

## PARAGRAPH ORGANIZATION IN THE COMPOSITIONS MADE BY IC STUDENTS

Ni'fatul Fauziyah

092084032

English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya

Email: [nifatul.fauziyah@gmail.com](mailto:nifatul.fauziyah@gmail.com)

Dosen Pembimbing:

Prof. Dr. Hj. Lies Amin Lestari, M.A., M.Pd.

English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya

### Abstrak

Program IC (*Intensive Course*) bertujuan untuk mengurangi perbedaan signifikan terhadap kemampuan siswa, khususnya dalam kemampuan menulis karena siswa seharusnya dapat menguasai seluruh aspek dalam menulis suatu karangan seperti halnya dalam tata bahasa, pemberian tanda baca, dan pengorganisasian suatu paragraph. Sayangnya, menulis suatu karangan dengan pengorganisasian suatu paragraf yang baik bisa menjadi sulit dikarenakan adanya perbedaan gaya penulisan yang berbeda dari gaya penulisan dalam bahasa pertama mereka. Dikarenakan adanya masalah tersebut, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu apakah para siswa dapat mengorganisasi paragraf dalam karangan mereka dengan lebih baik setelah mengikuti program IC 2012. Dengan mengadakan penelitian deskriptif kuantitatif dan dokumenter, dokumen karangan siswa dalam *pre-* dan *post-test* IC pun dianalisa. Terdapat pula sebuah rubrik (diadaptasi dari Myers, 1980: 55) yang digunakan untuk menganalisa hasil karangan siswa ke dalam tiga kategori yakni *excellent*, *good*, dan *poor*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa sebagian besar siswa IC memiliki pengorganisasian paragraf yang jauh lebih baik di dalam karangan *post-test* mereka.

**Kata Kunci:** IC (*Intensive Course*) 2012 UNESA, Karangan Siswa, and Pengorganisasian Paragraf.

### Abstract

IC (*Intensive Course*) program was aimed to reduce the significance difference in the students' proficiency, especially in writing because they should master all aspects in writing such as grammar, punctuation, and organization. Somehow, writing in a good organization would be difficult because of the students' rhetoric style too that is different from that of their first language. Due to this problem, this study was aimed to investigate whether the students organize their paragraphs *better* after joining the IC 2012 program. By conducting a descriptive quantitative and documentary research, the documents of the students' *pre-* and *post-test* compositions were analyzed. A rubric (adapted from Myers, 1980: 55) was also used to examine the students' paragraph organization into three categories; *excellent*, *good*, and *poor*. Having analyzed the paragraph organization, the result showed that most of the students have *better* compositions in *post-test*.

**Keywords:** IC (*Intensive Course*) 2012 UNESA, Students' Compositions, and Paragraph Organization.

### INTRODUCTION

English is a language that is widely used in all over the world. Harmer (2007:13) also stated that by the end of the twentieth century, English was already well on its way to be a language used widely for communication between people who did not share the same first or second language. The demand of understanding English is increasing as well as the interest of learning this language. For education field in Indonesia; for instance, due to the importance of understanding English, English then is made as the compulsory subject that must be

mastered by all of the students from elementary to university.

For being English teachers; a student must enter a specialized university for a specialized department. State University of Surabaya (UNESA) is one of the universities where future teachers are educated. English is a language that is widely used in all over the world. Harmer (2007:13) also stated that by the end of the twentieth century, English was already well on its way to be a language used widely for communication between people who did not share the same first or second language. The demand of understanding English is

increasing as well as the interest of learning this language. For education field in Indonesia; for instance, due to the importance of understanding English, English then is made as the compulsory subject that must be mastered by all of the students from elementary to university. English teachers are also needed to teach this language properly in all level of schools.

UNESA (State University of Surabaya) is one of the universities where the future English teachers are educated. The process of admission program in entering the English Department is not easy. There are many students who compete to join the department and there are also some requirements that should be fulfilled. One of the requirements is to join an English test right before they enter the department. A student must pass the minimum score of the test because the score of the test then could reflect the students' English proficiency.

As soon as the students enter the department, they will join the Intensive Course (IC) program. Through this program, it is hoped that the students' English proficiency will increase from elementary level when they enter the department into intermediate level after they join the IC program. The increase of the students' proficiency in English is also very important because by having better English proficiency, all students then could follow the other courses easily.

Djiwandono in Cahyono (2002:23) then stated that the purpose of the Intensive Course (IC) was to improve the students' fluency in English, supported by some materials of some basic aspects of language skills and components. This was also supported by one of the lecturers in English Department of State University of Surabaya who stated that IC program was very important because through this program, the university could determine the proficiency of their students who have just entered the university. The proficiency then could be seen from the ability in the language skills; listening, speaking, reading, or writing till the language components.

Related to the writing skill, the students were not trained to produce a good composition when they were in the senior high school. The students were asked to produce a composition but the students tended to worry and focus on the grammar or vocabulary in their compositions (Llach, 2011: 45). They did not realize that writing in a good organization was important. Then, in the university, the students are supposed to be taught how to write an academic writing. Grammar and vocabulary are important but having no coherence in their composition will be all useless. The students should be concentrated more on how to organize their ideas in writing. Therefore, as English Department students, they

should be introduced to the way English people organize their ideas in a composition.

Problems will arise because the way English people and Indonesian people organize their ideas are different. English people have "linear writing; begins with a topic statement, followed by a series of subdivisions of that topic statement" but Asian people; includes Indonesian people tend to write in "circular writing; delays expression of the purpose of the text and gradually develop the thesis" (Kaplan, 1966, Duszak, 1994 and Čmejrková, 1996 in Wu, 2006:14). Linear writing is considered better than the circular writing because linear writing will make the readers catch the content of the composition easily. Furthermore, Hinds (Rashidi & Dastkhezr, 2009:34) stated that English used a writer-responsible rhetoric (it was the duty of the writer to make his/her text clear to the reader). Good organization in a composition is also considered important because organization is a part of five features of effective writing includes focus; support and elaboration; style; and conventions which will be a valuable tool for the writing understanding. Writing organization deals with a progression, relatedness, and completeness of ideas. The organization is formed through the effective introduction, body, and conclusion (Cali & Bowen, 2003:2). Therefore, teaching how to organize the students' ideas in making a composition in linear way should be done as soon as they enter the university.

When the students are able to write in a good organization, they will also be able to join the other lectures easily. This is also in line with the philosophy of language learning that was stated by the coordinator of IC 2012, who said that writing skill was very important because a student's writing ability would also reflect his/her other abilities. When someone could write well, he/she could also have good ability in speaking, listening, and reading.

Still, a deep evaluation through this IC is needed. Do the students organize their paragraphs better after joining the IC 2012 program? Therefore a study on the paragraph organization of the students' compositions in Intensive Course (IC) 2012 UNESA is needed to be done. The focus is on the result whether the students organize their paragraphs better after joining the IC 2012 program.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This study was an ex-post-facto study. An ex-post-facto study deals with a study that compares one thing and another without giving a specific treatment for the subject because the treatment comes naturally (Ary et al., 2010:331—332). In this case, IC program was given for all subjects without giving specific treatment. Therefore,

the result of the students' paragraph organization came naturally right after the students joined the program. This study was also a descriptive quantitative study because this study described the students' paragraph organization by using numbers. Quantitative study uses objective measurement to gather numeric data that are used to answer questions (Ary et al., 2010:22). In analyzing the data, numbers were used in determining the comparison of the total students in each category (*poor*, *good*, and *excellent*) in pre-and post-test. Besides, it was also a documentary study because this study focused on the documentation of the students' compositions.

### Subjects of the Research

The students of IC 2012 UNESA were the subjects of this study. By using simple random sampling, 24 compositions of IC 2012 students were chosen from elementary, pre-intermediate, and intermediate group. The purpose was to get a general result on the IC students' organization in their compositions prior and after they join the IC program.

### Data Collection Technique

The documents of the students' compositions were taken. The compositions were from the compositions written in pre- and post-tests of IC 2012. The pre-test of IC 2012 was held on September 2012 and the post-test of IC was held on December 2012. The students got a similar question in pre-test and post-test. During the tests, the students were assigned to write a short essay of approximately 200 words to describe the students themselves, their English ability, and their expectation on their being accepted as a student in English Department. The students were given thirty minutes to write the composition. After the lecturers assessed the students' compositions, the original compositions were copied and analyzed for this study.

### Data Analysis Technique

The students' compositions were analyzed to see the quality of the students' paragraph organization. The process in analyzing the students' compositions was done through several steps. First, it was done by identifying the main idea and supporting ideas of the paragraph. Second, it was done by analyzing progressive, related, and complete ideas in the opening, body, and end of the compositions. Third, the students' paragraphs in terms of paragraph organization were categorized into *excellent*, *good*, or *poor* based on the rubric that was adapted from Myers, 1980: 55. After that, to see the students' progress in organizing paragraph, the result of the students' compositions was classified into nine groups; *poor to poor*, *poor to good*, *poor to excellent*, *good to poor*, *good to good*, *good to excellent*, *excellent to excellent*, *excellent to good*, and *excellent to poor*. The classification was based on the quality of the students' paragraph

organization in pre-test and post-test. Afterwards, to see the progress in each category, the classification was divided into three groups; better, similar, and worse. The better paragraph is for the paragraphs that are *poor to good*, *poor to excellent*, and *good to excellent*. Similar are for *poor to poor*, *good to good*, and *excellent to excellent*. For worse, the classification was for the paragraphs which are *good to poor*, *excellent to good*, and *excellent to poor*.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

Based on the analysis of the students' compositions, it was revealed that thirteen students in pre-test and sixteen students in post-test described the question prompt (describing the student himself, his English ability, and his own plans for his study at English Department) into one paragraph. Seven students tried to describe the question prompt into three paragraphs in pre-test. Three students also described the question prompt into three paragraphs in post-test. The rest of the students described the question prompt into two, four, and six paragraphs. The data was also presented in the following table.

Table 1. Number of Paragraphs in The Students' Compositions

Number of Paragraphs	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	13 Students	16 Students
2	1 Student	3 Students
3	7 Students	3 Students
4	2 Students	1 Student
6	1 Student	0 Student

As presented in Table 2, all students wrote the opening sentence but only one student wrote the main idea of the paragraph in pre- and post-test compositions. All students also wrote the closing sentence in their pre- and post-test compositions. The students had better transition signals, progressive ideas, and related ideas inside their post-test compositions. Somehow, none of the students write the closing and complete ideas in the post-test compositions.

Table 2. Paragraph Organization in The Students' Compositions

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Opening Sentence	24	24
Main Idea	1	1
Transition Signals	5	7
Conjunction	24	24
Progressive Ideas	18	22
Related Ideas	18	23
Complete Ideas	2	0
Closing	20	21
Conclusion	1	0

In table 3, the result also revealed that nine compositions were categorized into *poor*, ten compositions were categorized into *good*, and five



compositions were categorized into *excellent* in the pre-test. Somehow, in the analysis of the students' compositions in post-test, the result revealed significance differences. There were only two compositions categorized into *poor*, sixteen compositions were *good*, and the other six compositions were *excellent*.

Table 3. Quality of the Students' Paragraph Organization

Paragraph quality in Pre-Test			Paragraph quality in Post-Test		
Poor	Good	Excellent	Poor	Good	Excellent
9	10	5	2	16	6

After joining the Intensive Course Program in UNESA, the result showed that the students' compositions in post-test were better than in the pre-test. The data showed that eleven students had better quality in their compositions. They were from Poor to Good (six students), Poor to Excellent (two students), and Good to Excellent (three students). For the others, eight students had similar quality and five students had worse quality in their compositions. The data was also presented in the following table.

Table 4. Development of the Students' Paragraph Organization Quality

<b>Better</b>	
Poor to Good	6
Poor to Excellent	2
Good to Excellent	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Similar</b>	
Poor to Poor	1
Good to Good	6
Excellent to Excellent	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Worse</b>	
Good to Poor	1
Excellent to Good	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>

#### Better Quality in the Students' Paragraph

In pre-test, some students seemed to have difficulties in stating the main idea of the paragraph and finding appropriate transition signals or conjunction to make more progressive, related, sequential, and complete ideas. But, the quality of the students' compositions in post-test was better. The students stated the main idea and used appropriate conjunction. These compositions were written by Student 1 (C), Student 2 (E), Student 3 (C), Student 4 (E), Student 5 (E), Student 7 (D), Student 8 (E), Student 10 (A), Student 13 (C), Student 17 (F), and Student 19 (B). One example of a better composition was written by Student 4. She was from IC-E. In her pre-test, she did not state the main idea of her paragraph. She mentioned the description of herself and her family in the first three-sentences. She used some inappropriate

conjunction of "*and*" and "*because*" in some sentences. She also wrote an unrelated sentence in one of the sentences. Furthermore, she often did not use any transition signals. However, main idea of a paragraph could be found in the first sentence in her post-test composition. She also used excellent sequence in telling the ideas by using appropriate conjunction such as first, second, and third in her paragraph. She also provided explanation for each idea clearly. Therefore, she had better quality in her compositions.

#### Similar Quality in the Students' Paragraph

The data showed that eight students still had similar quality in their compositions in both pre-test and post-test. The compositions were written by Student 9 (A), Student 11 (A), Student 12 (C), Student 14 (A), Student 16 (A), Student 20 (F), Student 21 (B), and Student 23 (F). The compositions did not show any improvement in the quality of the paragraph organization. The example of similar quality of the students' paragraph was written by Student 20. She was from IC-F. In her pre-test composition, she did not write enough sentences to explain the ideas. She should be able to write more explanation in her composition. The example was when she wrote her current education then she jumped into her English ability. There should be more explanation in those ideas. Furthermore, she also did not use transition signals to connect those ideas. The problems of less explanation, unrelated sentences, and no transition signals were also still found in her post-test composition. She did not use conjunction to explain her ideas too. As a conclusion, the quality of the composition in pre- and post-test was still similar.

#### Worse Quality in the Students' Paragraph

Some of the students wrote compositions of worse quality in the post-test if they were compared to the ones produced in the pre-test. The compositions were written by Student 6 (D), Student 15 (A), Student 18 (B), Student 22 (F), and Student 24 (F). The example of compositions was written by Student 22. In her pre-test composition, she did not state the main idea of the paragraph. She started her composition using opening paragraph of introducing herself but not the main idea of the paragraph. She wrote many ideas with many explanations. She could write in a good sequence too by using some transition signals. But, these could not be found in her post-test. In her post-test composition, the sentences were not progressive, related, and complete. When she wrote the description of herself, for example, she did not use progressive and related ideas in the composition. She started describing her personality, then her physical appearance, then her personality, and her physical appearance again. Furthermore, she rarely used logical sequence of ideas. These could be found in her second paragraph of the post-test composition. She repeated the same ideas but ended her paragraph with the idea that was not explained in the previous sentence.

## Discussion

Based on the analysis of the students' compositions, the result reveals that the quality of the students' paragraph organization in post-test is mainly better than in pre-test. Some students have better quality because of some factors; IC handouts and the lecturers. The factors then are discussed as follows.

In order for teaching and learning process to be successful, teachers need to access to (and knowledge of) a wide range of materials, from course books and videos to magazines, novels, encyclopedias, publicity brochures, and the Internet. Course books, for instance, are very important for the students because they provide material which students can look back at for the revision, at their best, their visual and topic appeal can have a powerfully engaging effect (Harmer, 2007: 181—182). Students of IC Program 2012 also had enough materials of descriptive texts inside their IC handouts. There were twelve descriptive texts inside their handouts. The texts were presented in the *reading* section. The texts could be found in **Interchange Intro**, **Interchange 1**, **Interchange 2**, **Interchange 3**, and **Interchange Passage**.

The students of IC got enough materials of descriptive texts in their handouts. Twelve descriptive texts, four materials about *topic sentence*, and seven materials about conjunction give enough exposure of the understanding about the text itself. This is related to the reading writing connection. Olness (2005: 1) states that by reading literature often and widely, students more readily learn to write. By reading more descriptive texts, the students will get more experience and more exercise about the text. As a result, in the end of the IC program, the students will get more understanding about descriptive text and will be able to write a better descriptive text.

In the process of writing, teachers have a big role to teach how to write effectively. The process of teaching will not be easy especially for the students who just study and start writing a long paragraph. Black and William (Harmer, 2007: 137) found that feedback on students' work had probably had more effect on achievement than any other single factor. Furthermore, Harmer (2007:331) stated that teacher had a role as a feedback provider on writing tasks which demanded special care. Therefore, teachers should give feedback for every written product that has been created in every writing process. In the other words, students who have better quality in their compositions may have lecturers who often give feedback on their writing assessment.

Giving regular and continuous feedback was also done by some lecturers. In IC-B, for instance, TK also gave continuous feedback to the students' writing assignment. The feedback was also not merely about the grammar error, but also about words choice, coherence, organization, and so on. Somehow, one of the lecturers in IC-F did not give a deep feedback to the students' writing assignment. She did not give a high standard for her students' writing. As long as the students did the assignments, it would be enough for her. As a result, the

quality of the students' compositions in those classes would be different. In IC-B, the students' writing ability was *better* and *similar* but in IC-F, besides in *better* and *similar*, there were still some students who were in *worse*.

Those factors may give positive effects for some students but these factors may also give less effect for the other students. IC handouts provide enough materials of descriptive text for the students. But, not all students can understand the material by themselves without the help of their lecturers. Not all lecturers can give continuous feedback to the students' assignment too. Therefore, some students may have similar or worse quality in their post-test compositions.

As an addition, the result showed that the students still had some problems related to the paragraph organization. They tended to describe the question prompt of the pre- and post-test (describing the student himself, his English ability, and his own plans for his study at English Department) into one paragraph. Very few of them who tried to describe the question prompt into three paragraphs. They seemed to have difficulties in stating the main idea of the paragraph and finding appropriate transition signals or conjunction to make more progressive, related, sequential, and complete ideas.

The students might describe the question prompt into one paragraph because they felt the disturbances and did not have enough time to do the mental act. In the literature review, Nunan (Handayani, 2009:8) stated that writing was an activity that consisted of both mental and physical acts. Writing was a mental act. It was a mental act because of its process in gathering ideas, using the ideas, and organizing the ideas appropriately in a good sentence, paragraph, or even an essay which was readable. Writing was a physical act too because of its process in expressing ideas through words or hieroglyphics which were jotted down onto a piece of paper. In the other words, a process to make a piece of writing would determine the quality of the writing itself. In a process of writing a composition in a test such as pre- and post-test, the writers; in this case was the students of IC, could not have enough time to do the mental act. Some students would directly write what they had in their mind due to the limited time of writing; 30 minutes only.

The process of making a single paragraph can be so complicated compared to the final result that is only a single paragraph. Some writers need more time, special moment, and special place when they start writing. A single disturbance that comes from a sound of a small animal sometimes can destruct a writer's idea in writing the paragraph too moreover, in a test that will also determine the score of the students. (Brown, 2007: 391).

The students also seemed to have difficulties in stating the main idea of the paragraph. Since the students only had thirty minutes to write a piece of writing, in a piece of paper, they seemed to miss one of the writing procedures; thinking, drafting, and revising. In addition, the procedures are really important for all writers. When the writers make a written product, it will be valuable for the writer because it comes from the result of thinking,



drafting, and revising procedures that requires skill through certain process. (Brown, 2007: 391). Writing a composition in a test may lead the students to miss the process of revising. They will focus on the process of thinking and drafting so that the students may miss the importance of stating the main idea of the paragraph.

Finding appropriate transition signals or conjunction to make more progressive, related, sequential, and complete ideas were difficult for some students. This might happen because of the various considerations in determining the most and the least important writing components. According to Brown (2007: 413), writing has 6 components that need to be assessed. There are content (thesis statement; related ideas; development of ideas through personal experience, illustration, facts, opinions; use of description, cause/effect, comparison/contrast; and consistent focus), organization (effectiveness of introduction, logical sequence of ideas, conclusion, and appropriate length), discourse (topic sentences, paragraph unity, transitions, discourse makers, cohesion, rhetorical conventions, reference, fluency, economy, and variation), syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics (spelling, punctuation, citation of reference, neatness, and appearance).

Some components are considered more or less important than the other. Some writers may say that content is the most important component but some other writers may say that discourse is the most important component of all. As a result, there is no fix scale to put the most till the least important written component. This may also cause the various considerations in determining the most and the least important writing components. When some writers tend to pay attention on the mechanics, grammar, or vocabulary, they will only focus on their composition whether it has good mechanics, grammar, or vocabulary or not. (Llach, 2011: 45). As a result, the students may miss the least important component such as organization.

Repeated ideas in different sentence in the same paragraph were also found in the students' compositions. This may happen because the way English people and Indonesian people organize their ideas are different. English people has "linear writing; began with a topic statement, followed by a series of subdivisions of that topic statement" but Asian people; included Indonesian people tend to write in "circular writing; delay expression of the purpose of the text and gradually develop the thesis". (Kaplan, 1966, Duszak, 1994 and Čmejrková, 1996 in Wu, 2006:14). Many students who start to write do not know how to organize their ideas in a paragraph too. They think that writing their ideas in a list: 1, 2, and so on is considered as organizing their ideas (Myers, 1980:17).

Rashidi & Dastkheyr (2009) also conducted a study on the comparison of English and Persian organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Iranian EFL students due to the importance of organization in writing itself. As a result, there was not much difference found in organizational patterns between L1 and L2 argumentative writing. The students showed their preference for the initial positioning of their main idea, deductive type

organization, and to a lesser extent the presence of a summary statement for both L1 and L2 writing. In some cases, however, there were differences between L1 and L2 texts in terms of the use of general or neutral information as well as the location of main ideas. As a conclusion, the students of IC were quite similar to Persian students. They might have the difficulties because of they tended to write in "circular writing"; delayed expression of the purpose of the text which might cause the redundancy. These are the problems that may be faced by the students in their paragraph organization.

## CONCLUSION

### Conclusion

In pre-test, thirteen students organize their paragraph by describing the question prompt (describing the student himself, his English ability, and his own plans for his study at English Department) into one paragraph. There are seven students describe the question prompt into three paragraphs in pre-test. Three students also describe the question prompt into three paragraphs in post-test. The rest of the students describe the question prompt into two, four, and six paragraphs. They seem to have difficulties in stating the main idea of the paragraph and finding appropriate transition signals or conjunction to make more progressive, related, sequential, and complete ideas. There are sixteen students describe the question prompt into one paragraph in post-test too, but some students do not forget to state the main idea and use appropriate transition signals or conjunction. The quality of the students' compositions is better. It happens because IC Program provides selective handouts and two responsible lecturers in every class for a better teaching and learning process.

In general, the result shows that the students have *better* compositions in post-test. Somehow, some students still produce compositions of *similar* and *worse* quality due to the materials in IC handouts and different treatment given by lecturers responsible in each class. There are twelve descriptive texts, four materials about *topic sentence*, and seven materials about *conjunction* in the handout. This will give enough exposure for the students in understanding the organization of a text. Somehow, some students still need more explanation from their lecturers to get more understanding. Lecturers who often give regular and continuous feedback to the students' writing assignment will also give more experiences and practices for the students compared to the lecturers who do not give regular and continuous feedback.

## REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. K. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed.). USA: Wadsworth.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2007). *TEACHING by PRINCIPLES: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Cahyono, B. Y. (2002). How English Intensive Course Program Affects the English Proficiency of Students of Teachers' Colleges in Indonesia. Taken from <http://puslit.petra.ac.id/journals/letters/> , 4(1), 23—35.

Cali, Kathleen. & Bowen, Kimberly. (2003). *The Five Features Of Effective Writing* (pdf). North Carolina: LEARN NC. Taken from <http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pdf/the-five-features-of-effective-e65.pdf> on March 2013.

Handayani, Nurdityati. (2009). *Unity In The Freshmen's Pre-Test Expository Writing In IC Program of Surabaya State University*. Unpublished Thesis, UNESA, Surabaya.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). England: Pearson Education Limited.

Llach, M. P. A. (2011). *Lexical Errors and Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing*. Great Britain: MPG Books Group.

Myers, Miles. (1980). *A Procedure for Writing Assessment and Holistic Scoring* (pdf). Illinois: ERIC. Taken from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED193676.pdf> on March 2013.

Olness, R. (2005). *Using literature to enhance writing instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Rashidi, N. & Dastkheyr, Z. A. (2009). A Comparison of English and Persian Organizational Patterns in the Argumentative Writing of Iranian EFL Students (pdf). Retrieved March 9, 2013 from <http://ebookbrowse.com/gdoc.php?id=370176946&url=a3371a5fa204cb5c20ca2dc060e56f29>.

Wu, Haisheng. (2006). A Comparative Journalism Study of Different Writing Patterns across Cultures: from the Perspective of Comparative Rhetoric (pdf). Retrieved March 9, 2013 from <http://ebookbrowse.com/gdoc.php?id=370176946&url=a3371a5fa204cb5c20ca2dc060e56f9>