

Developing the Essay Writing Skills of Postgraduate Students at the University of Technology

تطوير مهارات كتابة المقالة لطلبة الدراسات العليا في الجامعة التكنولوجية

Asst. Prof. Dr. Dhuha Atallah

College of Basic Education/ Al-Mustansiriyah
University

Lecturer Muna Abdualhussien

Swear University of Technology

Abstract

The present study is an attempt to help postgraduate students in developing their writing skill by identifying their mistakes and difficulties and training them during the course about the correct way of good essay writing .

The study is limited to the postgraduate students in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Technology for the 2nd semester of the academic year 2008-2009.

The main instruments of the present study are a pre-posttest and a program of instructional techniques The validity of the instrument is ensured . First , the researchers have administrated pre -test to identify the common di.fficulties in the students' writing. Then they trained the students to develop their abilities in writing essay, by giving a set of instructional techniques for nearly eight weeks to help them to Overc.ome difficulties . At the end of the experiment , the posttest has been administrated to the study sample .

An accurate and detailed scoring scheme is developed to ensure more objective assessment of the written essays in the pre and posttest ranging between 0 to 100.

To achieve the aims of the study the researchers have used certain statistical tools. Pearson-correlation coefficient was used to calculate the .reliability of the test . In order to find out the significance of the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores paired-samples t-test is used . The results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the essay's writing in the pre -test and that of the post-test in favour of the latter , which ensures the benefit of the study instructional techniques in training the students.

ANOVA is used to find out which areas have witnessed a considerable. development. The results show statistically significant differences between the scores of the vari011s areas of the post test . Finally, Scheffe' test for multiple comparisons , only three comparisons are statistically significant between "title of the essay " , spelling" "verb tenses", and "punctuation" respectively in favor of"title of the essay".

Finally, in the light of the study findings , a number of conclusions are drawn , several recommendations are presented , and some suggestions for further research are put forward.

الخلاصة

تحاول هذه الدراسة مساعدة طلبة الدراسات العليا في تطوير مهاراتهم في الكتابة عن طريق تحديد أخطائهم وصعوباتهم من خلال تدريبهم خلال الفصل الدراسي على الطريقة الصحيحة لكتابة المقالات. واقتصرت الدراسة على طلبة الدراسات العليا في قسم الهندسة الميكانيكية في الجامعة التكنولوجية للفصل الدراسي الثاني للعام الدراسي 2008-2009. تضمنت الأدوات الرئيسية لهذه الدراسة الاختبار القبلي وبرنامج يستخدم التقنيات التعليمية الحديثة الذي تم ضمان صلاحيته. قام الباحثون أولاً ، بإدارة الاختبار القبلي لتحديد الصعوبات المشتركة الشائعة في كتابة الطلاب. ثم تدريب الطلبة على تطوير قدراتهم في كتابة المقالات ، عن طريق إعطاء مجموعة من التقنيات التعليمية لمدة ثمانية أسابيع تقريباً لمساعدتهم على التغلب على بعض الصعوبات. في نهاية التجربة ، تمت إجراء الاختبار البعدي لعينة الدراسة. تم تطوير نظام دقيق ومفصل لضمان تقييم أكثر موضوعية للمقالات المكتوبة في ما قبل وما بعد الاختبار تتراوح بين 0 إلى 100. لتحقيق أهداف الدراسة ، استخدم الباحثون بعض الأدوات الإحصائية مثل معامل الارتباط بيرسون لحساب موثوقية الاختبار. واختبار t لمعرفة أهمية الاختلافات بين درجات ما قبل الاختبار وما بعد الاختبار المقترنة . أظهرت النتائج أن هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين الدرجات المتوسطة لكتابة المقالة في الاختبار القبلي وتلك الخاصة بالاختبار البعدي لصالح الأخير ، وهو ما يضمن الاستفادة من أساليب الدراسة التعليمية في تدريب الطلاب. وتم استخدام اختبار ANOVA لمعرفة المناطق التي شهدت الكثير من التطوير. أظهرت النتائج فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين درجات مناطق المختلفة في الاختبار البعدي. أخيراً ، تم استخدام اختبار Scheffe للمقارنات متعددة ذات دلالة إحصائية وهي "عنوان المقال" ، و"التهجئة" ، و"الأزمة" ، و"علامات التنقيط" على التوالي لصالح "عنوان المقال". أخيراً ، في ضوء نتائج الدراسة ، تم استخلاص عدد من الاستنتاجات ، وتقديم العديد من التوصيات ، وطرح بعض الاقتراحات لمزيد من البحث.

1. Introduction

1.1 *Problem of the Study and its Significance*

Writing well is not just an option for young people, It is necessity. Along with reading comprehension ,the writing skill is a predictor of academic success and a basic requirement for participation in civil life and in global economy. Yet every year a large number of adolescents who graduate from high school are unable to write at basic levels required by colleges or employers. In addition, every school day many young people drop out of high school because they lack literacy skills to meet growing demands of the high school curriculum. Because the definition of literacy includes both reading and writing skills,. poor writing proficiency should be recognized as an intrinsic part of this national literacy crisis [10].

The writing skill is more and more important nowadays. Becoming a proficient writers is one of the major objectives of many students. specially for those who want to become members of international business) administrative or academic communities.. For scientists, writing is very essential Scientists must not only "do" science, but must "write" science. Bad writing can and often does prevent or delay the publication of good science [Day ,1998:X., as cited in Sattayatham &Ratanapjnyowong,[2008 :17-38].However ,it should be noted that science students should understand the .nature and characteristics of scientific writing itself since it presents obstacles to these students. Shepherd [1.973,as cited in Al-Samarrai,2003:2] holds that they find themselves in a new .situation represented by the intensity with which the information is written , and the interrelationships of the concepts introduced .

Defining. what writing is and deciding on the methods to teach it are hard tasks to accomplish and ELT has changed Its approach to teach academic Writing in course of time.. Early approaches involved controlled writing moving from paragraph to essay. Starting from the 60's ESL writing moved from controlled writing with emphasis on structure and· practice to process method which borrowed a lot from L1 composition

research and later to newer approaches based on research in L2 writing. Many researchers drew attention to the differences in logical processes since logic is not sometimes universal [Gulcat, 2006: Int.].

Developing learners' writing skills in L2 has been of concern for a long time in education. Bacha (2002:3) has reported findings of studies such as Grabe & Kaplan (1996), Shaughnessy (1977), Zaniel (1983), in which students studying in institutions, of higher learning in the medium of English, which may not be their native language, have been found to face problems mainly in writing, making them unable to cope with the institution's literacy expectations. However, these 'disadvantaged' students may be able to develop writing skills significantly with positive instructional attitudes towards the errors they make and an awareness on the teachers' part of learner problems.

Getting the students to write in the second language classroom can be a daunting task. This situation is brought about by several factors among which is writing apprehension or fear of writing & which is suggested by Stapa (1998). The fear of writing may be caused by the 'product approach' that emphasizes on the product alone not on the process of writing. The application of the process approach is recommended because it presents solutions to writing problems. It considers the writer's thoughts, experience and prior knowledge before the actual writing begins [14].

Bizzell (1986:49) believes that students' social situation and previous training may hamper their ability to succeed in the academy. For ESL students the gap is even bigger: there are linguistic problems and culture differences involved. The role of the university level ESL/EFL teacher to bridge the linguistic and cultural gap. Whether she/he is teaching basic writer or highly trained writer, she/he has to find a way to initiate the students into the culture of the university and at the same time help the students master the language of the discourse community they are heading for.

It is central to writing that the knowledge and skills that make the student a better writer can be taught and that novice writers make progress as a direct result of the instruction they receive. In a second language learning context, a student's progress in writing is often assumed to be simply a part of the overall increase in their language proficiency. It is clear that students' ability to write clearly and accurately depends to an extent on their general level of proficiency in the target language. However, there are aspects of proficiency that are either specific to students' writing or that may be specifically seen to develop through writing. Instruction in writing should be aimed specifically at improving proficiency in these areas [3].

Iraqi science students encounter many problems in their English lessons especially in writing as revealed through the researchers own experience contact with specialists in the field and previous literature [such as AJ-Smarrai 2003]. This state of affairs has urged the research's to find ways to help those students overcome their difficulties and improve their essay writing by conducting certain instructional techniques for this purpose, and this constitutes the essence of the present study.

1.2 Aims of the Study :

The present study aims at :

- 1- identifying the problems in English essay writing faced by postgraduate students in the University of Technology ,
- 2- examining the development of postgraduates' essay writing as a result of applying certain instructional techniques, and
- 3- finding out which areas of essay writing have witnessed more considerable development, if there is any than the others.

1.3 Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that:

- 1- there is no statistically significant difference between. the mean scores of the students' essay writing in the pretest and posttest after receiving training in certain instructional techniques ,and
- 2- there are no statistically significant differences between .the scores. of the various areas of the post essay test .

1.4 Limits

The study is limited to postgraduate students in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Technology for the 2nd semester of the academic year 2008-2009.

1.5 Definitions of Terms

The basic terms of the study are defined and operationally adopted as follows:

1.5.1 Essay

An essay is a group of paragraphs that develops one central idea included in a sentence called the thesis Statement . Unlike the paragraph , the essay is more formal composition that consists of an introduction developmental paragraphs and a conclusion [15].

1.5.2 Writing

Writing is a language skill that is usually associated with word choice , using appropriate grammar ,syntax , mechanism , and organization of ideas into a coherent and cohesive form. It also includes focusing on audience and the purpose as well as a recursive process of discovering meaning [8].

1.5.3 Skill

A skill is a cognitive operation with three essential characteristics : it has a specific set of identifiable procedure, it can be illustrated with a large and varied number of exercises; and it is developed through practice [7]

2. Procedures

2.1 Population & Sample

The population and the sample of the present study is the postgraduate students of the. Mechanical Engineering Dept. / University of Technology during the 2nd semester of the academic year 2008-2009 . The number of the students is 17 students :15 males .and 2 females . The researchers have included the two females from the sample to control the gender variable.

2.2 Experimental Design

In order to attain the aim of the study, an experiment was conducted . Due to the small number of the study sample, the researchers were obliged to adopt .the one -group pretest - posttest design in spite of its limitations. This design is depicted as follows:

Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
T ₁	X	T ₂

[12]

In this study, the sample was a administered a pretest in essay writing, exposed . to training in certain instructional techniques, and then administered an equivalent posttest at the end of .the expel:iment. The scores of both tests were compared to determine what difference, if any, the exposure to training has made.

2.3 Instruments of the Study

The main instruments of the present study are a pre-posttest and a program of instructional techniques for teaching essay writing.

2.3.1 The Pretest

The pretest is an essay about a subject selected from a number of topics suggested by the students with the help of one researcher who has undertaken the teaching. The suggested subject is one that is familiar to them (The Internet).

One of the most important purposes of the pretest is to achieve the first .aim of the study ; i.e. identifying the problems. in English essay writing faced 'by postgraduate students in the University of Technology. On the basis of the students, responses to the pretest, for researchers identified, the most common difficulties the students encountered in order to discuss them. in the class, as follows:

- Forgetting the title .
- Inability to use tenses correctly.
- Inability to Use punctuation marks and prepositions correctly.
- Lack of lexical variety.
- Relying heavily on repetition and elaboration.
- Lack of good essay organization.
- Incoherence.

2.3.2 The Instructional Techniques:

The training program designed by the researchers to develop the essay writing of the study sample consists of certain instructional techniques divided into two components:

1. A set of instructional techniques to help the students overcome the difficulties outlined in 2.3.1 above.
2. Model steps of writing essay adopted from Beare, Kenneth(2010) ,which are the following :
 1. Selecting the topic of the essay .
 2. Choosing the central idea of the essay .
 3. Outlining the essay into a number of paragraphs, body and summary paragraphs.
 4. Beginning the introductory paragraph with an interesting sentence.
 5. Adding thesis statement front above after the first statement .
 6. Using one sentence to introduce every body paragraph to follow .
 7. Finishing the introductory paragraph with a short summary or goal statement .
 8. Developing the ideas first presented in the introductory paragraph in each of the body paragraphs (usually two or three).
 9. Developing the body paragraphs by giving detailed information and examples. Body paragraphs should develop the central idea and finish with a .summary of that idea. There should be at least two examples or facts in each body paragraph to support the central idea.
 10. Writing the summary paragraph which summarizes the essay and is often a reverse of the introductory paragraph .
 11. Beginning the summary paragraph by quickly restating the principal ideas of the body paragraphs .
 12. Restating the basic thesis of the essay in the last but one sentence.
 13. Writing the final statement which can be a future prediction based on what has been shown in the essay .

2.3.3 Validity

The validity of the instruments of the study was ascertained by exposing them to four instructors, * who have long experience and interest in teaching English four postgraduate students. These experts agreed on the validity and suitability of the instruments.

2.3.4 Instruction

The experiment started on March 8th,2009 and ended on May 7th,2009; i.e. it lasted for nearly eight weeks. Lectures were given in neatly 100 minutes once a week. One of the researchers taught the sample herself since she was their original teacher. The experiment began with the administration of the pretest with a kind of brainstorming in which the students we.re asked to generate many ideas related to the topic and write them as notes. Depending on the generated ideas they wrote an essay and their .answer sheets were scored according to certain criteria by the researchers who listed the general basic difficulties.Then , the answers sheets were returned to the students.

-
1. ProfDr, Walid K. Hamoudi , School of Applied Sciences , University of Technology.
 2. Prof. Dr. Fatin Kh. Al-Rifai, College of Education/ Ibn Rushd, Baghdad University.
 3. Asst. Prof. Najem A. Al-Rubaiey, English Language Center -University of Technology.
 4. Instr. Dr. Ridha Gh. Dakhi) , College of Basic Education , Al-Mustansiriyah University .

Next lecture the researcher initiated the actual program by explaining and discussing the important steps in writing any essay. She advised the students to consult the dictionary whenever they read or write. For the next four weeks the researcher also explained the most important ways to overcome the difficulties and follow the students' progress each lecture by asking them to write an essay. The written essays were scored and returned to the students. In this way the students were able to discover their mistakes and weaknesses. Elaborated discussions were held each lecture and students were encouraged to write notes and exchange ideas. A second exam was given in the middle of the experiment to help the researcher check the students' progress and diagnose any arising problems, but not to be subjected to any statistical manipulation

2.3.5 The Posttest

At the end of the experiment an essay test about (The internet) was administered to the study subjects whose answers were scored by the researcher according to the same criteria adopted in scoring the pretest.

The reliability* of the tests was calculated by the *interscorer method*. The second researcher scored the same answer sheets again and the correlation between the two sets of scores was calculated using Pearson correlation formula yielding a reliability coefficient of 0.91 which is a very acceptable one.

2.3.6 The Scoring Scheme

Since essay tests are highly subjective, a very accurate and detailed scoring scheme should be developed to ensure more objective assessment. The scores range between 0 and 100 and are distributed as follows:

1. Correct organization	5%
2. Verb Tenses	20%
3. Spelling	20%
4. Punctuation	10%
5. Irrelevant ideas	10%
6. Clarity of ideas	10%
7. Ideas sequences	10%
8. Lexical variety	10%
9. Title of essay	5%

These criteria represent the major difficulties as well as main areas of evaluation. The students' scores on the pretest and posttest and on each area are shown in Appendices A and B.

2.4 The Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools are used in the study:

1. Pearson correlation coefficient to calculate the reliability of the test :

$$r = \frac{N \sum xy - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{[N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}} \quad [9]$$

No pilot study, was conducted due to the small size of the sample which represented the whole population.

Where:

x= the students' scores of the first scorer .

y=the students' scores of the second scorer.

N= the size of the sample .

2. Paired- samples t-test (or t-test for two dependent samples):

$$t = \frac{D^-}{S_D / \sqrt{n}}$$

Where:

D⁻ =the sample mean of the difference scores.

S_D= the sample standard deviation of the difference scores.

n= number of subjects.

[1]

3. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to find out the significance of the differences between the various areas of the post test .

4. Scheffe' test for multiple comparisons , to identify the source of difference between the various areas of the post test.

3. Results, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Results Related to the Second Aim and the First Hypothesis

To achieve the second aim of the study; i.e. examining the development of postgraduates' essay writing as a result of applying certain instructional techniques, and verify its first null hypothesis, paired samples t-test is used at 0.05 level of significance and with 14 degrees of freedom.

The computed t-value is found out to be 4.990 which is higher than the table t-value 2.145. This means that the difference between the pretest and posttest scores is statistically significant in favor of the latter since the posttest mean score 60.400 is higher than the pretest mean score (48.867), as shown in Table 1.

Table 1:t-test statistics for the total scores of the pretest and posttest

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Paired differences		Df	t-value		Level of Significance
				Mean	SD		computed	table	
Pretest	60	48.867	12.597	-11.533	8.951	14	-4.990	2.145	0.05
Posttest		60.400	14.884						

This statistical finding leads to the rejection of the first null hypothesis and its substitution with an alternative one which states that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the students' essay writing in the pretest and posttest after receiving training in certain instructional techniques. In order to investigate the development of each area of the students' essay writing, paired samples t-test is also used for

each area at 0.05 level of significance with 14 degrees of freedom.

As evident in Table 2 , it is found out that the subjects' punctuation, correct organization, title of essay, lack of irrelevant ideas and lexical variety are the areas that have developed significantly since their computed t-values (6.243, 5.392, 3.500, 2.200 and 2.161) are greater than the table t-value (2.145), with mean scores in the posttest that are higher than their counterparts in the pretest. Verb tenses, spelling, clarity of ideas and ideas sequences, on the other hand, have not witnessed significant development since their computed t-values (1.641, 1.374, 1.633 and 0.807) are less than the table t-value (2.145).

Table 2: t -test statistics for each essay area of the pretest and posttest

Area	N	Mean	SD	Paired		4f	i-value		Level of Significance
				Mean	SD		computed	table	
Cor.Org.2	15	2.400	1.242	1.200	0.862	14	5.392	2.145	0.05
Cor.Org.1		1.200	1.207						
Verb Tense 2	15	10.00	4.123	1.467	3.461	14	1.641	2.145	0.05
Verb Tense 1		8.533	3.021						
Spelling 2	15	11.400	3.814	0.933	2.631	14	1.374	2.145	0.05
Spelling 1		10.467	3.662						
Punctuation2	15	5.533	2.416	2.333	1.447	14	6.243	2.145	0.05
Punctuation 1		3.200	2.455						
Irr. Ideas 2	15	5.133	2.475	1.133	1.995	14	2.200	2.145	0.05
Irr. Ideas 1		4.00	2.00						
Clar. Id. 2	15	5.333	2.554	0.800	1.897	14	1.633	2.145	0.05
Clar. Id , 1		4.533	1.807						
Id. Seq. 2	15	5.333	1.915	0.400	1.919	14	0.807	2.145	0.05
Id. Seq. 1		4.933	1.438						
Lex.Var. 2	15	5.267	2.374	1.133	2.031	14	2.161	2.145	0.05
Lex.Var. 1		4.133	1.457						
Title 2	15	5.00	0.00	2.333	2.582	14	3.500	2.145	0.05
Title 1		2.667	2.582						

3.1.2 Results Related to the Third Aim and the Second Hypothesis

To fulfill the third aim of the study ; i.e. finding out which areas of essay writing have witnessed more considerable development ,if there is any , than the others , and verify its second null hypothesis , one -way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used at 0.05 level of significance .

The computed F-value is found out to be 3.397 which is higher than the table F-value (1.94) . This means that the difference between the various areas of the essay posttest is statistically significant (see Table 3).

Table 3: ANOVA statistics for the difference between the various areas of the post essay test

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value		Level of Significance
				Computed	Table	
Between Groups	22551.170	8	2818.896	3.397	1.94	0.05
Within Groups	104567.60	126	829.902			
Total	127118.77	134				

This statistical findings leads to the rejection of the second null hypothesis; i.e. there are statistically significant differences between the scores of various areas of the post essay test. In order to identify the source of these differences, Schaffe' test for multiple comparisons is used. This reveals that only three comparisons are statistically significant at 0.05 level; these are the mean scores of the "title of the essay" and each of " spelling", "verb tenses", and "punctuation" respectively, in favor of the "title of the essay" in all cases. The significant comparisons are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Scheffe' significant comparisons of the essay areas' mean scores

(I) Factor	(J)Factor	(I)Mean	(J)Mean	Mean Difference (I-J)	Level of significance
Title	Verb tense	100.00	57.467	42.533	0.05
Title	Spelling	100.00	57.267	42.733	0.05
Title	Punctuation	100.00	57.667	42.333	0.05

In other words , the essay area that has developed in the posttest more than the others is 'the tide of essay' (Appendix 2 displays that all the subjects were successful in this area).

3.1.3 Discussion of the results

The findings of the present study reveal that providing postgraduate science students with training in instructional techniques has improved their essay writing skill and helped them overcome their difficulties . This can be explained by the following factors:

1. Systematic training in essay writing draws students' attention to their drawbacks and errors and helps them get rid of these errors.
2. Such training guides them properly into the correct steps of essay writing that they should follow.
3. Providing students with instructional techniques may lessen their writing apprehension and increase their self-confidence, which is reflected in better quality of their essays.
4. Teaching students to write essay properly eliminates random guessing and 'trail - and-error' in their writing process.
5. The nature of science students' thinking is more conducive to learning rules, guidelines and logical aspects. This may explain the clear development of the areas of essay title punctuation, correct organization and lack of irrelevant ideas on behalf of other areas.
- 6-Postgraduate science students recognize the importance of good writing for improving the quality of their scientific publication, especially their M.SC. and *PhD*. these which are mostly written in English.

3.2 Conclusion

In the light of the study results and the researchers' own observations, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Training postgraduate science students in: essay writing techniques develops their essay writing skill.
2. The area of essay writing that has improved more than the others is writing the title of the essay.
3. In addition to the title, the areas that have developed considerably in science students, essays are punctuation, correct organization, lack of irrelevant ideas and lexical variety.
4. The training program in essay writing increases science students' motivation, interest and enthusiasm.
5. The findings of the present study give positive evidence to support the 'process approach' to essay writing.

3.3 Recommendations

Although writing is a gift and there are clear individuals' differences between students in writing in English, yet the researchers try to recommend the following in the light of the study finding:

1. Improving students writing needs time and practiced a lot of patience on the part of teachers.
2. The teacher must be ready to develop his way of teaching writing according to students' needs and difficulties.
3. It is very important to encourage students' talent by stimulating and encouraging them to read more and share ideas in order to write well.
4. It is very important to develop English language courses at the university level.
5. Providing science students with systematic training in essay writing is highly recommended to develop their skill.
6. It is very important to develop English essay writing courses at the university level.

3.4 :Suggestions for Further Studies

As an extension to the present study, the researchers suggest the following future researches :

- 1- Developing other studies about the relation between reading, listening and writing.
- 2- Conducting a study to identify the difficulties that face science students in comprehending English scientific texts.
- 3- Conducting a study to find out the effect of applying a learning strategy programmed to develop undergraduate science students' writing and -reading.

References :

1. Agresti, Alan & Finney, Barbara (1997) *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*, 3rd ed. New Jersey : Prentice Hall.
2. Al-Samurai, Intisar I. (2003) "The Effect of Using Certain Teaching Techniques on Overcoming Linguistic Difficulties Faced by Post-Graduate Students in Comprehending Scientific Texts in English". Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Baghdad.
3. Archibald, A. (2001) "Targeting L2 Writing Proficiencies : Instruction and Areas of Changing in Students' Writing over Time" *International Journal of English Studies*, Vol.1(2) pp. 153-174.
4. Bacha, N.N. (2002) , "Developing Learners' Academic Writing Skills in Higher Education , : A Study for Educational Reform" , *Lebanese American University* : Vol. 16, No.3.
5. -Beare, Kenneth (2010) . " *How to Write an Essay?* ' . *About.com: English as 2nd Language* . <http://esl.about.com/cs/writing/ht/ht-essay>.
6. Bizzell, P. (1986) "Composing Processes: An Overview" In A.R. Petosky & D. Barthelmae (Eds.) , *The Teaching of Writing* Chicago : The National Society of the Study Education, pp. 49-70 .
7. Eggen, P.D. & Kauchak , D.P. (1996) *Strategies for Teachers*, 3rd ed. Boston : Allyn & Bacon.
8. Gebhard , Jerry G. (2006) *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language* , 2nd ed. Ann Arbor : *The University of Michigan Press*.
9. Glass, G.V. & Stanly , J. C. (1970) *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology* . Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice Hall, Inc.
10. Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). "Writing Next : Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools" - *A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* . Washington , DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
11. Gukat, Z., (2006) *Defining Academic Writing* , Bogazici University SFL.
12. Isaac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1977) *Handbook in Research and Evaluation*, 8th printing. New York: Robert R. Knapp.
13. Sattayatham , A. & Ratanapinyowong, P. (2008) "Analysis of Errors in Paragraph Writing in English" , *Silpakorn University International Journal*, Vol.8: 17-38.
14. Sit S.H. & Abdul Majid., Ah. (2009) "The Use of First Language in Developing Ideas in Second Language Writing" *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol.7, No. 4.
15. Smalley R.L. & Rnetten, M.K. (1982) *Refining Composition Skills*, 2nd ed. New York: *Macmillan Publishing Company* .

Appendix A

The Students' Scores on Pretest

Student 's number	Correct organization(5%)	Verb Tenses (20%)	Spelling (20%)	Punctuation (10%)	Irrelevant ideas(10%)	Clarity of ideas(10%)	Ideas sequences { 10%}	Lexical variety(10%)	Title of essay(5%)	Total
1	2	10	10	2	5	2	5	4	5	45
2	1	5	17	7	7	5	6	5	0	55
3	1	10	10	5	2	4	5	4	5	45
4	0	7	8	2	3	4	3	3	0	30
5	1	6	10	2	4	6	3	4	0	41
6	0	5	14	3	5	7	4	5	0	49
7	0	6	5	2	2	3	6	3	5	32
8	0	12	12	5	2	7	7	4	5	62
9	0	10	18	2	6	6	7	4	0	62
10	1	7	8	0	1	2	4	1	5	39
11	1	8	10	5	7	5	5	2	5	59
12	2	6	8	0	3	2	5	5	0	31
13	2	14	9	6	5	6	3	6	5	69
14	4	14	12	7	6	6	7	6	0	62
15	3	8	6	0	2	3	4	6	5	52

Appendix B

The Students' Scores on the Posttest

Student's number	Correct organization (5%)	Verb Tenses (20%)	Spelling (20%)	Punctuation (10%)	Irrelevant ideas (10%)	Clarity of ideas (10%)	Ideas sequences (10%)	Lexical variety (10%)	Title of essay (5%)	Total
1	3	12	14	6	6	8	5	6	5	65
2	2	5	15	8	5	7	7	9	5	63
3	2	10	12	9	6	6	6	8	5	64
4	1	7	8	5	4	2	4	2	5	42
5	4	13	13	4	7	8	6	6	5	71
6	1	12	16	6	7	7	7	5	5	72
7	1	6	5	2	1	2	3	2	5	34
8	1	13	12	8	7	8	7	8	5	70
9	2	15	14	7	8	7	8	6	5	81
10	1	7	8	2	2	2	2	1	5	40
11	3	15	14	7	7	7	6	5	5	69
12	4	3	8	2	1	1	2	3	5	41
13	4	15	15	6	7	6	6	5	5	75
14	4	12	13	8	7	6	7	7	5	69
15	3	5	4	3	2	3	4	6	5	50