

## The Effect of Summarizing Model Essays on Developing EFL Learners' Writing Skill

*Farnaz Sahebkhair*

Young Researchers club, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

**Abstract:** The purposes of this study are twofold: its first aim is to investigate the effect of summarizing model essays on developing writing skill; it also attempts to determine which aspects of writing (grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, fluency and form) will develop by summarizing model essays. Based on the scores in a preliminary English test (Pet), the participants were equally divided into two groups: control group and experimental group. Control group practiced reading model essays extensively and experimental group summarized model essays. Students were asked to write an argumentative essay as the pretest. The students received 21 treatment sessions, after which a post-test was administered. The results revealed that summarizing model essays significantly affected EFL learners' writing by developing all aspects of writing specially grammar, mechanics, fluency and form in comparison to the control group which did not show a significant difference from pre-test to post-test except for the vocabulary. Vocabulary score was the highest in both groups in the post-test. The findings of the study suggest that reading model essays solely cannot be helpful for students and teachers should encourage students to summarize model essays for a better achievement.

**Key words:** Model Essays • Reading extensively • Summarizing • Writing skill

### INTRODUCTION

Some L2 writing researchers argue that L2 learners should be encouraged to use a model essay for improving their writing skills in terms of the relationship between reading and writing [1-5]. Model essays can improve accuracy and complexity of Efl learners' written performance better than teachers' written error correction [6]. L2 writers have to be exposed to various types of reading material since it is difficult to acquire L2 writing skills by only writing [7]. Model texts serve to model rhetorical elements, principles and patterns either by including a description of parts (thesis statement, claim, support, refutation, introduction and conclusion) or by having students discern these on their own [8]. Model essays are the most helpful tool if L2 writers have a sufficient amount of content knowledge [9]. Thus, some researchers emphasize the necessity of a model text illustrated in an academic writing textbook, which enables L2 writers to pay attention to the various aspects of TL [6, 10, 11].

**Summarizing Model Essays:** Summarization as a required technique in academic arena is believed to facilitate and enhance reading comprehension [12]. Summarizing helps students to comprehend knowledge, transferring it to long-term memory significantly because it leads students to a) reading to understand, b) to distinguish important ideas and c) to express the information by using their own words [13, 14]. Summarization can improve metacomprehension accuracy of written performance [15]. Summarizing text with different genres can have positive effect on using the same genres and improving written performance [16, 17]. Giving summary writing as assignments could actually boost psychology majors' reading and writing ability [18]. On the other hand, several L1 studies have reported that summarization may contribute to evidently better retention and recall of the information from the reading texts [19-21]. Since summarizers are required to comprehend, evaluate, select, condense and transform the reading information to produce the summary product, they can capitalize on more opportunities to process and interact with the text.

During the recurrent processing and interaction with the reading materials, summarizers can construct a newly internalized and synoptic representation of original text. Furthermore, via the summarization, readers are able to enhance the reading comprehension and retain the information better, which may be believed to conduce to the output tasks [22]. Effects of extensive reading and summary writing on cloze tests among Japanese university students from an English literature department were investigated [23]. Students who were involved in extensive reading plus English summary writing performed significantly better on cloze-test than those who kept doing cloze exercises. Two groups of psychology majors, one with and the other without take-home summary assignments were compared [18]. Students in summary group improved both reading comprehension and writing skills. It seems that summarization as a combination of and interaction between input and output can improve both comprehension and production outcomes. However, there are also several objections to using model essays in an L2 writing context. The process of making meaning in L2 cannot be achieved by referring to written texts [24]. In addition, model essays prevent L2 learners from having creativity, which is one of the important aspects of L2 writing skills [25]. Writing instruction with model essays has also been criticized by other researchers [26, 27] for laying emphasis not on content but on form. They insist that language form and the content of composition are inseparable. Even among researchers who claim that model essays can be beneficial pedagogical tools, there has been agreement that reading model essays is important but not totally sufficient [7, 10]. Little empirical research has been undertaken on the effect of summarizing model essays on EFL learners' writing performance in Iran. The present study therefore focused on the role of summarizing model essays in improving Iranian EFL learners' writing skill. Regarding the purpose of the study, the following research questions were asked:

- Does summarizing model essays have any effect on developing EFL Learners' writing skill?
- What aspects of EFL learners' writing skill (grammar, vocabulary, fluency, mechanics and form) will improve by summarizing model essays?

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

**Participants:** The participants in the present study were 40 female EFL students from Jahade Daneshgahi English Institute in Tabriz, Iran. Their ages ranged from 16 to 28

and they were all at intermediate level. Students in this institute were in Level7, studying Top notch 2 [28], according to their Level they are categorized into intermediate Level. So the researcher chose the (pet) which is designed for intermediate Level students. The test and guide for scoring was used from this website ([www.cambridgeesol.org/exams/pet](http://www.cambridgeesol.org/exams/pet)). Most students could answer between 60 -75 out of 100. Therefore, the researcher chose 60 as the passing score. 4 students who got less than 60 were not allowed to participate in the research. Based on the results they were randomly divided into two groups (control and experimental group).

**Instruments:** The proficiency test employed in the present study was the Preliminary English Test (PET). The test consists of four parts: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The subjects' scores were out of 100. In order to have homogeneous groups, those who obtained 60 or more were chosen as the participants of the study. Writing tasks and model essays for pre-test (Appendix A), post-test (Appendix B) and treatment tasks (appendix C) were chosen from the book 'How to Prepare for the TOEFL Essays' [29]. This book consists of different types of argumentative tasks, including four kinds of writing tasks AD (agreeing or disagreeing), PR (stating a preference), EX (giving an explanation) and MA (making an argument). For pre-test and post-test a MA kind of argumentative task was used. The argumentative tasks are the most common type of writing tasks which are used in Iranian English classes. Before starting the treatment sessions, the researcher asked students to choose topics that were interesting for them and choose topics that they had enough background knowledge about them.

**Design:** Due to the proposed research questions a true experimental method of research was required. It contained a pre-test, a post-test, a control group and an experimental group. In this study, students' language proficiency was controlled by taking the PET test. All the students in the institute were female. Therefore, gender was controlled by selecting two solely female language learner groups. Before starting the research, students did not get any instruction about how to use the models. They were supposed to work on the models individually.

**Procedure:** A week prior to starting the treatment sessions, a pet test was given to all participants in order to be sure of their homogeneity. On the basis of the

results of the assessment, students were sorted into two equal groups. One group for extensive reading (control group) and one group for summary writing (experimental group). Students were asked to write an argumentative essay as the pretest. Students' pre-test compositions were evaluated by two experienced teachers. The researcher as the teacher of both classes used analytic method (appendix D) for scoring students' writing performance. Students in control group were required to read ten model essays within five weeks, those in experimental group were supposed to read those essays and summarize them. Post testing procedures were exactly the same as pretesting. Students in both groups had access to another argumentative kind of writing task from the same book. Students writing were scored analytically. The researcher used method of analytical scoring [30]. In this scale for measuring written proficiency, different parts of writing (grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, fluency and organization/form) are scored from 1 to 6. Furthermore, they must be added up to gain the score of written performance.

**Results and Finding:** In this section, the results of t-test for proficiency test, a descriptive statistics of data, Pearson Correlation for showing the inter-rater reliability between the scores of two raters, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for finding the normalness of data, t-test for showing the results of pre-test and post-test scores will be presented. Finally, the researcher will discuss the results.

As a result of the t-test for proficiency scores, there has not been a significant difference in scores for control group ( $M = 63.15$ ,  $SD = 2.78$ ) and experimental group ( $M=64.40$ ,  $SD = 3.50$ ),  $t(38) = -.279$ ,  $P>.05$ .

**Inter-Rater Reliability for Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores:** The computed Pearson correlation coefficient for pre-test is ( $r = .917$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and for the post-test is ( $r = .954$ ,  $p = .000$ ), which indicates that there is a high positive relationship between the scores rated by Rater 1 and Rater 2 in both pre-test and post-test for control and experimental groups.

**Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for pre-test and post-test Scores in two Groups:** Before conducting T-test, the researchers used the kolmogorov-smirnov test to check the normality of the distribution of data. Results of kolmogorov-smirnov test for pre-test and post test of control and experimental groups is  $p>.05$ , so the distribution of data is normal.

Table 1: Independent sample t-test for pre-test scores in two groups

| Pre-test           | N  | Mean        | t     | F    | df    |
|--------------------|----|-------------|-------|------|-------|
| Control group      | 20 | 7.00 (2.67) | -.178 | .011 | 38    |
| Experimental group | 20 | 7.15 (2.64) | -.178 |      | 37.99 |

Note:  $p = .916$ . The adjusted Standard Deviation is shown in parentheses below the means

**T-Test for Pre-Test Scores:** A T-Test analysis was run to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the two groups' mean scores on the pre-test measuring writing skill. The results of T-test scores are presented in Table 1.

The mean score and the standard deviation in the control group were ( $M = 7.00$ ,  $SD = 2.67$ ) and the mean score and the standard deviation in the experimental group were ( $M = 7.15$ ,  $SD = 2.64$ ),  $t(38) = -.178$ ,  $p>.05$ , which shows that there is no significant difference between two groups regarding the pre-test scores for writing skills (Table 1).

According to analytical analysis of students' written performance, the score of different parts of writing (grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, fluency and form/organization) has been shown in Table 2.

As Table 2 shows in control group by the mean score and standard deviation of Grammar ( $M = 1.40$ ,  $SD = .68$ ), vocabulary ( $M = 1.45$ ,  $SD = .60$ ), mechanics ( $M = 1.25$ ,  $SD = .44$ ), fluency ( $M = 1.30$ ,  $SD = .57$ ), form/organization ( $M = 1.15$ ,  $SD = .36$ ), there is no significant difference with experimental group by the mean score and standard deviation of Grammar ( $M = 1.30$ ,  $SD = .47$ ), vocabulary ( $M = 2.00$ ,  $SD = .21$ ), mechanics ( $M = 1.35$ ,  $SD = .44$ ), fluency ( $M = 1.45$ ,  $SD = .51$ ), form/organization ( $M = 1.33$ ,  $SD = .47$ )

**T-test for Post-test Scores:** After treatment sessions, post test was applied. The results of post test are shown in Table 3.

The mean score and standard deviation in the control group were ( $M = 11.45$ ,  $SD = .75$ ) and the mean score and standard deviation in the experimental group were ( $M = 22.15$ ,  $SD = 1.49$ ),  $t(38) = -28.15$ ,  $p<.05$ , which shows that there is a significant difference between two groups in post-test (Table 3). Writing scores in the experimental group has developed more than the control group.

Table 4 shows the changes in different aspects of written performance in the post-test.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of different aspects of written performance in pre-test

| Control group | Mean | Std.deviation | Experimental group | Mean | Std.deviation |
|---------------|------|---------------|--------------------|------|---------------|
| Grammar       | 1.40 | .68           | Grammar            | 1.30 | .47           |
| Vocabulary    | 1.45 | .60           | Vocabulary         | 2.00 | .21           |
| Mechanics     | 1.25 | .44           | Mechanics          | 1.35 | .44           |
| Fluency       | 1.30 | .57           | Fluency            | 1.45 | .51           |
| form          | 1.15 | .36           | form               | 1.33 | .47           |

Table 3: Independent sample t-test for post-test scores in two groups

| Post-test          | N  | Mean         | t      | F     | df    |
|--------------------|----|--------------|--------|-------|-------|
| Control group      | 20 | 11.45 (.75)  | -28.15 | 12.28 | 38    |
| Experimental group | 20 | 22.15 (1.49) | -28.15 |       | 28.17 |

Note:  $p = .000$ . The adjusted Standard Deviation is shown in parentheses below the means

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of different aspects of written performance in post-test

| Control group | Mean | Std.deviation | Experimental group | Mean | Std.deviation |
|---------------|------|---------------|--------------------|------|---------------|
| Grammar       | 2.71 | 0.22          | Grammar            | 4.95 | 0.75          |
| Vocabulary    | 4.1  | 0.3           | Vocabulary         | 5.05 | 0.6           |
| Mechanics     | 2.55 | 0.51          | Mechanics          | 4.4  | 0.5           |
| Fluency       | 2.3  | 0.47          | Fluency            | 4.25 | 0.55          |
| form          | 2.15 | 0.36          | form               | 4.3  | 0.57          |

As Table 4 shows there are significant differences between control and experimental group in the mean score and standard deviation of written performance in post-test. Vocabulary by mean score and standard deviation ( $M = 5.05$ ,  $SD = .60$ ) in experimental group and mean score and standard deviation ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = .30$ ) in control group has developed more than the other aspects of written performance. However, in control group other aspects have not developed a lot in comparison to experimental group. In experimental group the mean score and standard deviation of Grammar ( $M = 4.95$ ,  $SD = .75$ ), mechanics ( $M = 4.40$ ,  $SD = .50$ ), fluency ( $M = 4.25$ ,  $SD = .55$ ), form/organization ( $M = 4.30$ ,  $SD = .57$ ) has developed significantly more than control group by Grammar ( $M = 2.71$ ,  $SD = .22$ ), mechanics ( $M = 2.55$ ,  $SD = .51$ ), fluency ( $M = 2.30$ ,  $SD = .47$ ), form/organization ( $M = 2.15$ ,  $SD = .36$ ). In the mentioned study, students who summarized model essays improved their writing skill more often than students who just read model essays. In both groups vocabulary developed more than the other aspects of written performance. These findings are consistent with other researches [1-4, 6] who found that students notice to vocabulary more than other parts in model essays. In these studies, the role of model texts in promoting noticing in a four-stage study, consisting of output, comparison and two revision stages, was investigated. In the comparison stage, participants were asked to write about whatever they noticed as they compared their original text with the models. The data was

coded into four categories; lexis, grammar, content and other. The findings of the study indicate that the participants noticed the lexical aspects far more frequently than the other three categories. Furthermore, in this study the results show that summarizing could improve grammar, form, fluency and mechanics much more than reading model essays. The reason behind the positive effect of summarizing model essays is the learners' cognitive processing system and the factor retention.

## CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to investigate the effect of summarizing model essays in comparison with reading model essays on developing EFL learners' writing skill. Two groups were chosen and independent sample t-tests were conducted to measure the effect of the treatment on two groups. The findings can be summarized as follows: (1) both reading model essays and summarizing model essays can improve writing. (2) However, summarizing model essays has more positive effect on developing writing skill. As results show summarizing model essays could develop all aspects of writing skill more than solely reading model essays. The reason behind these results is in accordance with previous finding that studying other people's writing products may not guarantee the valid transfer of essential writing features to students' own composition work [31]. Hence, via reading model essays extensively, students may not automatically transform

reading input into intake. The practice of summarization can help students to make their own writing more concise and to improve general quality of their writing [18]. One possible theoretical interpretation of the results could be that summarizing models requires students to be engaged in deeper process of information from the models than reading models extensively does [13, 14, 19]. During the recurrent interactions between reading and writing, the summarizer will construct a mental representation of a succinct text derived from the original one. In the interim the condensed information can easily be solidified in the long-term memory. In the present study, summarization of model essays proves to be an effective technique for improving students' essay writing. Accordingly, summarization is an effective technique to accompany the use of models because by summarizing the models students have to dedicate more efforts and consciousness to their reading, which may help to better their writing. The progress in writing skill in this study might be as a result of five week treatment sessions. Further studies should be down with delayed post-test for checking the long-term effects of summarizing model essays on writing. The participants of this study were all females at intermediate level; further studies should be carried out with male and/or at different levels of language proficiency. Further research should be conducted to probe into how many model essays are appropriate to be implemented. More studies should be done to explore how and when the models are used or the effects of different types of models in different contexts.

## REFERENCE

1. Abe, M., 2008. The role of model essays in the IELTS writing test. M.A. thesis, The University of Queensland.
2. Hanaoka, O., 2006. Exploring the role of models in promoting noticing in L2 writing. *JACET Bulletin*, 42: 1-13.
3. Hanaoka, O., 2007. Output, noticing and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Language Teaching Research*, 11: 459-479.
4. Qi, D.S. and S. Lapkin, 2001. Exploring the role of noticing in a three stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(4): 277-303.
5. Macbeth, P.K., 2009. Deliberate false provisions: The use and usefulness of models in learning academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(1): 33-48.
6. Saeidi, M. and F. Sahebkhair, 2011. The role of model essays on developing accuracy and complexity of Efl learners' written performance. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 10(1): 130-137.
7. Ferris, D. and J.S. Hedgcock, 1998. *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Rosa, A. and P. Eschholz, 2007. *Models for writers*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
9. Smagorinsky, P., 1992. How reading model essays affects writers. In J. Irwin and Doyle M. (Eds.), *Reading/writing connections*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, pp: 160-176.
10. Hyland, K., 2003. *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Yoshimura, F., 2009. Effects of connecting reading and writing and a checklist to guide the reading process on EFL learners' learning about English writing. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1): 1871-1883.
12. Oded, B. and J. Walters, 2001. Deeper processing for better EFL reading Comprehension. *System*, 29: 357-370.
13. Senemoglu, N., 2001. *Gelisim öğrenme ve öğretim*. Ankara: Ertem Matbaacılık.
14. Susar, F. and N. Akkaya, 2009. University students for using the summarizing strategies. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1): 24962499.
15. Thiede, W.K. and M. Anderson, 2002. Summarizing can improve metacomprehension accuracy. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28(2): 129-160.
16. Yu, G., 2009. The shifting sands in the effects of source text summarizability on summary writing. *Assessing Writing*, 14(2): 116-137.
17. Leopold, C. and D. Leutner, 2011. Science text comprehension: Drawing, main idea selection and summarizing as learning strategies. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(1): 16-26.
18. Radmacher, S.A. and E.L. Sawin, 1995. Summary writing: A tool to improve student comprehension and writing in Psychology. *Teaching in Psychology*, 22(2): 113-115.
19. Bean, T.W. and F.L. Steenwyk, 1984. The effect of three forms of summarization instruction on sixth graders' summary writing and comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 16(4): 297-306.
20. Doctorow, M., C. Marks and M. Wittrock, 1978. Generative processes in reading comprehension. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 70: 109-118.

21. Reder, L.M. and J.R. Anderson, 1980. A comparison of texts and their summaries: Memorial consequences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 19: 121-134.
22. Sagri, G., 1993. Composing a study-summary: A reading/writing encounter. In J.G. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, pp: 161-182.
23. Mason, B. and S. Krahsen, 1997. Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *System*, 25: 91-102.
24. Murray, D.M., 1980. Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning. In T.R. Donovan & B.W. McClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches to teaching composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, pp: 3-20.
25. Goby, V.P., 1997. Arguments against providing model answers in the writing skills classroom: The Singaporean case. *TESL Reporter*, 30(2): 28-33.
26. Judy, S., 1980. The experiential approach: Inner worlds to outer worlds. In T.R. Donovan & B.W. McClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches to teaching composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, pp: 37-51.
27. Collins, A. and D. Gentner, 1980. A framework for a cognitive theory of writing. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (:An interdisciplinary approach. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp: 51-72.
28. Saslow, J. and A. Ascher, 2008. *Top notch 2*. London: Longman Publication.
29. Zahedi, A., 2002. *How to prepare for the Toefl Essays*. Tehran: Zabankadeh Publication.
30. Hughes, A., 2003. *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. Watson, B.C., 1982. The Use and Abuse of Models in the ESL Writing Class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(1): 6-15.

## APPENDIXES

### Appendix A: pre-test

"what are the advantages and disadvantages of TV in our life?",

### Appendix B: post-test

" what are the advantages and disadvantages of computer in our life?".

### Appendix C :Treatment Tasks:

- [1] What are the advantages and disadvantages of being a teacher?
- [2] What are the advantages and disadvantages of recycling?
- [3] Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Telephones and email have made communication between people less personal.
- [4] Some people believe that university students should be required to attend classes. Others believe that going to classes should be optional for students. Which point of view do you agree?
- [5] Neighbors are the people who live near us. In your opinion what are the qualities of a good neighbor?
- [6] It is better for children to grow up in the countryside than in a big city. Do you agree or disagree?
- [7] In some countries, teenagers have jobs while they are still students. Do you think this is a good idea? What are the advantages and disadvantages?
- [8] If you were asked to send one thing representing your country to an international exhibition, what would you choose? Why? Use specific reasons and details to explain your choice?
- [9] Some students like classes where teachers lecture in class. Other students prefer classes where students do some of the talking. Which type of class do you prefer?
- [10] What are the advantages and disadvantages of having a pet?

### Appendix D (analytic method):

#### Grammar

6. Few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order.
5. Some errors of grammar or word order which do not, however, interfere with comprehension.
4. Errors of grammar or word order fairly frequent; occasional re-reading necessary for full comprehension.

3. Errors of grammar or word order frequent; efforts of interpretation sometimes required on reader's part.
  2. Errors of grammar or word order very frequent; reader often has to rely on own interpretation.
  1. Errors of grammar or word order so severe as to make comprehension virtually impossible.
- 

#### **Vocabulary**

6. Use of vocabulary and idioms rarely (if at all) distinguishable from that of educated native writer.
  5. Occasionally uses inappropriate terms or relies on circumlocution; expression of ideas hardly impaired.
  4. Uses wrong or inappropriate words fairly frequently; expression of ideas may be limited because of inadequate vocabulary.
  3. Limited vocabulary and frequent errors clearly hinder expression of ideas.
  2. Vocabulary so limited and so frequently misused that reader must often rely on own interpretation.
  1. Vocabulary limitations so extreme as to make comprehension virtually impossible.
- 

#### **Mechanics**

6. Few (if any) noticeable lapses in punctuation or spelling.
  5. Occasional lapses in punctuation or spelling which do not, however, interfere with comprehension.
  4. errors in punctuation or spelling fairly frequent; occasional re-reading necessary for full comprehension.
  3. Frequent errors in spelling or punctuation; lead sometimes to obscurity.
  2. Errors in spelling or punctuation so frequent that reader must often rely on own interpretation.
  1. Errors in spelling or punctuation so severe as to make comprehension virtually impossible.
- 

#### **Fluency(style and ease of communication)**

6. Choice of structures and vocabulary consistently appropriate; like that of educated native writer.
  5. Occasional lack of consistency in choice of structures and vocabulary which does not, however, impair overall ease of communication.
  4. "Patchy", with some structure or vocabulary items noticeably inappropriate to general style.
  3. Structures or vocabulary items sometimes not only inappropriate but also misused; little sense of ease of communication.
  2. Communication often impaired by completely inappropriate or misused structures or vocabulary items.
  1. A "hotch-potch" of half-learned misused structures and vocabulary items rendering communication almost impossible.
- 

#### **Form(organization)**

6. Highly organized; clear progression of ideas well linked; like educated native writer.
  5. Material well organized; links could occasionally be clearer but communication not impaired.
  4. Some lack of organization; re-reading required for clarification of ideas.
  3. Little or no attempt at connectivity, though reader can deduce some organization.
  2. Individual ideas may be clear, but very difficult to deduce connection between them.
  1. Lack of organization so severe that communication is seriously impaired.
- 

#### **Score:**

Grammar:-----+ Vocabulary:-----+ Mechanics:-----+ Fluency:-----+ Form=------(total)

Samples of writing and scoring

Pre-test: experimental group

What are the advantages and disadvantages of TV in our life?

TV is a important part of every one lives. And people spend a lot of their time in front of TV. And it have some advantage and some disadvantage and advantages and disadvantag is different for old people and children. People can take many information of TV about world and what happyning in the world and they can learning a lot of things about lives and about medical problems and a lot of things about many thing. They can have intertanment and look to movies and music and they can know about something they need and they can choose between different things of good or bad see in the TV. Some people spend more time in front of TV so they can't have more time to doing other works. And they can't will be with their family. And they can make eye problems and some behavior problems.

Total score: Grammar+ vocabulary+ mechanics+ fluency+ form= 2+3+2+2+2=11

Red underline: grammatical errors

Green underline: errors related to mechanics, form or fluency

Post-test: Experimental group

What are the advantages and disadvantages of computers in our life?

Computers and internet are a part of people lives and if people want or not they must work with them. People's lives are related to computers and without them people will have a lot of problems. Computers have some profits and some problems which affect people's lives. We should know about these and do something about it. Computers profits and problems are different for kids and adults. Computer has a lot of profits some are mentioned here:

We use computer in many offices and hospitals for doing works very fast, more carefully and save a lot of information for a long time. We use these information after a few years with an easy way. We can conduct many things (e.g. ship and plane) with computers. We can use computer for learning and connecting with other people in other places.

But computer make some problems in people's lives that people must pay attention to these problems. Some of these problems are: we spend a lot of time with computer and we will have some eye problems, overweight, mental problems and security problems about our information.

Total score: Grammar+ vocabulary+ mechanics+ fluency+ form= 4+4+4+4+4=20