Journal of Education and Practice
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.9, No.31, 2018

Effectiveness of Data Driven Instructional Methodology for Formative Assessment of English Writing Composition Skills – A Case Study

Summaira Sarfraz*
Department of Sciences & Humanities, National University Of Computer and Emerging Sciences Lahore, Pakistan

Nayab Mufti Zohaib
Department of Sciences & Humanities, National University Of Computer and Emerging Sciences Lahore, Pakistan

Abstract
The application of Data Driven Instructional Methodology (DDIM) in English language classrooms for teaching English to non-native speakers is currently alleged to be a fairly useful way of teaching English language (Dunn, 2013). This study explored the performance of students associated with data instructional methodology, implementation of DDIM in English classes, and its benefits for the learners in Pakistan. It is a classroom based study, investigating different instruction to second language learners based on their performance in selected activities. A sample of 50 undergraduate students is taken to teach English writing skills through formative assessments. Activities on paragraph writing and article reading and writing are included in formative assessments to analyze the improvement of students' in English writing skills. A diagnostic test is taken from students in their first lecture of English course to analyze students' writing skills in terms of four components: grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary and spellings to develop data driven learning corpora of students for DDIM. Paired t-test is used to analyze the results from formative assessments. The study indicated positive relation of DDIM with enhanced learning of students in sentence structure, grammar and vocabulary. It further highlighted the need of defined criteria to evaluate English writing skills of non-native speakers.
Keywords: Non-native learners, Data Driven, Instructional Methodology, Formative Assessment

1. Introduction

For a non-native speaker of English language, it is difficult to convey feelings and emotions in English language (EL), likewise such speaker cannot even write and read as per requirements due to lack of linguistic competency (Chomsky,1987). When non-native speaker studies English as course in their degree program, he faces resistance in learning due to several reasons- low motivation, traditional teaching methodology, mandatory to pass. As a consequence, English teachers face problems in their English teaching courses in terms of student's response to language learning at graduation level (Briggs, 2014). This triggers the need to delve methodology, to take non-native English speakers out from a predicament of second language learning and also extricate teachers of their dilemma to slow language learning. Various researches have been conducted such as on Iranian, Malaysian non-native English speakers but in Pakistani context, this area is not focused yet. For many years, teachers are trying hard to make improvements in the writing skills of Pakistani students. That concluded their weaknesses in terms of weak grammatical knowledge and cohesiveness in writing composition (Sarfraz, 2010). But results are not passable. Writing skills are most problematic area for ESL learners (Fareed, et al., 2016). "A text of an effective ESL writer must be cohesive, logical, clearly structured, interesting and properly organized with a wide range of vocabulary and mastery of conventions in mechanics" (Hall, 1988).

Data driven learning is an old idea proposed by John (1986) and Data driven instructional methodology (DDIM) is a sequel that was proposed to incorporate teachers experience, pedagogy, and curriculum with needs of students in learning English (Foreign language). First important consideration in this research is the role of data driven instructional methodology for language learning and its usability for teachers. Activity based teaching is opted to assess most suited course design for DDIM. In activity based reinforcement of learning English, students were given different activities focusing on selected four components to assess their performance. DDIM can be very useful in language pedagogy but unfortunately due to less research conducted about usefulness of DDIM in language teaching, majority of educational settings and teachers are not familiar with this technique (Fotovatnia, 2012) and in Pakistan, its practice is a big question mark.

In this study, data driven instructional methodology along with formative assessments is used in English language labs for two different batches enrolled in first semester of undergraduate Computer Science studies, to evaluate its effectiveness in bringing improvements in English language skills of ESL learners in Pakistan. In the Pakistani context, the basic knowledge of the vocabulary in English language is not sufficient unless it is combined with grammatical and structurally correct sentence formation used to convey intended meaning

through a particular text.

1.2Problem Statement in the context of Pakistani ESL learners

The use of corpora in language classrooms has proven to be an effective tool in teaching vocabulary, grammar and language use to learners of English as a second/foreign language. However, many EFL teachers find difficult to integrate corpus-based activities in their classrooms (Saeed & Waly, 2009). They face a challenge of making a choice about the relevancy of the corpus to the needs of present students. DDIM used the data of students that are present in the class and use the same data to bring improvement in their own learning.

1.3Objective of the Study

- To determine the effectiveness of DDIM for the improvement of English Writing Composition skills of English second language learners (ESL) in Pakistan.

1.4 Literature Review

ESL learners face various problems in English language learning. These problems can be categorized into linguistic, pedagogical psychological and cognitive categories (Haider, 2012). Students' writing ability can be enhanced through development of their interest, motivation and enjoyment for writing (Graham & Perin, 2007). Likewise, some metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective strategies can also enable the students to know and practically exercise the writing process (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Furthermore, the teachers can change or adapt the pedagogic approaches and can design tasks specific to the needs of students that could motivate students by giving them liberty of choosing topics of their interest (Pineteh, 2013). It will reshape their writing patterns and gave the “writer control over the expression of linguistic and domain-specific knowledge” (Kellogg & Raulerson, 2007). Data Driven Learning (DDIM) was first introduced by Johns (Higgins & Johns 1984). Johns initial focus was on language teaching in his publications (Johns & Davies, 1983). Later he introduced the idea of teaching language by collecting data of students and using them for their language learning. DDIM worked on the idea of data collection for language learning. It can be a corpus of data available online and also the data gathered from learners. Students can refer corpora to construct their own "learner dictionaries" of academic lexical items (Cobb, 1999), thus available corpora is the suitable option for teachers to engage students in learning vocabulary. Moreover “students can also analyze predetermined concordance lines to deduce usage patterns of grammatical components” (Hadley, 2002) and students search a corpus to correct instructor-designated systematic errors in their writing (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004) and students can also get aid in grammatical patterns and rules from a corpus (Vannestål& Lindquist,2007). Online corpus is available that helps a lot in the language learning and it is also compatible with existing practices of language teachers. (Tyne, 2012). Data Driven Instructional Methodology (DDIM) is a precise and systematic approach that relies on data-driven learning, characterized by “autonomic learning”, “authentic language input”, “self-discovery…” (Zhen ,2005). More and more corpus-based empirical studies have been carried out in EFL contexts and yet data-driven learning (DDIM) has not been integrated into mainstream teaching practices. (Rapti, 2013). Corpus research has highlighted the potential of corpora and data-driven learning (Johns & King 1991: iii) for language pedagogy. Application of DDIM has been found a fairly useful way in English language class rooms for teaching English to non-native speakers (Dunn, 2013). The absence of corpora from the EFL environment is attributed to a number of reasons such as lack of teacher training and limited number of corpus-based classroom materials (Rapti, 2013) Formative assessment and computer-managed instruction have historically involved the use of student performance data to guide what happens next in the instructional sequence (Morrison, Kemp, & Ross, 2001). Erikson (2007) described the effective use of formative assessment that “requires that the teacher develop systematic ways of paying close attention to the particular understandings of particular students (p. 192).” According to Xue-hua (2013), DDIM is beneficial for vocabulary acquisition.It is further linked with corpus linguistic, where learner can access large corpus online to learn language. According to Chambers and O’Sullivan (2004)(2006), DDIM is useful for the acquisition of lexical grammatical patterns. The result of the study showed that the learners ‘performance was different in different situations and attitudes were also varied; although, overall improvement was positive in the performance of students. Even though, many researches have been conducted on DDIM and online available corpora and its application in language teaching, but its application in Pakistan is limited due to less use of computers in language classrooms (Montazeri, 2013). Moreover, the available data should meet the learning needs of students. The teacher should be the one to determine the significance of SLA constructs and findings for teaching, instead of SLA researcher (Ellis, 2007). Thus DDIM can give this opportunity to teachers to design assessment designed from the own data of students. “Teachers need opportunities to become researchers in their own classroom as well as consumers of SLA research (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). The study focused on application of data driven learning from collecting written data of the Pakistani learners in the language classrooms instead of online corpora and using that data for the formative assessments to track performance of students in the results.

2.Methodology

This study has followed mixed approach by conducting quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data was collected from formative assessments and qualitative data was gathered from the responses of participants in the focus group discussions.

2.1 Participants and Sample Size

The sample size selected for the study was 50 undergraduate students from Computer Sciences discipline were purposely selected because had already taken pre-requisite English Language Proficiency course in the first semester and registered in English Writing Composition course that is offered in the 2nd semester of a four year Computer Science Degree program. All the students in Computer Sciences program were offered two core English courses in first and second semester to develop basic skills in English reading, writing, speaking and listening in their first semester in Reading and writing proficiency course whereas formal writing skills are focused in Writing composition course, offered in second semester.

2.2 Instrument

The instrument of the study is paragraph writing, evaluated based on four categories: Grammar, Sentence Structure, Vocabulary and Spellings. The diagnostic test was taken in the first lecture to identify common errors in texts of students. Students were given practice for their writing skills through formative assessments designed by data driven instructional methodology (DDIM). Results of formative assessment were tracked through bar charts. Quantitative data was collected from pre and post formative assessment. Results were analyzed with descriptive frequencies and paired t-test for each variable.

2.3 Data collection Procedure

The diagnostic test was conducted in first lecture to identify common errors of undergraduates in their written texts. Though errors were considered a sin in the past, now the linguists stress the importance of learners' errors. These errors are helpful to teachers, researchers, and learners themselves (Corder 1967). Four areas were identified; grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary and spellings. "Tenses and spellings are usually the most problematic area of the learners at graduation level in Pakistan". (Ijaz,et.al, 2014) . (See Appendix A)

Students were asked to write a paragraph on 'gender discrimination' of 80-100 words.

2.3.1 Formative assessments

6 formative assessments were designed and assessed based on data of each activity to get results on the performance of students. The role of teacher was facilitator and evaluator while giving full autonomy to learners on their pace of learning. Learners were also given access to computers to get help for assigned activity in English language labs.

Post formative assessment:

Students were asked to write a paragraph on Importance of education to compare pretest and posttest results. Pretest and posttest were kept same and evaluated on same rubric to maintain validity. (Campbell and Stanley, 1963)

3.Results

The results showed improvement in writing skills based on four selected components. Results of the study showed that with the application of DDIM performance of students improved in the writing skills of students by focusing on individual needs of students. It also helped in designing of formative assessments that were effective in getting the desired response. It is based on the notion that one strategy cannot fit to all students that is followed in tradition teaching methodology. Activities based on data driven instructional methodology followed by formative assessment give opportunities to students to work and learn from their mistakes.

For the evaluation of components, a rubric was followed that was adapted from NAPLAN marking guide because its related to common errors that students incur in their writings. Ranges were assigned; Grammar was given 1-4 marks, sentence structure 1-3 marks, vocabulary 1-3 marks and spellings 1-3 marks as shown in Table 1 (See Appendix A for description for marks).

Table 1 Formative Assessment Categories Marks Ranges

Grammar	1-4 marks
Sentence Structure	1-3 marks
Vocabulary	1-3 marks
Spelling	1-3 marks

Note: Rubric adapted from NAPLAN marking guide (2012) (See Appendix A for description)
Below average', 'average', 'good' ranks are given to marks distribution for interpretation of results

Table 2 Marks ranges based on rubric

	Below average	**Average**	**Good**
Grammar	1-2	2-3	3-4
Sentence structure	1-2	2-3	3
Spellings	1-2	2-3	3
Vocabulary	1-2	2-3	3

Fig 2 showed the results of activity 1. Students were asked to write a paragraph on "role of traffic police in Pakistan". All 50 paragraphs were collected and checked based on rubric (See Appendix A) Students scored below average within 1-2 range in grammar, sentence structure and vocabulary. While 91% students performed below average in vocabulary. This showed that vocabulary was the weakest among all. Students required practice in sentence structure and grammar and also in vocabulary building, that is the weakest identified area in diagnostic test. However the results of spelling were in the range of 2-3.

In activity 2, all students were given data of 50 paragraphs that they had written in their previous activity and asked to re-write by correcting their mistakes identified as per rubric by following DDIM approach. All paragraphs were collected again and checked based on the rubric. Fig 3 showed the results; 71% students scored below average in grammar, sentence structure 71%, vocabulary 80%. Although, performance in spellings, were comparatively better among all four components as also seen in diagnostic test. Based on above data, next activity was designed in which students were first given feedback by class teacher on their errors as per their marks based on defined rubric and asked to write a paragraph on "role of traffic police in Lahore" and provided with all previous written paragraphs as a data to use in the given activity. It was clearly seen in the results of figure 4, from this activity performance was slightly improved. While in activity 4 where students were asked to write a paragraph on the "protection of extinct animals in Pakistan" based on their own data, collected from previous activity; students improved in their sentence formation and grammar as well as in vocabulary as shown in fig 5. 56% students scored more than 2 in sentence structure , while 60% and 50% students scored above average in this activity. This showed that reading article and re-writing it improved their grammar and sentence structure. They made less spelling errors as well as used better vocabulary.

It was continued in next sessions and students were asked to correct their mistakes of paragraph written in last session. Moreover after correction their work was collected as a data.

Students were further asked to read an article online *The pangolin died — yes, it matters* (Talat, 2016) and asked to write a paragraph on *extinction of animals* by incorporating the information. They were given 20 paragraphs that they had written in previous session as an assembled data and asked to incorporate the data in their paragraphs. Next activity was focused on paraphrasing of the article. So that students can get exposure of grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary as well as correct spellings. The assigned article was "A not-so-funny comedy of errors at KLF's Urdu Digests session by Humair Ishtiaq" published in Blog section of Dawn news. This worked well and students performed better in all four components as shown in performance chart. After 3 weeks, it was analyzed that students are now making less errors in the four components as compared to diagnostic test. 80% students scored 3-4 in grammar and sentence structure. Thus their performance was significantly improved by following DDIM approach. They worked on their own data, corrected their own mistakes and produced better piece of work.

3.4 Pre and post formative assessment results

3.4.1 Grammar

Table 3 Diagnostic test results for the grammar component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	25	48.1	50.0	50.0
	2.00	25	48.1	50.0	100.0
	Total	50	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.8		
Total		52	100.0		

Table 4 Posttest results for the grammar component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	22	42.3	44.0	44.0
	3.00	21	40.4	42.0	86.0
	4.00	7	13.5	14.0	100.0
	Total	50	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.8		
Total		52	100.0		

Table 5 Effect of DDIM based formative assessments on grammar

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	posttest - pretest	1.20000	.67006	.09476	1.00957	1.39043	12.663	49	.000

Note: Paired Sample t test

Above table showed in pretest 48.1% students scored 2 out of 4 and in posttest 40.4% students scored 3 while 13.5% students scored 4 out of 4 in the grammar component. There was a significant difference between scores (t= 12 and $p < 0.001$) and mean difference is 1.2. Hence null hypothesis was rejected. DDIM based formative assessments have positive relation with the improvement of grammar in the texts of undergraduates.

3.4.2 Sentence structure

Table 6 Diagnostic test results for the sentence structure component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	47	90.4	94.0	94.0
	2.00	3	5.8	6.0	100.0
	Total	50	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.8		
Total		52	100.0		

Table 7 Posttest results for the sentence structure component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	3.8	4.0	4.0
	2.00	25	48.1	50.0	54.0
	3.00	17	32.7	34.0	88.0
	4.00	6	11.5	12.0	100.0
	Total	50	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.8		
Total		52	100.0		

Table 8 Effect of DDIM based formative assessments on sentence structure

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	posttest – pretest	1.48000	.83885	.11863	1.24160	1.71840	12.476	49	.000

In pretest 90% students scored 1 in sentence structure while after posttest 48% students scored 2 while 32% and 11% scored 3-4. Above results showed significant difference between scores (t= 12.4 and $p < 0.001$) and mean difference is 1.48. Hence null hypothesis was rejected. DDIM based formative assessments have strong positive relation with the improvement of sentence structure in the texts of undergraduates.

3.4.3 Vocabulary

Table 9 Diagnostic test results for the vocabulary component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	45	72.6	90.0	90.0
	2.00	5	8.1	10.0	100.0
	Total	50	80.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	19.4		
Total		62	100.0		

Table 10 Posttest results for the vocabulary component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	15	24.2	30.0	30.0
	2.00	32	51.6	64.0	94.0
	3.00	3	4.8	6.0	100.0
	Total	50	80.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	19.4		
Total		62	100.0		

Table 11 Effect of DDIM based formative assessments on vocabulary

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	posttest - pretest	2.66000	.59281	.08384	.49152	.82848	7.872	49	.000

Above table showed that 72.6% scored 1 in vocabulary pretest while in posttest 24.2% scored 1 while 51.6% scored 2. The table paired t-test showed DDIM based formative assessments have positive relation with vocabulary development. Mean difference is 2.6 as majority students started falling in 2 marks range instead of 1. But fewer students scored 3 marks. This showed improvement in vocabulary.

3.4.4 Spellings

Table 12 Diagnostic test results for the spellings component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	3	4.8	6.0	6.0
	2.00	40	64.5	80.0	86.0
	3.00	7	11.3	14.0	100.0
	Total	50	80.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	19.4		
Total		62	100.0		

Table 13 Post test results for the spellings component

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	3.2	4.0	4.0
	2.00	29	46.8	58.0	62.0
	3.00	19	30.6	38.0	100.0
	Total	50	80.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	19.4		
Total		62	100.0		

Table 14 Effect of DDIM based formative assessments on spellings

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	posttest – pretest	.26000	.48697	.06887	.12160	.39840	3.775	49	.000

Above table showed mean difference is .26. It was seen from the results that performance of students in

spellings marginally improved. They were in average range in diagnostic test and scored better in their posttest. The main difference was only .26, and frequency in good range increased from 11% to 30.6%. Ho is rejected and H_1 is accepted. DDIM based formative assessments have positive relation with the correction in spellings.

4.Discussion

The study showed sentence structure and vocabulary as weakest areas in writing skills of undergraduate students. Students were also weak in grammar; however they made fewer errors in spellings. The students were taught through formative assessments based on data driven learning Data Driven Learning (DDIM) is the teaching of language by collecting data of students from available corpora and using them for their language learning. Students can refer corpora to construct their own "learner dictionaries" of academic lexical items (Cobb, 1999), thus corpora is the suitable option for teachers to engage students in learning vocabulary. According to many researches, the major language issues in the learners' writing are usually of grammar and syntax. These errors included incorrect use of prepositions, articles, tenses, singular/plural, verbs, sentence structure, and the use of informal and spoken expressions (Haider, 2012). In the study, 48.1% students scored 2 out of 4 in grammatical component assessed as per rubric (Appendix A). The results showed improvement as in posttest 40.4% students scored 3 while 13.5% students scored 4 out of 4 in the grammar component. There was also a significant difference between scores ($t= 12$ *and* $p < 0.001$) and mean difference is 1.2. Hence null hypothesis was rejected, accepting DDIM based formative assessments have positive relation with the improvement of grammar in the texts of undergraduates. Instead of predetermined grammatical patterns, learners worked on their own incorrect grammatical structure and learned from their own data. Students search a corpus to correct instructor-designated systematic errors in their writing (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004) and students can also get aid in grammatical patterns and rules from a corpus data (Vannestål & Lindquist,2007). Vocabulary is a problem for learners as they are not aware of collocational and connotational meanings of the words. Haider (2012) also found similar problems of vocabulary in their studies. The study also highlighted vocabulary as weakest area as 72.6% scored 1 in diagnostic test for vocabulary. But the results showed improvement in students as in posttest 24.2% scored 1 while 51.6% scored 2 out of 3. The table paired t-test also showed DDIM based formative assessments have positive relation with vocabulary development. Mean difference was 2.6 as majority students started falling in 2 marks range instead of 1. But fewer students scored 3 marks. This showed that vocabulary was improved but at average level. Students in Pakistan faced difficulty with sentence structure. Being nonnative speakers they are not familiar with this component. It was seen from the results that in pretest 90% students scored 1 in sentence structure. This was lowest percentage among all the selected components. After giving them learning through formative assessments, 48% students scored 2 while 32% and 11% scored 3-4. This showed that students improved in their sentence structure by correcting their own mistakes and learning from their own data. Above results also showed significant difference between scores ($t= 12.4$ *and* $p < 0.001$) and mean difference was 1.48. Fareed et. al,., (2014) in the study also found syntactical errors in writings of ESL learners in lack of command over structure of a sentence. They wrote sentences like, "`I am going in weekend and more enjoy our family and see previous struggle.' The third highest number of errors belonged to vocabulary, for example, `Using the connection between the student and teacher, this (psychological) error from our society can evaporate'". According to (Megaiab, 2014), ESL learners commit a lot of spellings and punctuations errors as found in writing samples. However, these errors were not highlighted as a problematic in this research. Although, it was seen from the results that performance of students in spellings marginally improved as they were already in average range as seen in diagnostic test and also scored better in their posttest. The main difference was only .26, and frequency in *good range* increased from 11% to 30.6%. It presented contradiction with many researches as English spelling has always been labeled by many language researchers and teachers as an intimidating task especially for English Second Language learners, Arab ESL learners commit many errors when they spell out English words (Al-Sobhi,et.al,2017). Diagnostic test and posttest showed comparatively better performance in spellings of ESL undergraduate in Pakistan. It showed that formative assessments followed by DDIM helped in reduction of spelling errors.

5.Conclusion

From the study, it is concluded that DDIM is Effective for Formative Assessment of English Writing Composition Skills and not only encourages autonomic but directed learning (through feedback by formative assessment). Data-driven teaching and learning provided learners with rich authentic learning language data from real communicative activities. It enabled learners' to explore and use language knowledge based on corpus according to their own needs. Moreover, Formative assessment based feedback can 'close the gap' between current and desired performance (Stobart, 2003).The development of formative assessments based on DDIM was also helpful for teaching as it provided ease to teachers for using corpora specifically focusing on needs of the learners as the decreased use of corpora from the EFL environment is attributed to the reasons such as lack of teacher training and limited number of corpus-based classroom materials (Rapti, 2013).

Data driven instructional methodology is effective in catering language needs of non-native students. The discussed results showed the usefulness of DDIM for English teaching. Specifically in Pakistan, this technique can bring improvement in English writing as well as reading skills of non-native speakers. This research not only showed improvement in grammar and sentence structure but also vocabulary and spellings. All students are not same as of their capability to learn second language. It is thus recommended to design lesson plans as per individual needs of students to improve English writing skills. This further highlighted the role of teacher in implementation of Data Driven instructional methodology in class. Teacher should have keen motivation to understand learning needs and weak areas of students and thus designing course activities accordingly.

References

Allwright, R. L. (1984). Why Don't learners learn what teachers teach?-The interaction hypothesis. *Language learning in formal and informal contexts* , 3-18.

Al Saeed, Neveen and Salma Waly. 2009. Corpus for Classrooms: Ideas for Material Design. *Proceedings of the 10th METU ELT Convention. Accessed November 24, 2014.* http://www.dbe.metu.edu.tr/convention/proceedingsweb/Corpus.pdf

An Xue-hua, X. M.-y. (2013). An Empirical Research on DDIM in L2 Writing. *US-China Education Review, 3* (9), 693-701.

Bandar Al-Sobhi, Sabariah Md Rashid, Ain Nadzimah Abdullah. (2018). Arab ESL Secondary School Students' Attitude Toward English Spelling and Writing *SAGE Open* 8(1).

Ellis, P. R. (2005). Instructed Second Language Acquisition A Literature Review. *AUCKLAND UNISERVICES LIMITED* .

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next-effective strategies to improve writing
of adolescents in miDDIMe and high schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 94* (2),169-181.

Haider, G. (2012). An insight into difficulties faced by Pakistani student writers: Implications for teaching of writing. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 2* (3).

Fotovatnia, T. T. (2012). Data-driven learning:A student centered technique for language learning. *Theory and practice in language studies, 2* (7), 1526-1531.

Fareed, Muhammad & Ashraf, Almas & Bilal, Muhammad. (2016). ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences. 4*. 81-92. 10.20547/jess0421604201.

Hall, D. (1988). Writing well. Little, Brown and Company, Boston.

Kellogg, R. T., & Raulerson, B. A. (2007). Improving the writing skills of college students. *Psychonomic bulletin & review, 14* (2), 237-242.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom.

Pineteh, E. A. (2013). The academic writing challenges of undergraduate students: A South African case study. *International Journal of Higher Education, 3* (1), 12.

Petchprasert, A. (2012). Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning. *US-China Foreign Language, 10* (4).

Tyne, H. (2012). Corpus work with ordinary teachers: Data-driven learning activities: Input,Process and Product:. *Developments in Teaching and Language Corpora* , 114-129.

Y Paul Sussman. (n.d.). Acquisition outcomes in data driven learning: A review of classroom research.

Appendix A:
Evaluation criteria
Research parameters- Grammar, Sentence structure, Vocabulary, spelling
Improvement →

		1	2	3	4
Grammar	Marks Descriptors	Makes many grammatical errors that negatively affect communication, or doesn't/can't respond	Uses a range of grammatical structures, but may make several grammatical errors that interfere with communication.	Demonstrates good use of grammatical structures. Makes no grammatical errors, or a few minor grammatical errors that do not interfere with communication	Demonstrates good use of grammatical structures. Makes no grammatical errors
Sentence structure		• In general control is limited • Very short script • Most sentences contain the same structure Overuse of the conversational 'and' or 'then'	A short script with some complex sentences Most sentences uses the same structure Some tenses are incorrect	More routine use and greater control of simple and complex sentences. Most sentences are correct and the use of tenses.	Shows control over a range of structures All sentences are correct. Correct usage of tenses (minor slip up included)
Vocabulary		uses only basic vocabulary which may be used repetitively or which may be inappropriate for the task *f* has limited control of word formation and/or spelling; errors may cause strain for the reader	uses a limited range of vocabulary, but this is minimally adequate for the task *f* may make noticeable errors in spelling and/or word formation that may cause some difficulty for the reader	uses a wide range of vocabulary fluently and flexibly to convey precise meanings *f* skillfully uses uncommon lexical items but there may be occasional inaccuracies in word choice and collocation *f* produces rare errors in spelling and/or word formation	
Spellings		Correct spellings of _most simple words Some common words Errors evident in common words	Correct spelling of simple words most common words some difficult words incorrect difficult words do not outnumber correct difficult words	Correct spelling of all words Allow for a very minor occasional slip	

Appendix B

Diagnostic test

Write a paragraph of 80-100 words on *Importance of education.*

Diagnostic test results

Participants	Grammar	Sentence structure	Spellings	Vocabulary
1	1	1	2	1
2	2	1	3	1
3	2	1	3	1
4	2	1	3	1
5	1	1	2	1
6	2	1	2	1
7	1	1	2	1
8	1	1	2	1
9	2	1	2	1
10	2	1	2	1
11	2	1	3	2
12	2	1	2	1
13	1	1	3	1
14	1	1	2	1
15	1	1	2	1
16	1	1	2	1
17	2	2	2	1
18	1	2	2	1
19	1	2	3	1
20	2	1	3	1
21	1	1	2	1
22	1	1	2	1
23	1	1	2	1
24	2	1	2	1
25	2	1	2	1
26	2	1	2	1
27	2	1	2	1
28	1	1	2	1
29	1	1	2	1
30	1	1	2	1
31	1	1	2	1
32	1	1	2	1
33	1	1	2	1
34	1	1	2	1
35	1	1	1	1
36	1	1	2	1
37	1	1	2	1
38	1	1	2	1
39	1	1	2	2
40	2	1	1	2
41	2	1	2	2
42	2	1	1	2
43	2	1	2	1
44	2	1	2	1
45	2	1	2	1
46	2	1	2	1
47	2	1	2	1
48	2	1	2	1
49	2	1	2	1
50	2	1	2	1

Note: These are marks of individual students based on rubric (See Appendix A)