research

Conclusion

Chapter Two: Fieldwork

Introduction

While the previous chapter presented a literature review of communicative language teaching and the writing skill, the present chapter is concerned with the fieldwork of the study. It explores the implementation of communicative language activities in teaching EFL writing at the department of English, University of Jijel. It presents the instruments used for data collection and data analysis, followed by the discussion of the overall results, the limitations of the study and some recommendations for further research.

2.1. Research Design

According to Wang et al. (2018), descriptive research design is a type of conclusive research that is used to describe particular components causes, or phenomena in a research area. It uses quantitative methods to precisely depict a subject's current status rather than testing hypotheses (p. 21). Descriptive research is a research method that can determine the situation in current phenomenon. In other words, research design used to examine the situation involving identification of attributes of a particular phenomenon based on an observational basis. The present study is descriptive as it aligns with the nature of the research questions which focus on exploring the existing practices in EFL writing classrooms. The aim of the descriptive design is to describe the present implementation of Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) and to understand how teachers incorporate these activities in teaching writing. It also appropriate to collect reliable data through the teacher questionnaire and classroom observation which they offer valuable insights into the actual teaching approaches. The descriptive design is a suitable choice for this study as it is concerned with what is happening in the classroom, not why or how it happens which means without influencing the teaching process.

2.2. Population and Sampling

The present study targets a population of teachers of EFL writing at the undergraduate level at the Department of English, University of Jijel during the academic year 2024-2025. The sample consists of eight teachers of writing at the department. The classroom observation was the primary tool adopted in this study; varying from one to three sessions with each teacher. The questionnaire used in this study was administered to 08 teachers who taught writing to first-year, second-year, and third-year undergraduate students.

2.3. Research Instruments

The tools used to gather data for the current study are classroom observation and teacher questionnaire with teachers of writing in the Department of English, University of Jijel. Classroom observation is a data collection tool used to obtain more reliable information. According to Nunan and Baily (2009) classroom observation can be defined as "a family of related procedures for gathering data during actual language lessons or tutorial sessions, primarily by watching, listening, and recording (rather than by asking)" (p. 258). This instrument was chosen for the investigation because classroom observation facilitates recording data immediately in its real context, this helps in providing more accurate and authentic data than depending on participants' self-reported actions. According to Sanaei (2016), observation "can be regarded as a powerful instrument, to the extent that the researchers could attain an in-depth perception of their participants' performance" (p.906). Thus, this data collection tool aims at investigating how communicative language activities are implemented in Written Expression classes.

The questionnaire is a set of questions that help the researcher to collect the needed information about his/her topic of study from a selected sample of participants. As Brown (2001, p.6) said that "any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or

selecting from existing answers". Also, Nunan (1992, p.231) described the questionnaire as "an instrument for the collection of data, usually in written form, consisting of open and/or closed ended questions and other probes requiring a response from subjects". The selection of the questionnaire as the second data collection tool in this study is due to the fact that all respondents answer identical set of questions, which enhances the reliability and allows effective comparison of the collected data. As Brace (2008) claimed that "a questionnaire's main goal is to guarantee a standard and consistent method of collecting data from each participant in order to preserve consistency throughout the study. It ensures that every respondent is given appropriate questions in the same way" (p.4).

In this study the observation and the questionnaire were used as complementary tools to ensure the reliability of results through varying the source of data which refer to data triangulation. The combination of the questionnaire and the observation is important because teachers are sometimes not aware that they are using a particular approach in teaching and this is why there was a need for an observation to validate the questionnaire findings and identify practices that teachers may not explicitly recognize.

2.4. Classroom Observation

2.4.1. Description of the Observation

In the present study, classroom observation was used to collect data and check whether Written Expression teachers implement CLAs in their writing classes. The researchers constructed a checklist of thirteen (13) items and attended thirteen (13) sessions with eight (08) WE teachers of first year, second year and third year levels varying from one to three sessions with each teacher. Each group was observed for one hour and half, totaling nineteen and half hours of observation. The observation took place in the second semester of the academic year 2024/2025.

The checklist (See Appendix1) was conducted to include a number of statements that delineate how the CLT approach is used by teachers in writing classes. The observers tick in the columns by “yes” or “no” to confirm or disconfirm the presence of any of the CLT approach practices and activities in the classroom. This checklist was constructed based on characteristics from communicative language teaching, as outlined in Richards’ book Communicative Language Teaching Today and Littlewoods’ book Communicative Language Teaching. It focused on meaningful communication, students’ engagement, and learner independence. Through the first item, researchers sought to highlight whether the teacher assigns writing tasks with a clear communicative purpose. In the second item, they investigated whether these tasks were based on real-life or meaningful contexts. With the third item, they examined to identify whether students were encouraged to work in pairs or groups, while the fourth item was used to explore their active participation in discussions related to writing. In The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and nineth items, the researchers focused on the use of various communicative activities such as opinion sharing activities, role play activities, dialogues, task completion activities, information gathering activities and information transfer activities. Through the tenth item, they explored how the teacher provided feedback, with an emphasis on whether it was done interactively. In the eleventh item, they examined whether the teacher encouraged autonomous learning. With the twelfth item, the researchers assessed if the teacher is a facilitator more than a lecturer. Finally, in item thirteen, they observed whether the teacher prioritized fluency over accuracy. Besides, the researchers included space for more remarks and comments especially when observing some information that does not exist in the checklist.

Furthermore, the observers attended the classes without informing the teacher about the objective of the research, which helped in ensuring spontaneous teaching and avoiding anything prepared to maintain the validity of the data collected during the observation. In

addition to that, the observers sat in the back corner of the class, which allowed them to observe all the movements of both the teacher and the students without causing any kind of distraction.

2.4.2. Analysis of the Observation

Table 1

Writing Tasks with a Clear Communicative Purpose

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	3	23,08%
No	10	76,92%
Total	13	100%

The aim of observing this assess whether writing tasks are designed to enhance ability to communicate, reflecting authentic language use. During the thirteen sessions that we have observed, few teachers of Written Expression (n=3) assigned writing tasks that have a communicative purpose, while the majority (n=10) did not. The results show that in most observed classes, writing tasks did not reflect a clear communicative purpose.

Table 2

Real-Life Context Writing Activities

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	11	84,62%
No	2	15,38%
Total	13	100%

As a core principle of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Observing if writing tasks involve real-life situations or meaningful contexts in writing classes was necessary. The observation revealed that 84,62% of Written Expression teachers assigned writing tasks that involve real-life situations or meaningful contexts such as should fast food advertising to children be banned, accidents in the road, cheating in the exam, and

comparing between university and high school, whereas 15,38% of them did not. So, the majority of classes indicated a high degree of contextual relevance in writing tasks.

Table 3

Pair and Group Interaction Before/during Writing

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	2	15,38%
No	11	84,62%
Total	13	100%

The researchers observed whether students participate in group or pair work in the writing process, because it allows learners to share ideas, negotiate meaning, and engage in collaborative writing. This item was not apparent in 11 classes with a percentage of 84,62% and only 2 teachers applied it representing 15,38%.

Table 4

Engaged Discussions before/during Writing

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	9	69,23%
No	4	30,77%
Total	13	100%

The researchers examined the communicative and interactive nature of the classroom during their observation. The majority of classes (69.23%) offered opportunities for students' participation in discussions in the writing process. Students' participation in discussions is effectively established, fostering learner engagement and critical thinking.

Table 5

Motivating Students to Share Opinions

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	11	84,62%
No	2	15,38%
Total	13	100%

We wanted to verify if the teacher provides opportunities for the students to express their ideas and opinions using opinion sharing activities such as agree/disagree statements, rank order activities, and debates. The findings of the observation showed that most of teachers (84,62%) encourage students to express their ideas.

Table 6

The Use of Role Play Activities or Dialogues in the Writing Class

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	1	7,69%
No	12	92,31%
Total	13	100%

During writing classes observation, the researchers checked if role plays and dialogues are integrated in teaching writing. However, the use of such activities was rarely indicated with a percentage of 92,69% and only 7,69% was for dialogues and it was observed in one class. We have noticed that there was no integration of role plays and a rarity of dialogues in the writing classes.

Table7

The Use of Task Completion Activities in the Writing Class

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	4	30,77%
No	9	69,23%
Total	13	100%

The aim behind proposing this item in the checklist is to assess the integration of task completion activities in the writing class such as writing to solve problem or complete a scenario, puzzles, games and map-reading. At these activities, students focused on using their own language resources to accomplish tasks. They were observed in less than half of the classes (four classes) representing 30,77%. However, they were not observed in the remainder with a percentage of 69,23%.

Table 08

Information Gathering Activities Used in the Writing Class

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	5	38,46%
No	8	61,54%
Total	13	100%

The researchers also wanted to know whether information gathering activities are used in the writing class. These activities make students use their language resources to collect information through surveys, interviews and searches to support their writing. These activities were observed in five sessions (38,46%), while in other sessions they were not present (61.54%).

Table 09

Information Transfer Activities Used in the Writing Class.

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	1	7,69%
No	12	92,31%
Total	13	100%

The observation included assessing whether or not information transfer activities are used in the writing classes. At these activities, students grasp information that is presented in one form and represent it in another way including writing based on graphs, charts, or tables. Just one teacher applied this kind of activities representing (7,69%), and the majority of teachers did not apply it in the writing class (92,31%).

Table 10

Interactive Feedback on Students' Writing

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	4	30,77%
No	9	69,23%
Total	13	100%

During the observation, we also aimed at examining if teachers provide feedback through interacting with students to help them improve their writing. More than half of teachers (69,23%) do not give interactive feedback, and only few teachers (30,77) use this strategy which is effective for students to revise their writing and improve it through real communication with the teacher.

Table 11

Encouraging Autonomous Leaning

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	11	84,62%
No	2	15,38%
Total	13	100%

The researchers aimed at checking if the teachers of Written Expression encourage autonomous learning in the writing class. The majority of teachers (84,62%) applied autonomous learning in their classes by giving the students to choose topics of their interests to write about. While it was not observed in two sessions (15,38%), but teachers promoted learner autonomy which is a key principle of CLT that enhances motivation and self-confidence among students.

Table 12

Teacher as a facilitator

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	8	61,54%
No	5	38,46%
Total	13	100%

This item was proposed to evaluate if the teacher plays the role of a facilitator or a lecturer in the classroom. The findings show that the teacher played both roles; a facilitator was observed 8 times (61,54%) and a lecturer 5 times (38,46). In all the thirteen sessions

we have attended the teacher is a facilitator more than a lecturer, but more consistent application is needed.

Table 13

Focus on Fluency Over Accuracy

Item	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	2	15,38
No	11	84,62
Total	13	100%

The aim of this item is to determine whether teachers focus on fluency more than accuracy and that was checked from the feedback provided by the teacher. The findings show that teachers focused on accuracy more than fluency (84,62%). They focused more on the structure of paragraphs and essays, punctuation, and grammatical forms rather than meaning. It is noteworthy that there should be a balance between fluency and accuracy.

2.4.3. Discussion of the Observation Results

It was clear from the analysis of the classroom observation that Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) were not frequently used in EFL writing classes. The findings from thirteen observed writing class sessions indicate that, although certain communicative aspects were present, other essential practices in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach are still not utilized in the writing classes. Starting with the nature and context of writing tasks. Despite most of sessions (84.62%) included writing activities grounded in real or meaningful contexts, only 23.08% of the tasks had a clear communicative purpose. The writing tasks frequently failed to accomplish real communication goals and students were writing on relevant topics, but not always for real-world communicative contexts or audiences. In addition, the observation revealed insights on students' interaction and collaboration. Group and pair work before/during writing was rarely (15.38%) used, while discussions were more frequently observed, appearing in

69.23% of sessions. This clarifies that although classroom discussions foster participation, collaborative writing is still not a common practice. Moreover, while 84.62% of teachers encouraged students to express their thoughts and opinions, limited use of communicative strategies such as dialogues and role plays representing 7.69% shows a restricted range of activities to facilitate the sharing of ideas. The Communicative activities used in the classroom such as task completion were observed in 30.77% of sessions. Information-gathering tasks were observed in 38.46% of sessions, whereas information-transfer activities were used in just 7.69% of sessions. The inconsistent use of diverse activities indicates an emphasis on traditional tasks and the need to integrate additional types of CLAs. For feedback and teacher role, only 30.77% of the sessions included interactive feedback. However, the majority of teachers representing 84.62% encouraged autonomous learning, especially through allowing students to choose writing topics. Although the teacher served as a lecturer in 38.46% of the sessions, they acted as a facilitator in the remaining 61.54%. Fluency was not as important as accuracy. Teachers focused more on grammar and structure than on helping students write in a fluid, communicative style in 84.62% of sessions.

These findings suggest that while some principles of CLT are acknowledged in writing classes, the overall teaching practices do not align with the core aims of communicative language teaching. Based on these results, it is clear that the teachers do not fully implement the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in their writing classes.

2.5. The Teacher Questionnaire

2.5.1. Description of the Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire aims to collect data on the implementation of Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) in teaching EFL writing at the Department of English,

University of Jijel. It was administered to eight (08) Written Expression teachers at the department. It consists of nineteen (19) questions and is divided into two sections. The first is about the background information of the respondents and comprises four closed-ended questions (Q1–Q4); Q1 is on the academic degree held by the teachers, Q2 is about their years of experience in teaching English, Q3 is about the years of experience in particularly teaching writing, and Q4 determines the level(s) of students they currently teach in writing.

The second section, entitled "Teachers' Views about the Use of Communicative Language Activities", includes fifteen (15) questions (Q5–Q19). The section encompasses a mix of closed-ended questions such as multiple-choice and Likert scales and open-ended questions such as justifications. Q5 inquires how frequently teachers encourage writing among their students. Q6 investigates whether teachers ask students to set up writing learning goals and to provide a justification for the answer, and Q7 targets the teaching approaches they adopt (process, product, or genre). The remaining questions explore teacher understanding of Communicative Language Teaching (Q8), their experience in implementing it (Q9) with a justification, and the frequency with which they include CLAs into their writing classes (Q10). Q11 determines whether writing tasks incorporate meaningful contexts or real-life situations. Q12 examines the various CLA types that teachers use such as role-plays, dialogues, and discussions. Teachers' preferences regarding whether students work individually, in pairs, or in groups as well as their justifications are covered in Q13. Additionally, teachers are asked whether they encourage peer interaction (Q14), assign task completion activities (Q15), and information- gathering activities before writing like brainstorming or research (Q16). The use of information transfer activities, such as writing from graphs or charts, is examined in Q17. The final two questions assess whether teachers believe CLAs contribute to developing students' writing skills along with

the justification of their views (Q18), and what challenges they face in implementing CLAs into their writing classes (Q19).

2.5.2. Analysis of the Teacher Questionnaire

Section one: Background Information

Question 1: Which academic degree do you hold?

Table 14

Teachers' Qualifications

Responses	Participants	Percentage
Master's	3	37.5%
Magister	1	12.5%
PhD	4	50%
Total	8	100%

Table 14 indicates the teacher's qualifications. 50% of teachers have a PhD degree, while 37.5% of them have a master's degree, and only 12.5% of them said they have a magister degree.

Question 2: How long have you been teaching English?

Table 15

Teachers' Experience in Teaching English

Response	Participants	Percentage
1-5 years	3	37.5%
6-10 years	0	0%
More than 10 years	5	62.5%
Total	8	100%

The aim of this question is to elicit data about how many years the respondents have been teaching English by providing them with choices (1-5 years, 6-10 years, or more than 10 years). It was apparent from the responses received that 62,5 % of the participants have more than 10 years of experience, while 37,5% of teachers are new to teaching. Based on the results, most of the respondents have a significant amount of experience in the field.

This is a positive factor as their years of teaching English can help provide reliable and valuable data to the research.

Question 3: How long have you been teaching writing to EFL students?

Table 16

Teacher's Experience in Teaching Writing

Response	Participants	Percentage
1-5 years	6	75%
6-10 years	0	0%
More than 10 years	2	25%
Total	8	100%

The purpose of this question was to find out how many years the teachers have been teaching Written Expression. The teachers' responses indicate that 75% of teachers have taught writing for fewer than 5 years, while only 25% of them have taught Written Expression for more than 10 years. The result showed that more than half of them are novice Written Expression teachers.

Question 4: Which level do you teach writing?

Table 17

Levels of Teaching Writing

Response	Participants	Percentage
First year	4	50%
Second year	4	50%
Third year	3	37.5%

The aim of this question was to identify which level of writing classes are taught by the teachers, whether it is first year, second, or third year. Table 17 shows that 50% of the participants teach freshmen. Also, 50% teach sophomores while 37.5% of teachers teach third-year students. Gathering data from teachers of writing to various levels at the English Department of Jijel University is a good factor for the research because it ensures that the responses will represent various experiences from teachers with different levels.

Section Two: Teachers' Views about the Use of Communicative Language Activities

Question 5: Do you encourage your students to write in the classroom?

Table 18

Frequency of Encouraging Students to Write in The Classroom

Response	Participants	Percentage
Always	8	100%
Often	0	0%
Sometimes	0	0%
Rarely	0	0%
Never	0	0%
Total	8	100%

The answers to this question revealed that all teachers (100%) encourage their students to write in the classroom. This suggests that all teachers recognize how important writing is in learning language and they make an effort to include it regularly in their lessons.

Question 6: Do you ask your students to set their learning writing goal?

Table 19

Teacher Asking Students to Set Their Writing Learning Goals

Response	Participants	Percentage
Yes	6	75%
No	2	25%
Total	8	100%

The aim of this question was to explore whether the teachers encourage their students to set their learning writing goals. The results showed that almost all the teachers (75%) responded with "yes", which means that they recognize the value of identifying a writing goal for improving their writing skills. While only two teachers (25%) answered with "no".

Also, teachers were asked to justify their answers. As a follow up question, the teachers were required to justify their answers. Most teachers explained this as follows: “knowing learning writing goals ensures students’ knowledge about the final piece of writing they should produce. In addition, it helps and guides them to stay on the topic as the instruction they are asked to accomplish”. Also, a teacher said: “When students set up their goals, their motivation, focus, and responsibility will be increased, helping them enhance some specific aspects of their writing more effectively like achieving coherence or mastering some rhetorical patterns”. While two teachers who answered with “no” said: “they do not ask their students to set their writing goals because they teach only syllabus objectives”.

Question 7: which approach do you adopt when teaching writing?

Table 20

Approaches to Teaching Writing

Response	Participants	Percentage
The Process Approach	8	100%
The Product Approach	4	50%
The Genre Approach	5	62.5%

This question was addressed to inquire about the approaches that teachers adopt in the writing class. The results show that the highest percentage (100%) of teachers used the process approach while teaching writing. This means that the efficiency of this approach according to these teachers helps students to enhance their writing. However, 62.5% of the participants preferred to use the genre approach, while 50% of them used the product approach.

Question 8: Are you familiar with communicative language teaching (CLT)?

Table 21

Familiarity with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Response	Participants	Percentage
Very familiar	3	37.5%
Somewhat familiar	4	50%
Not familiar	1	12.5%
Total	8	100%

The purpose of this question was to investigate whether the teachers are familiar with the topic of the research which is on using communicative language teaching (CLT) activities in teaching writing. The half of the teachers (50%) are somewhat familiar with the CLT approach, while 37.5% of the respondents are very familiar with this approach. However, one teacher is not familiar with the CLT approach.

Question 9: Have you ever used CLT when teaching writing?

Table 22

Teacher's Use of CLT For Writing

Response	Participants	Percentage
Yes	8	100%
No	0	0%
Total	8	100%

Table 22 presents information about utilizing Communicative language teaching in EFL classes to teach writing. According to the data, all of the teachers claimed that they use CLT as an approach to enhance their students' writing skills. In a follow up question, the teachers were requested to justify their answers. The majority of teachers explained as follows: they applied the CLT approach in teaching writing by promoting group and pair work, encouraging discussions and think-pair-share activities, watching videos, listening to given materials, reading texts, and writing essays to have a final product. Some teachers said that they implemented the CLT by focusing on real-life scenarios to write the

paragraphs and essays and encourage their students to engage in conversation before they start writing". A teacher claimed: "I have applied the CLT in teaching writing by promoting collaborative writing, peer feedback, and purposeful communication, which aids learners see writing as a tool for real interaction".

Question 10: If yes, how often do you integrate communicative language activities (CLAs) into your writing lessons?

Table 23

Teacher's Integration of Communicative Language Activities in Writing

Response	Participants	Percentage
Always	2	25%
Often	3	37.5%
Sometimes	3	37.5%
Rarely	0	0%
Never	0	0%
Total	8	100%

The purpose of this question was to investigate whether the teachers integrate communicative language activities in their writing lessons. The results show that the majority of teachers reported that they often or sometimes integrate these activities in the classroom when teaching writing by equal percentage of 37.5%. 25% of them claimed that they always use CLT in their lessons. This strong presence of this approach comes from that the teachers of Written Expression at the Department of English, University of Jijel believe that communicative activities are beneficial tools for improving learners' writing skills.

Question 11: Do your writing tasks involve real- life situations or meaningful contexts?

Table 24

Inclusion of Real- Life Situations in Writing Instruction

Response	Participants	Percentage
Always	3	37.5%
Often	4	50%
Sometimes	1	12.5%
Rarely	0	0%
Never	0	0%
Total	8	100%

This question was posed in order to know if the teachers implement writing tasks that are related to real-life situations or have meaningful contexts. Based on the data provided in the table, half of teachers (50%) often involve real-life situations in writing tasks, 37.5% always involve them, and only 12.5 % sometimes do so. These results have a good effect on students writing because providing real-life language experience reflects the core principle of communicative language teaching, which emphasizes using language in practical situations.

Question 12: Which CLAs do you use in writing classes? Other (Please specify)

Table 25

Types of Communicative Activities Used in Writing Classes

Response	Participants	Percentage
Role play	0	0%
Dialogues	1	12.5%
Discussions	8	100%

The aim of the question was to identify the type of communicative activities that are used by the teachers when teaching writing. The table indicates that most of the teachers (100%) preferred using discussions, while only one teacher claimed that they use dialogues when teaching writing and none of them chose role plays. However, some of the

participants added some options such as peer review, group and pair writing, games, and analyzing given texts.

Question 13: When you assign an activity to your students, do you ask them to work…….

Individually, or in pairs, or in groups.

Would you please justify your answer?

Table 26

Modes of Students' Work Assigned by Teachers

Response	Participants	Percentage
Individually	8	100%
In pairs	7	87.5%
In groups	7	87.5%

This question aimed to demonstrate whether the teachers ask their students to work individually, in pairs, or in groups. Based on the result provided in the table, all of the teachers (100%) ask their students to work individually when doing an activity; while 87.5% of them prefer that the students work in pairs, and the remainder 87.5% assign group work tasks. Also, teachers were asked to justify their answers. Most teachers explained this as follows: "it depends on the type of activity or on the lesson objectives, the individual work for tracking the personal development and highlighting writing personal criteria, pairs practice assigned to help peer assisting and reviewing learning, and group work for discussions". A teacher said: "Practice is usually composed of three stages. Group, pair, individual, moving from one step into the other ensures interaction and communication between students, for example: they divide the group into two subgroups. They engage in controversial topics (discussions). Then they write essays individually".

Question 14: Do you encourage peer interaction and communication inside the classroom?

Table 27

Encouragement of Peer Interaction in The Classroom

Response	Participants	Percentage
Yes	8	100%
No	0	0%
Total	8	100%

This question was posed to capture the number of teachers who encourage peer interaction and communication inside the classroom. All the teachers (100%) claimed that they encourage students to interact with each other in the classroom. While, there is no one who does not encourage them, which means that the desired frequency of peer engagement is successfully achieved.

Question 15: Do you assign task- completion activities in writing classes (e.g., writing to solve problem or complete a scenario)?

Table 28

Use of Task- Completion Activities in Writing Classes

Response	Participants	Percentage
Always	1	12.5%
Often	3	37%
Sometimes	2	25%
Rarely	1	12.5%
Never	1	12.5%
Total	8	100%

The purpose of this question was to explore whether teachers use task-completion activities when teaching writing. The results indicate that a higher percentage (37%) of teachers often assign task-completion activities in their writing classes, while only 25% of them responded by “sometimes”. Then, 12.5% referred to both “always” and “rarely, and another 12.5% of participants have never used this kind of activities.

Question 16: Do you assign information- gathering activities before writing (research, brainstorming…)?

Table 29

Use of Information-Gathering Activities in Writing Classes

Response	Participants	Percentage
Always	5	62.5%
Often	0	0%
Sometimes	2	25%
Rarely	1	12.5%
Never	0	0%
Total	8	100%

This question was to explore whether teachers use information-gathering activities when teaching writing. The table shows that more than half of (62.5%) of teachers always assign information-gathering activities in their writing classes, while 25% of them said that they sometimes use this kind of activities in teaching writing. Only one teacher (12.5%) goes with "rarely".

Question 17: Do you assign information transfer activities (e.g., writing based on graphs, charts, or tables)?

Table 30

Use of Information Transfer Activities in Writing Classes

Response	Participants	Percentage
Always	0	0%
Often	1	12.5
Sometimes	1	12.5%
Rarely	4	50%
Never	2	25%
Total	8	100%

The purpose of this question is to verify whether teachers use information transfer activities when teaching writing. 50% of teachers claimed that they rarely use these activities in their teaching writing classes while 25% of teachers said that they never use

these activities. The same percentage 12.5% goes for those who claimed they often and sometimes use information transfer activities.

Question 18: Do you think that communicative language activities are important in developing students' writing skills?

Would you please justify your answer?

Table 31

Teachers' Perspectives on the Importance of Communicative Activities in Developing writing

Response	Participants	Percentage
Yes	8	100%
No	0	0%
Total	8	100%

The aim of this question was to demonstrate teachers' perceptions regarding the significance of communicative activities in developing their students' writing skills. All the teachers agreed on the valuable role that communication plays in improving students' proficiency in writing. This means that they recognize the efficiency of CLT in teaching writing; they consider it as a tool of improvement that helps them to achieve their purposes. Also, the teachers in this question were asked to justify their answers. The majority of them said: "CLAs improve students' writing by providing meaningful contexts, promoting real-world language use, and encouraging interaction which help students develop both their language and critical thinking". A teacher said: "some activities could be useful to develop the student's writing skills, like brainstorming, discussions and group work". Another teacher said: "CLAs set the context for learners to understand the topic they will write on and provide information and supporting ideas that may help ensuring clarity". A teacher said: "CLAs help students to brainstorm ideas, consider different stands, reflect on possible solutions, and refutations".

Question 19: What challenges have you faced when integrating CLAs in your writing classes?

This question aimed to show the difficulties that teachers face when they implement communicative language activities in teaching writing. Based on the responses received, some teachers said: “Communicative language activities are time and effort consuming inside and outside the classroom which require significant teachers’ preparation and planning. While other teachers said: “some students’ reluctance to communicate and interact with each other because of the lack of confidence, limited vocabulary, shyness or anxious and the overuse of the native language”. A teacher said: “it is difficult to account for various learning styles, preferences, and needs, especially in large classes where managing participation becomes a challenge”. Moreover, some teachers said: “not all CLAs are practical in the writing class because of time constraints in covering both communicative tasks and writing mechanics”. Thus, the awareness of this approach’s limitations provides a valuable opportunity for future enhancement and more effective implementation.

2.5.3. Discussion of the Teacher Questionnaire Results

It is clear from the teacher’s questionnaire analysis that the majority of Written Expression teachers prefer to implement communicative language activities (CLAs) in teaching their students’ writing, despite some practical challenges. According to the teachers’ answers in the first part, it is noticed half of Written Expression teachers at the English department, University of Jijel, hold a PhD degree, and 37.5 % of them hold a master’s degree, while a teacher holds magister degree. In addition, most of them have more than ten years of experience in teaching English; however, more than half of them are novices in teaching writing or have taught writing for less than five years, and only two of

them have taught writing for more than ten years. This means that their insights into using CLAs in writing are based on both their high qualification and their experience.

The analysis of the second section of the questionnaire was concerned with teacher's views on the use of communicative language activities. The results showed that all of them agreed to encourage their students to write and set their goals when writing in the classroom because it is correlate with the principles of CLT, which prioritize meaningful and purposeful communication. It encourages learner autonomy and it helps students concentrate on real life writing activities. The result revealed that the process approach is highly implemented in teaching writing. The genre and product approaches were also used by some teachers. This adaptability shows that educators value the writing process and pay attention to both the structure and context of their students' work. From the teachers' responses, it is noticed that the majority of them are somewhat familiar with the CLT approach which they claimed to integrate into their writing classes. The findings also suggest that teachers reported assigning students to work in pairs, groups, or individual work, it depends on the type of activity and the lesson objectives. They encourage students to interact with each other when they are writing in order to share ideas and assess each other's work. Teachers identified discussions as the most commonly used communicative activity, while dialogues and role plays were far less utilized. The frequent use of task-completion, and information-gathering activities supports the teachers' intention to make the writing instruction more meaningful and communicative, while information-transfer activities were rarely used in writing classes. All teachers agreed on the importance of communicative language activities in developing student's writing by providing meaningful contexts, and activities such as discussions and group work could be useful for students. Furthermore, the results pointed to certain limitations of using CLAs. Time management, classroom size, and the effort required to prepare these activities were

commonly cited as obstacles. Teachers also pointed to student participation because of shyness, lack of confidence and vocabulary, and overuse of native language.

To sum up, the feedback obtained from the teachers' questionnaire indicates that while there is high support for the application of communicative language activities in EFL writing, various practical problems still affect their full implementation.

2.6. Overall Results Discussion

The findings from the Written Expression classes' observation and the teacher questionnaire, which was administered to Written Expression teachers at the English Department, University of Jijel, to explore the implementation of CLAs in writing classes helped us to answer all the research questions. The gathered data revealed existing discrepancies between the observation and teachers' responses and views.

First, with regard to the first research question: Are Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) implemented in the teaching of EFL writing at the Department of English, University of Jijel? the results of the observations showed that CLAs were rarely ever used in writing classes. Role plays, discussions, and real-world writing tasks were few, and just 23.08% of the writing activities that were observed had a clear communication objective. In contrast, teachers consistently supported the use of CLAs in the questionnaire responses, recognizing their importance in raising students' writing engagement and proficiency. They asserted that they included meaningful, real-life situations in their writing tasks. This finding supports Littlewood (1981) assertation that CLT emphasizes on integrating meaningful communication and learner engagement. That is to say, despite teachers' theoretical support for the use of CLAs in writing classes, the classroom observation illustrates that these activities are not always used in practice.

Students' interaction and collaboration are core principles of CLT (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The observation findings showed that in 69.23% of sessions, there were

discussions, although pair or group work was only used 15.38% of the time. The practice of writing collaboratively was rare. However, the questionnaire indicated that teachers commonly assign students to work individually, in pairs, or groups based on the requirement of the task, and they encourage peer interaction to share and assess ideas. It is apparent that although teachers affirmed, they perform collaborative work frequently, observations reveal that there is still limited collaborative writing and that the majority of activities are individual or discussion-based.

Second, with respect to the answer to the research question: What types of Communicative Language Activities (CLAs) are used in EFL writing instruction at the University of Jijel? both similarities and contrasts across the observation and the questionnaire were detected. In the classes that were observed, 30.77% of the sessions included task-completion activities, 38.46% involved information-gathering activities, and only 7.69% involved information-transfer tasks. However, the teachers stated the use of discussions, task completion, and information gathering-activities, but acknowledged the limited application of information transfer tasks and role plays. Thus, it is deducible that both reflect that certain communication activities have been used more than others, with discussions taking dominance and more complex or interactive CLAs being overlooked (Richards, 2006; Littlewood, 1981).

Third, with reference to the answer to the research question: How do EFL teachers integrate Communicative Language Activities into their writing instruction? the roles and feedback of the observed teachers show differences with the communicative principles that the teachers assert they follow. Despite encouraging student autonomy and acting mostly as facilitators (61.54%), only 30.77% of sessions included interactive feedback from teachers. Accuracy was prioritized over fluency (84.62%). According to the results of the questionnaire, teachers placed a strong emphasis on encouraging students' autonomy and

helping them develop writing goals. However, complete CLA integration was restricted by real-life challenges like time constraints and classroom management. Although teachers place a significant emphasis on autonomy and communicative teaching. The emphasis on accuracy and the absence of feedback indicates a gap between goals and implementation.

Both observations and questionnaire data confirm that there are challenges to the effective use of CLAs. Although this is not explicitly observed during observations in the classroom, the limited frequency and diversity of CLAs suggest a number of challenges that limit their use. In their questionnaire responses, teachers explicitly mentioned vocabulary problems, shy students, large class sizes, time constraints, and frequent use of the native language. Both tools confirm that actual challenges to the effective integration of communicative activities in writing classrooms, which come from both internal and external classroom circumstances.

As a conclusion, according to the comparison, teacher classroom practices do not completely correspond to their positive opinions and theoretical support for CLAs in teaching writing. Although the data obtained suggested that teachers' use of CLAs was minimal and irregular, it is expected that they do employ such activities in other sessions that were not included in the observation period. Practical difficulties represent an important part of the difference between purpose and implementation. Overcoming these challenges that prevent the successful implementation of communicative language teaching activities in writing classes is believed a necessity.

2.7. Limitations of the Study

While investigating the use of communicative language activities in writing classes at the

Department of English, University of Jijel, some challenges were encountered by the researchers. Among these challenges:

- Due to time constraints, the researchers were forced to conduct classroom observation of Written Expression classes for a relatively limited period of time, they wish it was extended, which may not have exhaustively captured the full range of teaching practices or student interaction.
- Some Written Expression teachers kindly declined our request to observe their classes during quizzes period, which reduced the number of sessions we could attend. Additionally, some sessions were scheduled at the same time, which further limited our observation opportunities.

2.8. Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of this study will hopefully improve the teaching and learning of EFL writing at the Department of English, University of Jijel. By investigating whether communicative language activities (CLAs) are used in writing classrooms, the study indicates important areas that require improvement. For a more successful integration of CLAs into writing education, the following recommendations have been set forth based on the analysis of the classroom observation and teacher questionnaire:

- Teachers are recommended to increase their use of communicative language activities (CLAs) in writing classes at the Department of English, University of Jijel because they develop writing skill through improving fluency, negotiation of meaning, and idea generation. CLAs also encourage collaborative learning through pair, group work, and interactive feedback.
- For future researchers, this research paved you the way to know whether communicative language activities are used in teaching EFL writing, you can do research on this topic by conducting an experimental study on the effectiveness of

such activities in developing the writing skill at the Department of English, University of Jijel. According to the findings of this research, the following studies might be proposed to be investigated in the future:

- The Impact of Communicative Language Activities on EFL Students' Writing Performance.
- A Comparative Study of Traditional and Communicative Approaches in Teaching EFL Writing
- Using Communicative Tasks to Improve EFL Learners' the Writing Skill

- It is suggested for future researchers who want to work on the effectiveness of using CLAs on the writing skill it is better to expand the sample size by adding other universities.
- While this study focused only on teachers' perspectives, but further research works could investigate students' attitudes and preference in using CLAs for writing classes. This could provide deeper understanding of how students view and benefit from these activities.
- As role plays and information-transfer tasks were rarely used, other studies could focus on testing and evaluating the impact of these particular types of CLAs on students' writing.
- Teachers are invited to encourage students to use CLAs not only inside the classroom but also outside the classroom.
- Since some teachers mentioned several challenges in using this approach, other researchers could investigate the effectiveness of techniques for overcoming these obstacles and adapting CLAs to fit the real classroom environment.

Conclusion

The present chapter provided the practical part of this research study which seeks to investigate the implementation of CLAs in teaching EFL writing. It presented the results of the data gathered by the two research instruments, namely the classroom observation and teacher questionnaire, which was administered to the Written Expression teachers of undergraduate levels. Each research instrument was described, analyzed, and discussed separately then it was followed by an overall results discussion that compared the two research tools. The analysis of classroom observation showed limited use of some communicative activities while the teacher questionnaire revealed activities in their writing classes. At the end of the chapter, a set of limitations of the study and recommendations for further research are mentioned.

General Conclusion

Writing is a productive skill that enables individuals to express their thoughts, feelings, and convey information effectively. Due to its importance, educators and researchers have always been interested in developing and adopting new methods and techniques to help students improve this skill, specifically in the EFL context. The present study aimed at investigating the implementation of the communicative language activities (CLAs) in teaching EFL writing in the Department of English, University of Jijel. More specifically, it seeks for the particular type of communicative activities employed in the EFL writing classes and how they are employed.

This dissertation consists of a general introduction, two chapters, and a general conclusion. The first chapter, with its two sections, includes the literature review of the research study while the second chapter considers with the field work. The first section of the theoretical part addresses the concept of communicative language teaching, defining CLT and CLAs, their importance, the principles of CLT, and the different types of CLAs. The second section considers with the writing skill, its definition, and its importance, followed by the approaches of teaching writing and application of CLAs in teaching writing. The fieldwork focused on the description, analysis, and discussion of the results obtained from the adopted research instruments, namely classroom observation and teacher questionnaire. It concluded with the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.

From the classroom observation results, it has been deduced that most of Written Expression teachers, at the Department of English, University of Jijel use of CLAs in their writing classes is limited while the teacher's questionnaire results revealed that the majority of Written Expression teachers at the Department of English are in favor of implementing CLAs in developing students' writing proficiency. Also, the observation showed that only a few types of CLAs such as opinion sharing and discussions were used

and their integration was inconsistent, while from the questionnaire, it has been deduced that teachers admit that they use various CLAs through peer interaction, real-life tasks, and using individual, pair, and group work depending on the lesson objectives. In conclusion, teachers usually encourage the use of these activities in teaching EFL writing.

In conclusion, this research study effectively achieved its aims by answering the research questions related to the investigation of the implementation of CLAs in EFL writing classes, the types of activities used, and how teachers integrate them. The findings from both classroom observation and teacher questionnaire provided valuable insights into current practices, emphasizing the need for more consistent and effective use of communicative approaches in writing instruction at Jijel University.

References

Al-Garni, S. A., & Almuhammadi, A. H. (2019). The effect of using communicative language teaching activities on EFL students' speaking skills at the University of Jeddah. *English Language Teaching, 12*(6), 72–86.

Almuslehi, M. A. (2023). The impact of the communicative language teaching approach on the development of writing skills. *Linguistics and Translation Studies*, (39).

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153–160. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153

Bakhreddinovna, G. M. (2020). The interactive methods and principles of foreign language teaching. *International Journal on Integrated Education, 3*(1), 77–79.

Begibaeva, N. D. (2020). Competence Approach to Teaching Writing. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 8(4), Part II, 62–65. Progressive Academic Publishing, UK. Retrieved from www.idpublications.org

Bell, J., & Burnaby, B. (1984). *Handbook for ESL literacy*. Toronto: OISE.

Benbrika, N., & Lalili, Z. (2021). *Investigating the implementation of the Communicative Language Teaching approach at Labani Ahmed Secondary School* (Master's thesis, University of Jijel). DSpace University of Jijel.

Bousbai, A. (2016). A communicative view to teaching English literature at the Algerian university. *Al Athar*, *15* (25), 121–127.

Brace, I. (2008). *Questionnaire design: how to plan, structure and write survey material for effective market research* (2nd ed.). Kogan page

Brandl, K. (2008). *Communicative language teaching in action*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 36–57.

Byrne, D. (1993). *Teaching writing skills*. London: Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cerbin, B., & Beck, T. (2001). *Why learning to write well in college is difficult.* Writing Across the Curriculum, University of Wisconsin–Madison. https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/wac/why-learning-to-write-well-in-college-is-difficult/

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Daniels, P. T., & Bright, W. (Eds.). (1996). *The world's writing systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dudley-Evans, T. 1997. 'Genre models for the teaching of academic writing to second language speakers: advantages and disadvantages' in T. Miller (ed.). *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications.* Washington DC: United States Information Agency.

Duigu, G. (2002). *Essay writing for English tests*. Cammeray, Australia: Academic English Press.

El Aggoune, A. (2023, October 31). Teaching through the adoption of the communicative approach: EFL students' reflections on the experience. *University of 8 Mai 1945, Guelma*.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gabrielatos, C. (2002). EFL writing: product and process. *U.S. Department of Education*.

Gee, S. 1997. 'Teaching writing a genre-based approach'. *Review of English Language Teaching,* 62: 24-40.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Harris, J. (1993). *Introducing writing*. Clay Ltd, St. Ives plc.

Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Writing English language tests*. London: Longman Group.

Hezbri, M., & Goui, D. (2021, March 15). Key issues in implementing CLT in EST. *Majalt El Ouloum El Arabiya wa Adabouha*, *13*(1), 2694–2705.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Johnson, K., & Porter, D. (Eds.). (1983). *Perspectives in communicative language teaching*. London: Academic Press.

Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching ESL/EFL writing courses. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 219–232). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching, 40*(3), 243–249. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 65–83.

Murray, D. (1972). Writing as a process, not product. *Leaflet, 73*(3), 11–14.

Nasri, C. (2020). The use of some aspects of the communicative language teaching or effective linguistics instruction: The case of first year students, University of Oum El Bouaghi. *Afkar wa Affak. 7* (2), 337–350.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research*: A comprehensive guide. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle

Nurlatifah, U., & Yusuf, Y. Q. (2022). Students' difficulties in EFL writing: A case study. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, *6* (1), 12–25.

Pilleux, M. (1969). The dialogue: A useful tool in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 3*(3), 203–206.

Powell, B. B. (2012). *Writing: Theory and history of the technology of civilization*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Raimes, A. (1953). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ramies, A. (1983). Traditional methods in EFL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(1), 23–35.

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saadi, D. Teaching the English article system using the communicative/structural approach. Journal of Human Sciences, *27*(3), 181–194.

Saleh, S. E. (2013). Understanding communicative competence. *University Bulletin, 3*(15), 101–110.

Sanaei, O. (2016). Investigating anxiety symptoms and reactions within EFL learners' oral narratives: The case of intermediate level students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(5), 902-912. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0705.10

Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*. Yale University Press.

Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Wray, D. (Ed.). (2004). *Literacy: Major themes in education* (Vol. 3). London: Taylor & Francis.

Appendices

Appendix1: Observation Checklist

Observation Checklist for EFL Writing Classes

Date:

Class observed: **Time:**

Teacher:

Department of English – University of Jijel

Observation item	Yes	No	comments
The teacher assigns writing tasks that have a clear communicative purpose.			
Writing tasks involve real-life situations or meaningful contexts.			
Students interact in pairs or groups before/during writing			
Students actively participate in discussions before/during writing.			
The teacher motivates his/ her students to express their ideas and opinions through opinion sharing activities.			
Role plays activities or dialogues are used in the writing class.			
Task completion activities are used in the writing class.			
Information gathering activities used in the writing class			
Information transfer activities are used in the writing class.			
The teacher provides feedback on students' writing through interaction.			
The teacher encourages autonomous learning.			
The teacher is a facilitator rather than a lecturer.			
The teacher focuses on fluency more than accuracy (This can be checked through the feedback given by teachers)			
Further comments			

Appendix 2: Teacher Questionnaire

University of Jijel

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English

Teacher Questionnaire

Dear teachers,

This questionnaire is designed to collect data from Written Expression (WE) teachers on the implementation of communicative language activities (CLAs) in teaching EFL writing at the English Department, University of Jijel. Therefore, we would be very grateful if you could share with us your valuable insights, opinions, and experience about this topic. Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Section One: Background Information

1. Which academic degree do you hold?

☐ Master's ☐ Magister ☐ PhD

2. How long have you been teaching English?

☐ 1-5years ☐ 6-10years ☐ more than 10 years

3. How long have you been teaching writing to EFL students?

☐ 1-5years ☐ 6-10 years ☐ more than 10 years

4. Which level do you teach writing?

☐ First year ☐ Second year ☐ Third year

Section Two: Teachers' Views about the Use of Communicative Language Activities

5. Do you encourage your students to write in the classroom?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐Rarely ☐ Never

6. Do you ask your students to set up their learning writing goal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Would you please justify your answer?

……

……

……

……. .

7. Which approach do you adopt when teaching writing? (Select all that apply)

☐ The Process Approach ☐ The Product Approach ☐ The Genre Approach

8. Are you familiar with communicative language teaching (CLT)?

☐ Very familiar ☐ Somewhat familiar ☐ Not familiar

9. Have you ever used CLT when teaching writing?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Would you please justify your answer?

……

……

……..

10. If yes, how often do you integrate communicative language activities (CLAs) into your writing lessons?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

11.Do your writing tasks involve real- life situations or meaningful contexts?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

12. Which CLAs do you use in writing classes?

☐ Role play ☐ Dialogues ☐ Discussions

- Other (Please specify):

.....

.....

13. When you assign an activity to your students, do you ask them to work…… (Select all that apply)

☐ Individually ☐ In pairs ☐ In groups

- Would you please justify your answer?

……

……

……

……

14. Do you encourage peer interaction and communication inside the classroom?

Yes ☐ No ☐

15. Do you assign task- completion activities in writing classes (e.g., writing to solve problem or complete a scenario)?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

16. Do you assign information- gathering activities before writing (research, brainstorming…)?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

17. Do you assign information transfer activities (e.g., writing based on graphs, charts, or tables)?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

18. Do you think that communicative language activities are important in developing students' writing skills?

☐ Yes ☐ No

-Would you please justify your answer?

……

……

…..……

……..

19. What challenges have you faced when integrating CLAs in your writing classes?

……..……

……

……..……

……

……. .

Résumé

Cette étude de recherche a été menée pour examiner l'application des activités langagières communicatives dans l'enseignement de l'écriture en anglais comme une langue étrangère au sein du département d'anglais de l'université de Jijel. Elle vise particulièrement à déterminer si les enseignants utilisent ces activités communicatives dans les cours d'expression écrite, à identifier les types d'activités qu'ils adoptent, ainsi que la manière dont ils les intègrent dans leur enseignement. Pour atteindre cet objectif, une méthode de recherche descriptive a été adoptée. La collecte des données s'est faite par l'observation de treize (13) séances d'expression écrite durant le second semestre de l'année universitaire 2024/2025, en plus d'un questionnaire distribué aux enseignants de l'expression écrite au niveau de la licence. Les résultats ont révélé une divergence entre les données issues des deux outils de recherche. L'observation a montré que les enseignants ne mettent pas en œuvre les activités communicatives de manière complète dans leurs cours; certaines activités sont utilisées plus que d'autres, notamment les discussions, tandis que les activités plus interactives et complexes sont négligées. Quant au questionnaire destiné aux enseignants, il a révélé que ces derniers croient que les activités communicatives améliorent les compétences en écriture des étudiants en anglais et soutiennent leur utilisation en classe, malgré certains problèmes qui entravent leur mise en œuvre effective.

Les mots clés : Les activités de langue communicatives, écriture, cours d'écriture en anglais langue étrangère

ملخص

أجريت هذه الدراسة البحثية للتحقق من تطبيق الأنشطة اللغوية التواصلية في تدريس الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة جيجل وتهدف بشكل خاص الى معرفة ما إذا كان الأساتذة يستخدمون هذه الأنشطة التواصلية في دروس التعبير الكتابي، وأنواع الأنشطة التي يعتمدونها، والطريقة التي يدمجون بها هذه الأنشطة في التدريس. لتحقيق ذلك، تم الاعتماد على المنهج الوصفي، تمت عملية جمع البيانات عن طريق المراقبة لثلاثة عشر (13) حصة من حصص التعبير الكتابي خلال السداسي الثاني من السنة الجامعية 2024/2025، بالإضافة الى استبيان وزع على أساتذة التعبير الكتابي في مرحلة الليسانس. كشفت النتائج عن تباين بين المعطيات المستخلصة من أداتي البحث، حيث أظهرت المراقبة ان الأساتذة لا يطبقون الأنشطة التواصلية بشكل كامل في حصصهم، إذ يتم استخدام بعض الأنشطة أكثر من غيرها، خاصة المناقشات، بينما تم اهمال الأنشطة الأكثر تفاعلية وتعقيدا. أما استبيان الأساتذة، فقد أظهر أن الأساتذة يؤمنون بأن الأنشطة التواصلية تحسن الكتابة لدى طلبة الإنجليزية، ويدعمون استخدامها في الأقسام، رغم وجود مشاكل تعيق تطبيقها الفعلي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأنشطة التواصلية، الكتابة، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبية