



Tikrit University

Journal of Al-Farahidi's Arts



<https://doi.org/10.51990/jaa.15.53.1.27>



**Sahar Ismael Abdul
Hameed ***

E-Mail: sara.ham669@gmail.com
Mobile: +9647706909334

**Prof. Dr. Istabraq Tariq
Jawad ¹**

E-Mail: astbraktarek@tu.edu.iq
Mobile: +9647718127952

Department of English Language *
College of Education for Humanities
Tikrit University
Salahuddin
Iraq

Department of English Language ¹
College of Education for Humanities
Tikrit University
Salahuddin
Iraq

Keywords:

- Organizational Competence
- Tikrit University
- University Students
- EFL
- Students English Writing

Article History:

Submitted: 24/10/2022
Accepted: 02/11/2022
Published: 05/03/2023

Investigating The Organizational Competence in EFL University Students' Writing at Tikrit University

A B S T R A C T

Organizational competence is essential for an efficient EFL writer as it is concerned with two essential characteristics for language proficiency which are grammatical and textual abilities. Organizational competence shows basic abilities in the EFL students' writing. When students are proficient in grammatical and textual abilities, they will be able to write effectively. The current study aims at identifying and comparing:

1. EFL university organizational competence at the departments of English in Tikrit students' and AL-Anbar universities.
2. EFL university students grammatical competence at the two universities.
3. EFL university students' textual competence at the two universities.
4. The differences of organizational competence abilities among EFL university students according to gender variable at the two universities: Tikrit and Al-Anbar.

The current study is an investigation study and the sample of the present study is two hundred and fourteen in the third stage of the Departments of English, Colleges of Education at Tikrit, and Al Anbar universities during the academic year 2021/2022. The data gathered by using a diagnostic test to assess students' organizational competence in writing. According to the findings of the current study, EFL university students have a low ability in organizational competence. In the light of these results, some conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies are presented.



التحقيق في الكفاءة التنظيمية في كتابة طلاب جامعة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في جامعة تكريت

الملخص

تعد الكفاءة التنظيمية ضرورية لكاتب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية الفعال لأنها تهتم بخاصيتين أساسيتين لإتقان اللغة وهما القدرات النحوية والنصية. تُظهر الكفاءة التنظيمية القدرات الأساسية في كتابة طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. عندما يتقن الطلاب القدرات النحوية والنصية، فسيكونون قادرين على الكتابة بفعالية. تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى تحديد ومقارنة:

١. الكفاءة التنظيمية لطلاب جامعة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في أقسام اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعتي تكريت والأنبار.
٢. الكفاءة النحوية لطلاب جامعة EFL في الجامعتين.
٣. الكفاءة النصية لطلاب جامعة EFL في الجامعتين.
٤. الفروق في قدرات الكفاءة التنظيمية لدى طلبة جامعة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية حسب متغير الجنس في الجامعتين: تكريت والأنبار.

الدراسة الحالية هي دراسة استقصائية وعينة الدراسة الحالية مائتان وأربعة عشر في المرحلة الثالثة لأقسام اللغة الإنجليزية وكلّيات التربية في تكريت وجامعات الأنبار خلال العام الدراسي ٢٠٢١-٢٠٢٢. البيانات التي تم جمعها باستخدام اختبار تشخيصي لتقييم الكفاءة التنظيمية للطلاب كتابيًا. وفقًا لنتائج الدراسة الحالية، فإن طلاب جامعة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية لديهم قدرة منخفضة في الكفاءة التنظيمية. في ضوء هذه النتائج بعض الاستنتاجات والتوصيات والمقترحات.

سحر إسماعيل عبد الحميد *

البريد الإلكتروني: sara.ham669@gmail.com

رقم الجوال: +9647706909334

أ. د. استبرق طارق جواد¹

البريد الإلكتروني: astbraktarek@tu.edu.iq

رقم الجوال: +9647718127952

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية *
كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية
جامعة تكريت
نينوى
العراق

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية¹
كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية
جامعة تكريت
نينوى
العراق

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الكفاءة التنظيمية
جامعة تكريت
طلاب الجامعة
اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية
كتابة الطلاب باللغة الإنجليزية

تاريخ المقالة:

قدمت: ٢٠٢٢/١٠/٢٤

قبلت: ٢٠٢٢/١١/٠٢

نشرت: ٢٠٢٣/٠٣/٠٥

Chapter One: Introduction:

1.1. Statement of the Problem:

Learning a foreign language is a lifelong process and it is often a challenging experience for learners. English occupies the status of a foreign language in the education system of majority of Arab countries. However, learning English as a foreign language is not an easy task. Acquiring English is a difficult issue among second or foreign language learners ESL/EFL especially Arab learners. According to Brown (2000), in order to master English language, learners have to be adequately exposed to all of the four basic skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. English Language teaching is currently focusing on the teaching and learning of the four language skills. Researches show that learners' writing performance poses specific challenges for English second language teaching and learning contexts across the globe; in particular, in higher education institutions (Munro 2003; and Gambell 1991). Writing is a crucial act in the process of learning any foreign language, but more so in English since it has become the language of global communication. According to Tribble (1997:8) writing skill is more and more important nowadays. Becoming a proficient writer is one of the major objectives of many students, especially for those who want to become members of international business, administrative or academic communities.

Writing as a private activity plays the role of a powerful tool that evaluates learning and recall. It can be used to explore and refine ideas, organize thoughts and record information (Brown, 1999: 2).

Moreover; wri. is an important discipline. It is the tool that helps students develop their knowledge. Mastery of the writing system of any language requires the ability to master grammar, spelling, punctuation ... etc. These aspects are very important in written language and any error in these aspects can affect the written production and may lead to misunderstanding, (Ahmed 2016;189).

It is beneficial to consider the organizational competence of EFL students because it may reflect and specify the difficulty they face in writing. "The ability to write presupposes some level of morphological, lexical and syntactic as well as idiomatic knowledge, such knowledge alone does not guarantee the ability to write well because writing involves much more than constructing grammatical Sentences" (Schmitt and Rodgers, 2020: 283).

The current study attempts to investigate the EFL university students' organizational abilities in the lights of the grammatical and textual components suggested by Bachman (1980) model of organizational competence.

1.2. Aims of The Study:

The study aims to identify and compare:

1. EFL university students' OC at the departments of English in Tikrit and AL-Anbar universities.
2. EFL university students' grammatical competence at the two universities.
3. EFL university students' textual competence at the two universities.

4. The differences of OC abilities among EFL university students according to gender variable at the two universities: Tikrit and Al-Anbar.

1.3. Hypothesis of The Study:

It is hypothesized that:

1. There are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students OC at the two universities: Tikrit and Al-Anbar.
2. There are statistically significant differences among EFL university students' grammatical competence at Tikrit and Al-Anbar universities.
3. There are statistically significant differences among EFL university students' textual competence at the two universities.
4. There are statistically significant differences of OC abilities among EFL university students according to gender variable at the two universities.

1.4. Limits of The Study:

The present study is limited to third year EFL university students at the departments of English Colleges of Education in Tikrit and Al-Anbar Universities during the academic year 2021-2022. The model of the study is Bachman (1990) model of language competence/organizational competence. The study left out the phonology as the current the study is concerned with writing variable.

1.8. The Model of The Study:

The adapted model of the current study is Bachman's model of organizational competence (1990), which consists of two sub-competences: grammatical and textual.

Grammatical which includes vocabulary, morphology, syntax, phonology, graphology

Textual which includes cohesion and Rhetorical organization.

Section Two:

2.1.5.2. Organizational Competence:

OC comprises those abilities involved in controlling the formal structure of language for producing or recognizing grammatically correct sentences, comprehending their propositional content, and ordering them to form texts. These abilities are of two types: grammatical and textual (Bachman, 1990:88).

2.1.5.3. Grammatical Competence:

Grammatical competence includes those competencies involved in language usage, as described by Widdowson (1978:254). These consist of a number of relatively independent competencies such as the knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and phonology/graphology. These govern the choice of words to express specific significations, their forms, their arrangement in utterances to express propositions, and their physical realizations, either as sounds or as written symbols. Suppose, for example, a test taker is shown a picture of two people, a boy and a taller girl, and is asked to describe it. In so doing, the test taker demonstrates her lexical competence by choosing

words with appropriate significations (boy, girl, tall) to refer to the contents of the picture. She demonstrates her knowledge of morphology by affixing the inflectional morpheme (-er) to 'tall'. She demonstrates her knowledge of syntactic rules by putting the words in the proper order, to compose the sentence 'The girl is taller than the boy'. When produced, using the phonological rules of English, the resulting utterance is a linguistically accurate representation of the information in the picture.

2.1.5.4. Textual Competence:

Textual competence includes the knowledge of the conventions for joining utterances together to form a text, which is essentially a unit of language - spoken or written - consisting of two or more utterances or sentences that are structured according to rules of cohesion and rhetorical organization. Cohesion comprises ways of explicitly marking semantic relationships such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 274), as well as conventions such as those governing the ordering of old and new information in discourse. Rhetorical organization pertains to the overall conceptual structure of a text, and is related to the effect of the text on the language user (van Dijk, 1977: 4). Conventions of rhetorical organization include common methods of development such as narration, description, comparison, classification, and process analysis. We teach some of these organizational conventions formally in expository writing classes when we show students how to order information in a paragraph: topic sentence, first primary support sentence, secondary support sentences, second primary support sentence ... conclusion, or transition sentence. Other conventions for organizing discourse may not be taught formally at all, however, either because they are not fully understood or because they are simply too complex to teach (McCrimman 1984).

Textual competence is also involved in conversational language use. Indeed, much of the work in discourse analysis that takes conversation as its primary point of departure deals with components of textual competence (Richards and Schmidt 1983b:117-154). These conventions, such as attention getting, topic nomination, topic development and conversation maintenance appear to be ways in which interlocutors organize and perform the turns in conversational discourse, and may be analogous to the rhetorical patterns that have been observed in written discourse (Hatch 1978:401-35).

in written discourse, it is obvious that conversational interchange, by its interactive or reciprocal nature, gives rise to or necessitates devices for organizing discourse that are unique to this genre of discourse. Nevertheless, rather than considering these conventions as a separate component of communicative language ability, I believe they can be best described in terms of the abilities associated with textual competence (Bachman, 1990: 89).

2.1.6. Organizational Competence and Writing:

OC which refers to the ability to arrange morpheme, words, and sentences in order to make meaning, is divided into two smaller competences, grammatical competence and textual competence respectively. Grammatical competence

is the ability to organize language on the sentence level. It comprises four elements, namely vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and phonology. Vocabulary is all the words and lexical items of a language and their meanings. It could be one word or several words that combine to have one collective meaning. Morphology is the study of the structure of words of a language via the study the morpheme of a language and how the morphemes come together to form words. Syntax deals with the proper order of words in a sentence. Phonology is concerned with the study of the sounds of a language. Textual competence which is defined as the ability to organize language on the composition level includes cohesion and rhetoric. Cohesion deals with sentence cohere (stick together) in logical order, while rhetoric is the science of persuasive speaking (Bachman, 1990:89).

Whereas, knowledge of a foreign language becomes today a mandatory component of the professional training of a modern specialist in any sphere. That is why a foreign language in a university is not only professionally-oriented but cultural, linguistic and intellectual as a whole. At the same time, the tasks of teaching students a foreign language include the cognitive needs of young people, and this, by definition, actualizes the problem of structuring the organization of their knowledge. And the use of a foreign language in future professional activity, in the long run, will always be directed to the process of self-education in this or that area (Khuziakhmetov & Valeev, 2017:149-158).

In this regard, a foreign language as one of the means of exploring the world occupies a special place in the system of modern education due to its social, cognitive and developmental functions. On this basis, teaching a foreign language has its own specifics, which, in particular, is related to the intensification of the learning process through the cognitive activity of students, and therefore through the competent organization of their knowledge. Therefore, it is necessary to create conditions for a maximum realization of the intellectual potential of students taking into account such important features of students as the level of self-knowledge as a prerequisite for personality development; readiness for self-assertion; the need for occupation; the desire to test own strengths and character; the desire for self-determination from the point of view of searching for one's own moral ideal; defining own values, etc. (Valeev & Muzafarova, 2016:119).

In this regard, the organization of knowledge in the course of studying a foreign language is carried out within the framework of teaching students' productive social interaction in a foreign environment. This implies the development of logical, critical and creative thinking; mandatory availability of independent work focused on the application of acquired knowledge, skills, and experience in practice. Thus, in order to achieve the goal of teaching students a foreign language in the context of organizing their knowledge the educational process in the university should be organized in such a way that it is as efficient and optimal as possible. This poses the following tasks for the teacher: determining the logic of carrying out each practical lesson, taking into account all its stages; determining what tasks and exercises to offer students for the development of skills in different types of cognitive

activity; determining formulations and instructions for assignments and exercises that are communicative in nature; determining formats and genres that future professionals will use in their professional activities; determining the optimal forms of work, methods and techniques for students to use in the process of their independent work (Nazarova & Valeev, 2017:21-33).

Writing competence refers to the ability to write a good composition which meets the following criteria: (a) Purpose and clarity, the degree to which the students has demonstrated an understanding of the position taken in the article and has established a reasoned response and critical interpretation, (b).

Organization, the degree to which the student has produced a unified and coherent composition, (c) Specificity and evidence, the degree to which specific evidence from the article is documented, integrated, and used to support arguments in the student's writing; the degree to which counter arguments are supported through evidence, and (d) Usage, mechanic, and grammar, the degree to which the student has exhibited corrected usage (tense, word choice), spelling, punctuation, and grammar (Hermanto, 2008:185).

This writing competence is much closely deal with writing process, that is knowledge of the most appropriate way of preparing for a writing task. If writer knows what to write in a given context, what the reader expects the text to look like, which parts of the language system are relevant to the particular task in hand, and has a command of writing skills appropriate to this task, then they have a good chance of writing something that will be effective (Tribble, 1996:274).

In addition, taking good care during writing process will determine the quality of the result of the writing. Writing process involves cyclic writing activities which move learners from generation of ideas and the collection of data through to the publication of a finished text (ibid).

Section Three: Methodology:

3.1. Population and Sample:

Population and sample consider a basic step in the procedure of the study. Population means all the individuals of the group while sample means a subset of the population (Creswell, 2012:142).

3.1.1 Population of The Study:

Creswell (2012:142) describes population as a group of individuals who have the same characteristic. For example, all teachers would make up the population of teachers, and all high school administrators in a school district would comprise the population of administrators. As these examples illustrate, populations can be small or large. Within this target population, researchers then select a sample for study.

Moreover; population can be defined as all individuals or interesting units, so it is difficult to have available data for all individuals in population (Hanlon and Larget, 2011:2). Ary et.al (2006:125) add that population refers to all the subjects that you want to study and it comprises all persons, objects or events.

The population of the current study is (312) undergraduate students from departments of English, Colleges of Education, Universities of Tikrit and Al-Anbar during the academic year 2021-2022. Table.1 shows the population distribution.

The sample is a subset of the target population that the researchers are intending to evaluate in order to generalize the target population. Ideally, a survey is selected to represent the population as a whole (Creswell, 2012:145) According to Ary et al. (2006:148) a sample is a number of individuals objects or events selected for a study from a population, usually in such a way that they represent the large group from which they are selected.

As for the current study, the sample is randomly selected in order to be truly representative of the population characteristics without any bias and in order to obtain valid and reliable results. The total number of the sample is (214) chosen randomly. Intentional choice is represented through choosing college and random choice is achieved through selecting a representative number of students from Colleges of Education/ Tikrit and Al-Anbar universities, as shown in the following table:

Table (1) Population and Sample of the Study

College	Population	Sample	
		Male	Female
Tikrit University	149	42	93
University of Al-Anbar	163	60	121
Total	312	102	214

3.2. Test Construction:

Collecting information from students is an important duty, therefore it should necessarily be conducted in systematic ways. Otherwise, it is difficult to know how rational educational decisions and judgments can be (Hughes, 1989:15). Thus, one research instrument is adopted in the current study which is a diagnostic test.

Baker (1989:3) defines test as a means of reaching to the correct and accurate decision. The construction of the test involves planning for the test, preparing the items and instructions, putting them together and reproducing the test (Brown, 2004:47).

The Construction of the diagnostic test is viewed basically as the persons' competence in the area of content and this competence is the result of many intellectual variables.

In order to achieve the aims of this study, a diagnostic test has been constructed. The test has major two tasks, namely, recognition and production tasks. In the construction of the test a specification of the behavioral objectives is derived, as table 3illustrated:

The test is designed to investigate the OC in EFL university students' writing on both recognition and production levels, and it consists of four questions. includes sixteen items. In the first question, the students are going to identify tenses, state concord, state parts of speech, identify prefixes, explain word process formation, state model verb, explain passive, explain morphology, identify meaning words, and explain textual and cohesion.

While question number two consists of three branches (A, B and C), branch A demands three items. Whereas branch B requests students to choose an appropriate answer, which consists of three items related to production level. is to circle the noun that is the topic of the paragraph and assess pronouns that refer to it that require students to explain meaning and writing level. While question number three consists of two branches (A and B), branch A students to in the correct way and consists of eight items, whereas branch B, requires students to write a composition and show their cohesive and rhetorical organization abilities.

3.3. Validity:

Validity is the extent to which deductions made from assessment results are suitable, useful, and meaningful in terms of the objectives of the assessment (Gronlund, 1970:226). Messick (1989:11) defines validity as an incorporated evaluative judgment of the degree to which experimental evidence and theoretical argument assist the adequacy and suitability of inferences and actions based on scores of the test.

3.3.1. Face Validity:

A test is said to be valid if it measures what it claims to measure (Al-Hamash and Younis, 1975:24). Heaton (1988:159) states that face validity is "the extent to which the test measures what is supposed to measure and nothing else". Face validity refers to the degree to which a test looks right and tests the knowledge and abilities it claims to test (Mousavi, 2009: 247). Hence, validity is the degree to which the test is truly measuring what it was designed to measure. In order to ensure the face validity of the study instruments, it has been submitted to the jury members of teachers and specialists in English language teaching, linguistics, and literature.

3.3.2. Construct Validity:

Collecting information from students is an important duty, therefore it should necessarily be conducted in systematic ways. Otherwise, it is difficult to know how rational educational decisions and judgments can be (Hughes, 1989:15). Thus, one research instrument is adopted in the current study which is a diagnostic test.

Baker (1989:3) defines test as a means of reaching to the correct and accurate decision. The construction of the test involves planning for the test, preparing the items and instructions, putting them together and reproducing the test (Brown, 2004:47).

The Construction of the diagnostic test is viewed basically as the persons' competence in the area of content and this competence is the result of many intellectual variables.

In order to achieve the aims of this study, a diagnostic test has been constructed. The test has major two tasks, namely, recognition and production tasks. In the construction of the test a specification of the behavioral objectives is derived, as table 3 illustrate:

3. 4. Reliability of the Test:

Reliability can be defined as the consistency with which a test measures the same thing all the time (Harrison, 1983:11). There are many methods for achieving the reliability of the test.

Crocker and Algina (1986:10) define the internal consistency of the test scores is the overall degree to which one can expect the constant deviation scores of individuals across testing situation in the same testing instrument. So, the concept of reliability is unrecognized if it is done outside of literature measurement.

Internal consistency is equated, typically, with Cronbach coefficient alpha because it is widely used to measure reliability (Devellis, 2003:28). Cronbach alpha formula is the most common statistical way that measures reliability which is actually an average of all possible split-half reliability estimates of an instrument (Crocker and Algina, 1986:6).

The obtained result after the application of Cronbach's alpha formula is 0,94 which is considered to be suitable index from a statistical point of view.

3.7. Item Analysis:

Bachman and Palmer (1996:92) mentions that item analysis is a process that comprises different statistical means directed to investigate the quality of test items that have been given to students. The purpose behind this process is to discover the difficulty level and discrimination power of the items in the test. Item analysis is a number of procedures adopted to analyze test items properties regarding difficulty level and discrimination power. The quality of the test is estimated through investigating its internal consistency in terms of the students' responses according to a statistical formula mentioned later.

3.7.1. Difficulty Level DL:

Item difficulty refers to the measurement device that measures the students' failure or pass in a specific item (Devellis, 2003:139). The difficulty level (DL) of the item is measured by selecting the higher group which has the highest mark and the lower group which has the lowest mark and applying the DL formula:

The items of this test are considered acceptable if they range from 0.31 to 0.65 which indicates the suitability of items.

3.7.2. Discrimination Power DP:

According to Groulund (1974:211), the discrimination power (DP) is defined as the instrument which is used to find out the items of the test whether they are effective or not. So, the DP formula is used to find out the DP of the items. The items are considered effective because they extend from 0.31 to 0.70, as in table (3.7):

Table (6) The Difficulty Level and Discrimination Power of the Test Items

Question	Item	Higher	Lower	Difficulty	Discrimination
Q1/	1	21	12	0.45	0.30
	2	6	1	0.70	0.50

	3	5	1	0.65	0.40
	4	5	1	0.35	0.40
	5	4	1	0.30	0.30
	6	9	6	0.40	0.30
	7	14	4	0.55	0.50
	8	9	6	0.30	0.30
	9	9	6	0.40	0.30
	10	8	5	0.53	0.30
	11	8	5	0.42	0.30
	12	7	5	0.46	0.20
	13	7	4	0.67	0.30
	14	6	3	0.67	0.30
	15	6	2	0.54	0.40
	16	49	20	0.62	0.41
Q2 / A	1	35	15	0.50	0.57
	2	34	10	0.65	0.69
	3	28	5	0.65	0.66
Q2 / B	1	30	22	0.35	0.57
	2	26	16	0.45	0.71
	3	20	13	0.40	0.50
	4	16	10	0.30	0.43
	5	14	8	0.30	0.43
Q2 / C	1	24	14	0.55	0.36
Q3 / A	1	13	9	0.60	0.29
	2	12	9	0.65	0.21
	3	10	5	0.70	0.36
	4	10	5	0.55	0.36
	5	8	4	0.40	0.29
	6	8	2	0.50	0.43
	7	7	2	0.50	0.36
	8	6	1	0.55	0.36
Q3 / B	1	70	30	0.40	0.36

Chapter Four:

4.1 Results Related to the First Hypothesis:

Comparison Between the Theoretical Mean and Students' Performance at the Two Universities in the OC Test

To verify the first hypothesis, which states, "There are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' OC at the two universities; Tikrit and Al-Anbar." The mean scores of the students' OC in the test are (28.93) and the theoretical mean is (50) with a standard deviation of (11.28), respectively. The T-test formula for one sample is used. The calculated t-value is (27.309), which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value, which is (1.972) at the (0.05) level of significance when the degree of freedom is (213), as shown in Table (8).

The results of the table (8) indicate there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' OC tests at the two universities in favour of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the OC test. So, the first hypothesis is accepted.

Table (7) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and One Sample T-Value of the Students' Organizational Competence Tests at the Two Universities

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	Theoretical Mean Score	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
O. C	214	28.93	11.28	50	Calculated	Tabulated	213	0.05
					27.309	1.972		

The Comparison between the Mean scores of the Students' OC Tests at the Two Universities in the Recognition and Production Levels.

The mean scores of the student's OC tests at the recognition level and that at the production level of the two universities are calculated and compared to find out whether there is any significant difference between the two levels. The obtained results show that students' mean scores at the recognition level are found to be (15.22) and that at the production level is (13.75). The t-test formula for two paired samples is used and results show that the calculated t-value is (9.238) and the tabulated t- value is (1.972) at the degree of freedom (213) and level of significance (0.05), as shown in table (8).

This means that there is a significant difference between students' OC tests at the recognition level and that at the production level of the two universities and for the benefit of the recognition level. Therefore, this hypothesis is accepted, as shown in table (8).

Table (8) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, and T-Value of the Experimental Group at the Recognition and Production Levels

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Recognition	214	15.22	6.08	Calculated	Tabulated	213	0.05
Production	214	13.75	5.38	9.238	1.972		

Comparison Between the Mean Scores of the Tikrit and Al-Anbar universities at OC Test.

To find out whether "there are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' OC at the two universities; Tikrit and Al-Anbar", all mean scores are obtained and compared. Statistics show that the mean scores of the Tikrit university are (28.15) and that of the Al-Anbar university is (29.54). By using the t-test formula for two independent, the calculated t-value is found to be (0.896), while the tabulated t-value is found to be (1.972) at the degree of freedom (212) and level of significance (0.05), This means indicate that there is no significant difference between the two universities in the OC Test.

Thus, the first hypothesis, which states that there are statistically significant differences between the EFL university students' OC at the two universities, Tikrit and Al-Anbar is rejected, as shown in table (9).

Table (9) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Two Independent Sample T-Value of the Students' Organizational Competence Tests Between the Two Universities

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Tikrit	93	28.15	9.63	Calculated	Tabulated	212	0.05
Anbar	121	29.54	12.40	0.896	1.972		

4.1 Results Related to The Second Hypothesis:

Comparison Between the Theoretical Mean and Students' Performance at the Two Universities in the Grammatical Competence Test

To verify the second hypothesis, which states, "There are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' grammatical competence at Tikrit and Al-Anbar universities." The mean scores of the students' OC in the test are (14.58) and the theoretical mean is (25) with a standard deviation of (6.11), respectively. The T-test formula for one sample is used. The calculated t-value is (24.927), which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value, which is (1.972) at the (0.05) level of significance when the degree of freedom is (213), as shown in Table (7).

The results of the table 10) indicate there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' grammatical competence tests at the two universities in favour of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the grammatical competence test. So, the first hypothesis is accepted.

Table (10) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and One Sample T-Value of the Students' Grammatical Competence Tests at the Two Universities

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	Theoretical Mean Score	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
G.C	214	14.58	6.11	25	Calculated	Tabulated	213	0.05
					24.927	1.972		

Comparison Between the Mean Scores of the Tikrit and Al-Anbar universities at Grammatical Competence Test.

To find out whether "there are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' OC at the two universities; Tikrit and Al-Anbar", all mean scores are obtained and compared. Statistics show that the mean scores of the Tikrit university are (14.24) and that of the Al-Anbar university is (14.85). By using the t-test formula for two independent samples, the calculated t-value is found to be (0.716), while the tabulated t-value is found to be (1.972) at the degree of freedom (212) and level of significance (0.05), This means indicate that there is no significant difference between the two universities in the Grammatical Competence Test.

Thus, the second hypothesis, which states that there are statistically significant differences between the EFL university students' OC at the two universities, Tikrit and Al-Anbar is rejected, as shown in table (11).

Table (11) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Two Independent Sample T-Value of the Students' Grammatical Competence Tests Between the Two Universities

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Tikrit	93	14.24	5.32	Calculated	Tabulated	212	0.05
Anbar	121	14.85	6.66	0.716	1.972		

4.1.3 Results Related to The Third Hypothesis:

Comparison Between the Theoretical Mean and Students' Performance at the Two Universities in the Textual Competence Test.

To verify the third hypothesis, which states, "There are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' textual competence at the two universities." The mean scores of the students' textual competence in the test are (14.33) and the theoretical mean is (25) with a standard deviation of (6.07), respectively. The T-test formula for one sample is used. The calculated t-value is (25.657), which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value, which is (1.972) at the (0.05) level of significance when the degree of freedom is (213), as shown in Table (12).

The results of the table (12) indicate there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' textual competence tests at the two universities in favour of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the textual competence test. So, the first hypothesis is accepted.

Table (12) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and One Sample T-Value of the Students' Textual Competence Tests

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD	Theoretical Mean Score	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
T. C	214	14.33	6.07	25	Calculated	Tabulated	213	0.05
					25.657	1.972		

Comparison Between the Mean Scores of the Tikrit and Al-Anbar universities at Textual Competence Test

To find out whether "There are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' textual competence at the two universities", all mean scores are obtained and compared. Statistics show that the mean scores of the Tikrit university are (13.87) and that of the Al-Anbar university is (14.69). By using the t-test formula for two independent samples, the calculated t-value is found to be (0.982), while the tabulated t-value is found to be (1.972) at the degree of freedom (212) and level of significance (0.05), This means indicate that there is no significant difference between the two universities in the textual competence test.

Thus, the third hypothesis, which states there are statistically significant differences among the EFL university students' textual competence at the two universities is rejected, as shown in table (13).

Table (13) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Two Independent Sample T-Value of the Students' Textual Competence

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
				Calculated	Tabulated		
Anbar	121	14.69	6.78	0.982	1.972	212	0.05

4.1.4. Results Related to The Fourth Hypothesis:

Comparison Between the Theoretical Mean and Students' OC According to Gender (Females) Variable at the Two Universities

To verify the fourth hypothesis, which states, "There are statistically significant differences of OC according to gender variable at the two universities." The mean scores of the students' OC in the test are (28.24) and the theoretical mean is (50) with a standard deviation of (11.16), respectively. The T-test formula for one sample is used. The calculated t-value is (19.672), which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value, which is (1.984) at the (0.05) level of significance when the degree of freedom is (213), as shown in Table (14).

The results of the table (14) indicate there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' OC according to gender variable at the two universities in favour of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students (Females) of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the OC test. So, the first hypothesis is accepted.

Table (14) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and One Sample T-Value of the Students' Organizational Competence According to Gender

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	Theoretical Mean Score	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Females	102	28.24	11.16	50	Calculated	Tabulated	101	0.05
					19.672	1.984		

Comparison Between the Theoretical Mean and Students' OC According to Gender (Males) Variable at the Two Universities

To verify the first hypothesis, which states, "There are statistically significant differences of OC according to gender variable at the two universities." The mean scores of the students' OC in the test are (29.57) and the theoretical mean is (50) with a standard deviation of (11.39), respectively. The T-test formula for one sample is used. The calculated t-value is (18.970), which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value, which is (1.984) at the (0.05) level of significance when the degree of freedom is (213), as shown in Table (15).

The results of the table (15) indicate there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' OC according to gender variable at the two universities in favour of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students (Males) of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the OC test. So, the first hypothesis is accepted.

Table (15) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and One Sample T-Value of the Students' OC According to Gender

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	Theoretical Mean Score	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Males	112	29.57	11.39	50	Calculated	Tabulated	111	0.05
					18.970	1.984		

Comparison Between the Mean Scores of OC According to Gender Variable at the Two Universities

To find out whether "There are statistically significant differences of OC according to gender variable at the two universities", all mean scores are obtained and compared. Statistics show that the mean scores of the males are (29.19) and that of the females is (28.24). By using the t-test formula for paired samples, the calculated t-value is found to be (0.573), while the tabulated t-value is found to be (1.972) at the degree of freedom (101) and level of significance (0.05), This means indicate that there is no significant difference of OC according to gender variable at the two universities.

Thus, the fourth hypothesis, which states there are statistically significant differences of OC according to gender variable at the two universities is rejected, as shown in table (16).

Table (16) The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Paired Samples T-Value of the Students' Organizational Competence According to Gender

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Males	102	29.19	11.42	Calculated	Tabulated	101	0.05
Females	102	28.24	11.16	0.573	1.972		

4.5. Discussion of the Results:

This study attempts to investigate the OC in EFL universities students writing at the two colleges of education, Al-Anbar university, according to Bachman (1990), expand the notion of communicative competence to that of communicative language ability (CLA), which "attempts to characterize the processes by which the various components interact with each other and with the context in which language use occurs."

The findings from the current study differ from those of previous studies, which found that students' writing abilities have improved with time. diagnostic test for the current study. It was noted that the students of the two universities, Anbar, do not have any OC in writing skills, so the discussion of results is as below:

The results of the first hypothesis indicate there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' OC tests at the two universities in favour of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the OC test. So, the first hypothesis is accepted, as explained in the table (7).

Whereas the comparison between the mean scores of the students' OC tests at the two universities in the recognition and production levels.

The results indicates that there is a significant difference between students' OC tests at the recognition level and that at the production level of the two universities and for the benefit of the recognition level. Therefore, this hypothesis is accepted, as shown in table (8).

Also, the results of the same hypothesis concerning comparison between the mean scores of al-Anbar universities at OC test show that there is no significant difference between the two universities in the OC test, as explained in the table (9).

The second hypothesis relates to the grammatical competence of EFL university students at Al-Anbar universities. The table (10) reveals statistically significant differences in favor of the theoretical mean between the theoretical mean and the students' grammatical competency tests at the two colleges. According to this data, the students of the two universities demonstrated a considerable lack of grammatical proficiency on the examination. The second hypothesis is thus acceptable.

In addition, the findings of the same hypothesis concerning a comparison of the mean scores obtained by the universities of al-Anbar on a test of grammatical competence show that there is not a significant difference between the two universities in the grammatical competence test, as is shown in the table (11).

According to the third hypothesis on the textual competence of students studying English as a Foreign Language at the universities of Al-Anbar in Iraq, according to the findings presented in table 4.6, there are statistically significant differences in favor of the theoretical mean by comparing the students' textual competency tests at the two universities to the theoretical mean. In light of these findings, it may be deduced that the students attending the mentioned universities had a notable lack of textual competence throughout the test. Based on how well the two universities have done overall, the third hypothesis is accepted.

As shown in Table (7), from the same hypothesis comparison between the mean scores of the al-Anbar universities at textual competence test. This means indicate that there is no significant difference between the two universities in the textual competence test.

Concerning the fourth hypothesis, the table (14) shows that when the theoretical mean and the organizational skills of female students at the two universities are compared, there are statistically significant differences in favor of the theoretical mean. Thus, according to these results, the students (females) of the two universities showed a significant weakness in the OC test. So, the fourth hypothesis is accepted.

While the comparison between the theoretical mean and students' OC according to gender (males) variable at the two universities, as shown in table (15), indicates that there are statistically significant differences in favor of the theoretical mean, the results indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the theoretical mean and students' OC according to gender variable at the two universities. According to these

findings, the organizational competency test was significantly under-performed by the male students attending the two universities in investigation. The fourth hypothesis is verified as a result.

Moreover, the comparison between the mean scores of OC according to gender variable at the two universities (female and males), as shown in the table (16), indicates that there is no significant difference in OC according to gender variable at the two universities between females and males.

The findings of the current study reveal that students in English Departments/Colleges of Education at the universities of Al-Anbar that most of students need both academic skills and OC to manage the many competing interests that college life offers. While critical thinking and comprehension skills are essential for any college course, it's also important that students have the ability to effectively manage their time."

The lack of OC among the students of the two universities can be attributed to a number of factors, including a weak linguistic foundation in terms of grammatical ability, as well as a lack of textual competence through writing, and how the text contains coherence and cohesion in ideas and builds a smooth idea.

Chapter Five: Conclusions:

From the analysis of data of this study, it has been concluded that:

1. Instructors do not have enough experience to become organizationally competent since they are expected to cover the language teaching materials in accordance with the curricula and syllabuses that have been supplied for them to follow.
2. Other causes of OC neglect may include a lack of classroom time, resources curriculum overload, or the teacher's personal lack of confidence and lack of training, which hinders their ability to teach this element of linguistic competence effectively.
3. Students of English as a Foreign Language have trouble implementing some textual skills because they are unfamiliar with them.
4. Even in their native language, most EFL college students have no concept how to organize their ideas while writing an essay.
5. Most of the students are unable to use the grammatical rules in appropriate way in relation to the given context. They put all their concentration on the formula of the grammatical rules, and pay little or no attention to their use.

References

- [1] Alderson, J. Clapham, C., and Wall, D. (1999). *Language Test Construction and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Algarabel, S. and Dasi, C. (2001). *The Definition of Achievement and the Construction of Tests for its Measurement: A Review of the Main Trends*. Spain University.
- [3] Al-Hamash, K.I and Younis, Hamdi (1975). *Principles and Techniques of Teaching English as a Second Language*. Baghdad Middle East Printing Press.
- [4] Allen, P., Cummins, J., Mougeon, R., & Swain, M. (1983). *The development of bilingual proficiency: second year report and appendices*. Toronto: Modern Language Centre OISE.
- [5] Ary, D. Jacobs, L. C. and Sorensen C. (2006). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Cengage Learning.
- [6] Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- [7] Bachman, L. F., and Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1982). The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency. *TESOL quarterly*, 16(4), 449-465.
- [9] Baker, D. (1989). *Language Testing*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [10] Bell, J., & Burnaby, B. (1984). *A handbook for ESL literacy*. Oise Press.
- [11] Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- [13] Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [14] Brown, T. (2010). Construct validity: A unitary concept for occupational therapy assessment and measurement. *Hong Kong Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 20(1), 30-42.
- [15] Brown, H.D. (1999) *Teaching by principle ;An Interactive Approach to language pedagogy*(2nd ed.)New york Addison wesle
- [16] Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and communication* (pp. 14-40). Routledge.
- [17] Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative pedagogy. In J. C. Richards, & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). Longman.
- [18] Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1 47.
- [19] Candlin, C. N. (1978). Form, function and strategy in communicative curriculum design. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.), *The communicative teaching of English* (C. N. Candlin, Trans., pp. 24-44). Langenscheidt-Longman.
- [20] Candlin, C. N. (1986). Explaining communicative competence limits of testability. In *Toward communicative competence testing: Proceedings of the second Toefl invitational conference* (Vol. 21, pp. 38-57). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- [21] Cardoso, A., Pereira, S., Silva, E., & Sousa, O. (2009). On the development of textual competence in primary education.
- [22] Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. A. Soler, & M. S. Jorda (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41-57). Springer.
- [23] Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.
- [24] Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

- [25] Creswell, John W. (2012). Educational Research. New York: Pearson Education.
- [26] Crocker, L. and Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory. Philadelphia: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- [27] Davies, A. (1968). Language Testing Symposium: A Psychological Approach. London: Oxford University Press.
- [28] Devellis, R. (2003). Scale Development Theory and Applications. United States of America: Sage Publication.
- [29] DeVellis, R. F. (2016). Scale development: Theory and applications, California: Sage publications.
- [30] Dragomir, I. A., & Niculescu, B. O. (2020). "Different Approaches to Developing Writing Skills." Land Forces Academy Review, 25(3), 201-206.
- [31] Ebel, R. and D. Frisbie (1991). Essentials of Educational Measurement. 5th eds. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [32] Feigl, H., & Brodbeck, M. (1953). Readings in the Philosophy of Science. British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 7(26).
- [33] Fterniati, A., & Spinthourakis, J. A. (2005). Implementing a Text Oriented Approach to Effect Students' Textual Competence. The International Journal of Learning, 12.
- [34] Gebhard, J.G. (1996). Teaching English as a foreign or second language. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- [35] Gee, J. P. (2004). "Language in the Science Classroom: Academic social languages as the heart of school-based literacy." In Establishing scientific classroom discourse communities (pp. 28-52). Routledge.
- [36] Genesee, F. and Upshur, J. (1996). Classroom-Based Evaluation in Second in m Language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [37] Glass, G., and J. Stanley (1970). Statistical methods in education and psychology Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [38] Graulund, N. (1974). Individualizing Classroom Instruction. New York: Macmillan Co.
- [39] Gronlund, N. (1970). Measurement and Evaluation. 2nd edition. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- [40] Habermas, J. (1970). Towards a theory of communicative competence. Inquiry, 13(1-4), 360–375.
- [41] Hadfield and Hadfield (2008). Oxford basics: Introduction to Teaching English, Oxford University Press, New York.
- [42] Halliday, M. A. (1978). Language as social semiotic. Edward Arnold.
- [43] Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- [44] Hanlon, B. and Larget, B. (2011). Samples and Population. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- [45] Harmer, J. (1998). How to teach English, Addison Wesley Longman Limited, England, U.K.
- [46] Harmer, J. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching (Third Edition). London and New York: Longman.
- [47] Harrison, A. (1983). A Language Testing Handbook. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- [48] Hatch, E. (1978). 'Discourse analysis and second language acquisition' in E. Hatch (ed.): Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings. Kowley, Mass: Newbury House: 401-35.
- [49] Healey, J. F. (2012). The Essentials of Statistics: A Tool for Social Research, Canada: Nelson Education, Ltd.
- [50] Heaton, J. B. (1975). Writing English Tests. London: Longman press. Heaton, J. B. (1988). Writing English Language Tests. 2nd Ed. New York: Longman Group.
- [51] Hermanto, H. (2008). The Influence of Language Competence, Writing Competence, And Cultural Competence on Producing a Successful Writing. Jurnal Sosial Humaniora (JSH), 1(2), 185-195.

- [52] Hogue, A. (2008). *First steps in academic writing* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- [53] Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [54] Hyland, K. (2002). "Genre: Language, context, and literacy." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 113-135.
- [55] Hyland, K. (2007). *Writing in the Academy: Reputation, Education and Knowledge*. London, UK: Institute of Education Press.
- [56] Hymes, D. (1982). Narrative form as a "grammar" of experience: Native Americans and a glimpse of English. *Journal of Education*, 121-142.
- [57] Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin Books.
- [58] Kartashova, V. N., Zaitseva, I., Lavrishcheva, E., Osipova, N., Pozdnyakova, M., & Parshutkina, T (2019). The Technology of Developing the Summarizing Component of Textual Competence by The Future Foreign Language Teacher. *Ad Alta: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 9(1 S7), 10-12.
- [59] Khuziakhmetov, A. N., & Valeev, A. A. (2017). The development of university students' cognitive capacities. *Modern journal of language teaching methods*, 7(2), 149-158.
- [60] Littlewood, W. (2004). Second language learning. In A. Davies, & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 501–524). Blackwell.
- [61] Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative language teaching: An expanding concept for a changing world. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. II, pp. 541–557). Routledge.
- [62] Madsen, H. S. (1983). *Techniques in Testing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [63] Madsen, H.S. (1983). *Techniques in testing*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [64] McCrimman, J. M. (1984). *Writing with a Purpose*. Eighth edition. Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin.
- [65] Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R.L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13-104). New York: Macmillan.
- [66] Mousavi, S. A. (2009). Multimedia as a test Method Facet in Oral Proficiency Tests. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning*, 5(1), 37 -48.
- [67] Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [68] Nazarova, M. V., & Valeev, A. A. (2017). Didactic possibilities of interactive technologies in teaching a foreign language at the university. *Modern journal of language teaching methods*, 7(4), 21-33.
- [69] Nigrelli, C. (2019). Improving Textual Competence in a Second Language Initial Literacy Classroom. *Computational and Corpus-based Phraseology*, 126.
- [70] Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for The Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [71] Obdržáleková, V. (2019). Communicative and Textual Competence in Translations of Legal Texts from English into Czech: A Case Study. *CLINA Interdisciplinary Journal of Translation, Interpretation and Intercultural Communication*, 5(2), 99-119.
- [72] Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- [73] Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (1983). Conversational analysis. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 117-154). London: Longman.
- [74] Saddler, B. & Graham S., (2007). The relationship between writing knowledge and writing performance among more and less skilled writers. In *Reading & Writing Quarterly*. 23: 231–247.
- [75] Saussure, F. d. (1916). *Course in general linguistics*. Open Court.

- [76] Savignon, S. J. (1972). Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching. Center for Curriculum Development.
- [77] Savignon, S. J. (1983). Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Addison-Wesley.
- [78] Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative language teaching: Linguistic theory and classroom practice. In S. J. Savignon (Ed.), *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (pp. 1–27). Yale University Press.
- [79] Stevens, P.J. (2007) "Intermediate Statistics: Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing." Washington: American Educational.
- [80] Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- [81] Tunay, T., & Özlem, K. (2020). On the models of communicative competence. In *Proceedings of GLOBETS online: International Conference on Education, Technology and Science* (pp. 86-96).
- [82] Turbill, J., Barton, G., & Brock, C.H. (2015). *Teaching Writing in Today's Classrooms: Looking Back to Look Forward*. Norwood: Australian Literacy Educators' Association.
- [83] Valeev, A. A., & Muzafarova, N. M. (2016). Actualization of the supersonic approach in teaching a foreign language. Actual problems of pedagogy and psychology. Paper presented at the 25th anniversary of the Russian society Janusz Korczak, Kazan, Russia.
- [84] Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- [85] Walter, T. (2004). *Teaching English Language Learners: The How-To Handbook* (First Edition). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education ESL.
- [86] Westwood, Peter, (2004). *Learning and Difficulties: A Handbook for teachers*, Acer Press, University of Hong Kong
- [87] White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing*. London, UK: Longman.
- [88] Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [89] Williams, D.J., (2003). *Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Appendix (B) The Diagnostic Test

**Universities of Tikrit and Al-Anbar
College of Education for Humanities**

Gender:

Note: Answer all questions, each question is allotted 2 marks.

Do as required.

1. Correct the Following:

a- since john (leave) Anne she has hardly eaten anything.

b- The English teacher will be out the (follow) days.
you should give..... (self) another chance

2. correct this sentence: Let you and Idol it

.....

3. Correct the place of the adverb: Ali sings loudly the song

.....

4. He is (old) than I.(correct)

5. Add a preposition in blank: Divide the pens the three students.

6. Use a conjunction: He like February but also June.

7. make new word combining the base word and prefixes. (Behave, sense)

8. give the example about Acronyms in word process formation.

9. Use future expression: I teach you later in the day.

10. She(eat) a dinner at home by this time tomorrow.

11. replace the underlined word by appropriate model

John is capable of typing very fast.

12. Change the sentence to passive: I did not fix the car.

.....

13. How many bound morphemes does the word "Transportable" contain?

.....

14. identify the wrong verb tense in the sentence

I never work as a cashier until I get a job there

15. identify wrong ward torn and correct answer in the sentence.

Her voice is irritated

16. Re-write the following sentence to achieve a high cohesion:

When my father and brother got home, he gave me a book.

Q2: A: Identify the reference of the logical subject of the clause

1. He wanted me to telephone you at once and ask you to come to Danzig. He offered to find a translator for your essay

2. the restaurants specialty is fish. they are always fresh. the food is delicious. therefore, it is always crowded.

Q2: B: choose appropriate answer in the blank.

1. Heto college every day (goes. going. go)

2. She just now (has arrive ,arrived .arrive)

3. The antonym ward of Best is..... (worst. Wear .war)

4. the synonym word of mistake is (bad. error. confusion)

5. The opposite of sunny is (rainy. cloudy. cold)

Q2: C: A circle the noun that is the topic of the paragraph and all pronouns that refer to it.

Some researchers believe that social animals such as dogs may have a sense of morality. That is dogs know right from wrong .for example ,dogs follow certain rules when they play together ,and they exclude dogs that don't follow the rules .Dogs sense of right and wrong also includes knowing how to behave correctly around humans .for example ,they know how the pack leader (that is ,the boss)in any family is .they also know that

they are not allowed to eat the pack leaders food .if they steal a bite of food from Dads dinner plate .they slink around the kitchen looking gutty because they know they have broken a rule. other Researchers say that fear of punishment. not guilt, is the reason for dogs, slinking behavior

Q3: A: Rearrange to Rhetorical Organization

1. after I have finished, get out of the clothes and go out to buy the breakfast food. and then go home to help my mother to prepare it, take it to the dining table and bring the water and then sit down and eat breakfast.
2. I wake up every morning in the early morning with every activity and vitality, ready to start my day, then I go to bathroom, showering and getting read.
3. As soon as I arrive at (2p,m) I will go directly to listen to the school broadcast. Then I go to my class until the end of my school days.
4. I then bid my parents farewell and go out to the school walking on foot because it is close and do not need to take any transportation.
5. will then go straight home for launch, sit down a bit and then go out to help my father in his work and sit down in his shop until he rests a little and comes back.
6. When he returns, I ask him for permission to go out with my friends and then go back to doing sports.
7. At this time, I took my books with me to do my homework.
8. After I finish, I go home and bathe and sit with my family watching TV or talking and then I go back to my room to check on my home works and after finishing I go to change my clothes and sleep early so, I can wake up actively for the second day.

Q3: B: writing about an experience where you learned something about your-self.

.....

