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This study investigated the extent to which adjunct language instruction (ALI) was effective and identified the factors that influenced the effectiveness.

In exploring the effectiveness, this study attempted a study on engineering students in UiTM using customized lab report writing instructional materials. A needs analysis was conducted and it showed that engineering students preferred learning report writing to personal essay writing. The students' preference for learning report writing set the stage for further exploration. Sixty students were instructed lab report writing in content-based writing
using genre-based materials based on the students’ actual Physics lab experiments, called Physics Adjunct Language Instruction (PALI). The results showed that the students’ grades of lab report writing improved. Another test was carried out to find whether teaching writing in an ALI approach was able to meet the writing needs of engineering students. This test used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) as an analytical tool. As SEM requires a sample size of 200 to 300 respondents, another instruction using similar materials, PALI, was carried out on 260 engineering students. The structural model showed that there were two factors that influence the improvement of the students’ lab report writing in PALI. The factors were the teaching conduct and the preference for materials.

In summary, the research revealed three main findings. First, the type of writing needed by engineering students in UiTM was report writing. Second, the PALI led to an improvement in the engineering students’ lab report writing ($t = -8.01, p = .000$). Third, PALI provided two factors or conditions necessary for its success: the way the lab report writing was taught ($\beta = 0.451$) and the preference of materials which are related to the learners’ content subject ($\beta = 0.419$). These two necessary conditions contribute 69.9% ($R^2 = .699$) to meeting the success in lab report writing of these engineering students.
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Keputusan menunjukan tahap pencapaian para pelajar dalam penulisan laporan makmal meningkat. Seterusnya, kajian dibuat untuk mengenal pasti faktor-faktor kepada keberkesanan tersebut. Dalam fasa ini kaedah ‘Structural Equation Modeling’ (SEM) digunakan sebagai alat analitikal. Memandangkan SEM memerlukan 200 – 300 sampel, maka 260 orang pelajar kejuruteraan telah diajar dalam fasa ini dengan menggunakan bahan-bahan yang sama iaitu PALI.
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The Organization of the Thesis

Chapter 1 provides a brief description of the justification of the attempt to use adjunct language instruction, a review of the ESL module undertaken by engineering students, and their level of English proficiency at UTM. The second part of this chapter describes the background, problem statement, purpose, objectives, research questions, significance, scope, and the definition of terms of the study.

Chapter 3 reviews relevant literature in three areas: English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Content-based instruction (CBI), and scientific writing and its features.

Firstly, it discusses scientific writing, technical writing, and report writing; laboratory report genre; and their features. It traces the nature of writing in general, expository, personal essays, and technical writing.

Secondly, it discusses English for Specific Purposes (ESP), its classification, and how CBI fits into the scope of ESP.

Thirdly, as this study is based on the concept of CBI, a detailed treatment is necessary to explain the concept, and its state of development. CBI is primarily the coordination of the learning of language and subject matter.

Chapter 6 suggests that ESL teachers:

should note the content background knowledge of the students and their preference for their content subject materials to be used in their ESL learning.

integrate content concurrent materials and ESL instructional materials.

use direct instruction to teach content-related vocabulary and the passive voice.

include concurrent lab experiments and lab report writing to teach the passive voice structure in the ESL classes for engineering students.

have positive attitudes when teaching writing for specific purposes and adopt relevant methodology as teaching conduct contributes to success in instruction.

Chapter 2 deals with the issues that justify the study. The issues are the need of appropriate approaches to teach writing to engineering undergraduates, the writing needs of professionals, engineers, and engineering undergraduates, the factors that affect the writing ability of engineering students, and the theoretical underpinnings of the study.

A central theme of the issues is the importance of understanding and using the learners' contexts and needs when choosing instructional materials and teaching approach to improve deteriorating English writing skills.

The second part of the chapter contains the theoretical underpinning of the study. It reviews the learning models of CBI and the Theory of Register.

Chapter 4 describes the research methodology. It contains the Procedures, Participants, Instrumentation and the methods used for data analysis.

Chapter 5 reports six significant findings. They are:

(a) The use of genre-based materials in adjunct language instruction (ALI) appears able to improve the engineering ESL students' lab reports writing performance significantly.

(b) Direct teaching of lab report writing in this context is effective.

(c) There is only limited improvement in essay writing of engineering students after the instruction of PALI.

(d) There is a causal relationship among the three necessary conditions of ALI. Among these, the study selects the teaching conduct as the principal factor in the success of ALI.

(e) The probability level of the ALI structural model is 0.088, which means that the model produced in this study can represent the population.

(f) The two necessary conditions are the teaching conduct ($\beta = 0.451$) and the students' preference for materials ($\beta = 0.419$).
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the background, justification, problem statement, purpose, objectives, research questions, significance, scope, and definition of terms of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

The poor writing performance of engineering students at UiTM has remained a major cause for concern. The non-content writing instruction elicits general complaints from most ESL teachers teaching writing in the Faculty of Engineering, of whom the present writer is one of them, that the writing performance is generally unsatisfactory. In fact, this study began with the observation of three problems during the writer's ten years of teaching non-content based writing to engineering students of the university. The first was the students' continuous production of unsatisfactory short essays. The second was the students' anxiety about the language of the reports that they wrote in English to meet the requirement of their content subjects. The third was the persistent errors generated when they used the passive voice in the writing. Some information was also gathered to throw light on the language proficiency of engineering students in UiTM. Engineering students of UiTM who studied in December 1999-April 2000 reported that they faced a lot of difficulties when they had to write their final year projects because of poor
writing skills (Language Centre, UiTM). They claimed that this particular inability severely affected their overall academic results. In addition, comments gathered from the English language teachers at the Language Centre, UiTM, pointed mainly towards the students' inability to speak and write. They commented that students severely lacked vocabulary knowledge that is expected from university students and this may be attributed to a lack of reading habit, exposure to English language, and inappropriate teaching methods. To overcome these problems, the students continuously sought help from their English language teachers to edit their reports before submitting them to their science and engineering content instructors.

The problems in classrooms and the information from the ESL instructors in UiTM signaled an important direction in which ESL teaching should take. It led to the present writer's inference that the students' continuous production of unsatisfactory essays and reports might be related to, though not directly caused by, the inappropriate instructional approaches and irrelevant instructional materials. In particular, the writer assumed that inappropriate instructional approaches and irrelevant materials led to the students' dislike of writing, which in turn led to the students' unsatisfactory writing. Mohan (1986) claims that an educational approach that separates language learning and subject matter is inadequate to fulfill the needs of learners. For example, the present writer had seen in classrooms that the learners concerned in this study failed to write clearly to express their knowledge in written academic projects. This could be due to language learning being separated from the content areas. It was also believed that the materials