The Role of Model Text Use in Writing Instruction

Behçet ERDEN[a]

Abstract

Writing is undoubtedly one of the most difficult skills to acquire in second language learning settings. Frequently, it is seen as an individual-based skill and considered to be a redundant and time-consuming skill, especially among state schools in Turkey. Most of the writing sections in course books are either totally left out or not studied enough. The purpose of this study is to share the findings of a classroom research study which aims to help students of a state university to overcome their problems in writing via model text use under the umbrella of cooperative learning. The study uses the mixed method and the sampling method benefitted is convenience-sampling. Students' actual written works and their reflections on the process were used as main sources of data to capture the perceptions and thoughts of 22 students on whether model text use in writing instruction aids them to produce better writing. In addition, by processing the collected data, it was also measured whether there was a relationship between writing performance and gender. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data revealed that subjects of the study do better when they deal with the task by analyzing a model text of the same genre prior to actual writing. As for the relationship between gender and writing performance, no correlation was found between the two. Since the integration of model text use and cooperative learning approach during writing instruction remain largely unexplored in the field, this study will hopefully assist the ones interested in the issue.

Keywords

Model Text Use
Cooperative Learning
L2 Writing

[a] Corresponding: Behçet ERDEN, Instructor., Gebze Technical University, Gebze/Kocaeli, Türkiye, berden@gtu.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0003-4339-2385.

Introduction

Writing is one of the two productive skills that demonstrate other skills acquired in the target language; therefore, it is widely accepted to be difficult for language learners. While portraying the current level of a language learner, productive skills are called on. Since becoming proficient at the skill is seen as so crucial, teachers often put emphasis on grammar structures and, as a result, students place more effort into mastering grammar and the requirements of writing such as content and organization are ignored. It is a well-known fact that writing requires conscious preparation; planning, and organization of ideas. Therefore, it is not realistic to expect one to write automatically, without any arrangements. Rao (2007) states that writing is both a mean to express oneself ideas and feelings and an indicator which facilitates the acquisition of other study skills the students need in their academic settings such as synthesizing and analyzing. In addition to speaking, writing is a must have skill not only for daily life but for academic situations as well. In order to reach communicative competence, learners are to have a good level of writing skill. They should always be aware of the fact that they will be asked to produce kinds of written works ranging from informal paragraphs to academic papers throughout the years they spend as students. With reference to this belief, writing is naturally a multifaceted procedure that entails combining various mechanisms of language, so it takes time to be proficient at. Therefore, it should be considered as important as other skills and this paramount skill in order not to cause stress on students about writing, more attention must be paid on the instruction of this paramount skill.

Reading

Reading is a lifelong skill to be used both at school and throughout life According to Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson (1985), reading is a basic life skill. It is crucial for an individual's academic and overall success in life. Opportunities for personal fulfilment and professional success will surely be lost without a strong reading foundation. The ability to read provides numerous opportunities to language users. Brown (1987) claims that reading provides students with the opportunity to examine the correct use of grammar, how the sentences are composed and how the sentences are logically connected to form texts. It allows them to study new vocabulary to use in correct contexts and lets them gain experience. However, learning to read in another language can be more challenging than that of a native language. In order to eliminate the problems, language teachers must try to find ways to make reading practices easier and more productive. Reading is a complex process with its phonetic language systems, and so learning to read is accepted to be better through formal settings like learning to write. However, for the practicability, it is so convenient a skill that many activities on each stage (pre-, while-, post) of reading can be conducted for the benefit of students. It is this flexibility which makes reading sufficient enough to be integrated with writing.

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning, or CL, is a teaching technique that is based on the innate human desire to work together. It is understood from the description of the CL approach that students work in small groups and receive awards and recognition based on how well their groups accomplish (Slavin, 1980). According to Mandal (2009), the premise behind the CL techniques is rewarding groups rather than individuals, so students are expected to be encouraged to assist one another in mastering academic material. In cooperative group work, each team member is accountable for not just understanding the material being taught, but also assisting

other team members in learning and fostering an environment of success. It can be claimed that when pupils collaborate, they learn more successfully. Slavin (1980), asserts that students will gain more from discussing each other's ideas when working in groups rather than alone. Richards and Renandya (2002) concur that CL is one of the strategies teachers employ to promote group cooperation and receive active engagement from every member. According to Ahangari & Samadian (2014), as it offers the most opportunities for student-student interaction with consequential input and output in a supportive environment, CL has been proven to be an efficient and productive teaching technique for developing learners' linguistic, social, and communication skills. Johnson and Johnson (2000) outline five fundamental elements of CL:(a) Positive Interdependence: Student team members rely on one another to complete the assigned task by sharing their thoughts and opinions; (b) Individual and Group Accountability: Each student team member is accountable for providing their individual portion of the work and mastering all necessary material for the success of the group; (c) Face-to-Face Promotive Interaction: CL also places a strong emphasis on small-group interaction. Group members play a crucial role by giving and receiving feedback and motivating one another to reach the common objectives; (d) Small-Group and Interpersonal Skills: These are the fundamental abilities for effective teamwork. To encourage teamwork, build trust, and improve communication, group members must develop interpersonal skills, which are commonly known as active learning, encouraging, and supporting others; (e) Group processing: This means reviewing the group session, describing what member actions were and/or were not helpful, and deciding which actions to continue or change.

In sum, as Artz and Newman (1990) state, CL is a collective learning activity to accomplish a common objective. Its basis for learning is established on the socially structured information sharing of student team members, each of whom is in charge of their own learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Pair Work

Many theories and language teaching approaches highlight the importance of pair work as a form of collaborative learning. Richards and Schmidt (2002) simply define pair work as a learning activity that involves learners to work together in pairs. Increased opportunities for students to use English in class is one of the key reasons to promote pair work in the English language classroom. Due to the fact that "students feel less anxiety when they are working "privately" than when they are "on the show" in front of the entire class," working in pairs helps students reduce their anxiety when studying (Doff, 1990). Pair studies allow students to collaborate with one another and learn new information together, increasing the likelihood that a task will be successfully completed. Because pair work activities assist teachers in reducing teacher talking time (TTT), which is desired to be as minimal as possible, they have become increasingly important in language teaching.

Group Work

Working in groups is a practice that has a long history in English language instruction. It is regarded as a beneficial technique (Chen &Hird, 2006). It's been noted as one of the common methods of teaching and learning, and it's developed into a crucial component of the toolkit used in language instruction. (Pica, 1987) Additionally, it is emphasized as a way to give the learners a chance to practice the target language. Vygotsky's writings were the forerunners in

elevating group work and student engagement in the classroom. Given that group work is based on collaboration, it is also deemed to be a time-saving activity. In this study, it was students' own choice to study in groups as they wished to work on the writing material more collaboratively in a social context.

Model Text Use

Recently, experts in the field of second language writing have pushed for the use of model texts as effective pedagogical resources for teaching students how to write in L2 contexts. The genre-based approach is where the idea of modeling first arose. The genre-based approach's goal is to help students become aware of the structure and intent of various text forms, guiding them as they evaluate these elements and then re-creating them in their writing. According to Hammond et al. (1992), there are three steps that make up a genre-based approach to writing instruction: modeling, collaborative text negotiation between teachers and students, and independent text construction by students. Learners get the chance to analyze the goal, general organization, and linguistic elements of the target text they will be writing during the modeling stage. While constructing the texts cooperatively, the teacher plays a crucial role in scaffolding students' writing by giving information about the characteristics of various text types. At this stage, students perform written tasks that require them to utilize the necessary language forms. In the last phase, known as the independent production of text, students create their own texts by selecting themes, doing their research, and writing several drafts. The idea of modeling and the explicit teaching of the genre are two aspects of genre-based writing exercises that stand out. According to Hyland (2004), the modeling phase helps students explore the genre and comprehend its rhetorical frames and formulaic sequences. Bastian (2010) states that the explicit teaching of genre encourages awareness of its norms and highlights the importance of reflection on its usage and purpose. According to Hyland (2003), since they give students the chance to increase their understanding of the targeted rhetorical norms, models are highly appreciated in genre-based writing teaching. The results of a study by Macbeth (2010) show that the modeling gives less proficient L2 writers the assistance they need to produce important writing elements including thesis statements, subject phrases, and supporting sentences. Models, according to Macbeth, aid education and provide students with concise guidance on how to produce their writing. In addition, according to Swales (1990), the presence of models enables students to concentrate on a text's formal and functional elements as well as the compelling connections that link them. Model texts are a typical strategy used by writing teachers to help learners tackle new and obscure genres. Model texts give students a tangible representation of what the final output should look like and help them digest the rhetorical devices, etiquette, and organizational elements of the text. Learning to recognize and become aware of rhetorical styles can help L2 students use their knowledge more imaginatively in future writing assignments.

Regardless of the advantages that modeling may offer in aiding students in producing written work, a number of issues have been highlighted by academics. The most frequent is that using model texts does not really help when it comes to explaining meaning in L2 writing. According to Bawarshi (2000), modeling ignores the natural processes of learning and creativity and impairs students' ability to think creatively about the topic (Badger &White, 2000). Models might be taken incorrectly as a formulaic writing style that leads students to assume there is just one accepted pattern for writing a particular genre. Smagorinsky (1992) further claims that students are more inclined to employ models inaccurately or far too directly to their own

rhetorical context. In order to prevent this result, Macbeth (2010) advices teachers to assist learners as they move from writing in an oversimplified and synthetic style to modifying model elements for their own needs.

In order to fill the gap, this study aimed to investigate whether model text use in writing instruction in a cooperative way has an effect on students' writing performances. In line with the aim of the study, this study sought answers to the following research questions:

1. Does model text use in writing instruction affect learners' writing performances?

2. Is there a relationship between gender and writing performance?

Methodology

Research Design

A mixed methods research design was used for the current study and the sampling method best suited to the study was convenience sampling. According to Creswell (2014), in convenience (non-probable) sampling, participants are selected according to convenience and availability. For the quantitative part, data collected through the learners' actual written works and the interviews were analyzed to reach a conclusion along with the writing scores of the participants. The students' papers were graded by two instructors for inter-rater reliability. With this respect, a quasi-experimental design was employed since the study included both the control and the experimental group. As for the qualitative aspect of the research, reflection papers from the students were used as the actual source of data.

Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in the school of foreign languages of a public university. The lesson in which the study was carried out was writing and each week they received 3 hours of writing instruction. The study consisted of three cycles and each cycle lasted for a two-week period which counts for eighteen hours of writing treatment in total. Regular face-to-face language courses are offered in every course. The school strives to prepare students for their departments, where the majority of them will need to attend vocational lectures. The subjects attended the study were 44 preparatory class students, 22 of whom were assigned as the control group and the other 22 constituted the experimental group, consisting of six female and sixteen male students. The age range is between 18 and 27 and their level of English is intermediate. These students were never taught using CL before by their teachers. Because of ethical considerations, all of the participants and school administrators were informed about the study, and the participants were the ones who willingly consented to participate.

Table1. Characteristics of the Participants

Gender	Control		Experimental		
	n	%	n	%	
Female	10	45,5%	16	72,7%	0,01*
Male	12	54,5%	6	27,3%	

*Significant difference at 0.05 level

Data Collection Tools

Students' writing papers were used as the actual data collection tool. In addition to the written works of students, reflection papers from the groups were used in order to get more in-depth data about their thoughts.

Data Collection Procedure

The first week started with the brainstorming session. The students were asked to discuss and find a problem area on which they want to study to improve themselves. To find a common ground, first they discussed in small groups and in the end, the whole class declared that they wanted to study essay writing as they were supposed to write in their mid-term and final exams. During this period, the teacher was just in the role of a facilitator and only when some questions arose, the teacher provided some help, otherwise he remained silent. The aim in doing so was to help learners to be more autonomous. As Dewey (1916) emphasized, "the starting points of activities must be the learner's own felt needs so that educational aims must be those of the learners rather than those of the teachers". In the second lesson, students were asked to write an opinion essay on "Part-time Jobs". The students were given 40 minutes to prepare an essay that was at least 250 words long. After they wrote their papers, the researcher collected them to assess. In the last session of the first week, the teacher asked students to set up their groups as they wished. It was up to students to choose their group members because the researcher wanted them to feel comfortable through the study. There were 6 groups in total (4 groups of 4/2 groups of 3).Each team member was given a role to perform, and those roles changed every session so that everyone had a chance to play different roles during the treatment. According to Johnson & Johnson (1994), it was expected that assigning roles and duties to the team members would lead to high-quality learning and encourage the learners' individual accountability and positive interdependence. In the first lesson of the second week, after deciding on the groups as well as roles, the learners started to search for model texts. While doing so, most of them got help from the internet and the others tried to find sample texts from either the course book or the writing book itself. The following session was the investigation phase in which the students offered some sample texts that they had found, and among those, they chose one to study in detail. As a class, they agreed to work on the same text. Before they started to focus on the model, the teacher projected the sample and read it aloud. While he was reading, the students listened to the sample text and followed it in silence. That was the only moment the teacher participated in the process actively. Then, they started to study the model in detail by finding the topic sentence, transitions, supporting details, and so on. They tried to use the information they learned in previous classes by activating their schemata. During this process, the students were expected to exchange ideas, brainstorm and discuss on the topic. The last lesson of the second week was the implementation session. As the learners investigated the model text in depth, each group discussed a topic that they would like to write about, and then, they constructed their outlines collaboratively and wrote the first drafts. The researcher collected all of the written products and distributed them randomly among groups with a view to having learners discover their own mistakes and try to correct them within groups. Moreover, as stated previously, this perspective in teaching helps learners to be more autonomous, which has become a crucial issue in recent years. After they finished analyzing the papers, the researcher collected them to keep till the next session. The third week was determined to be the evaluation week. The researcher distributed the papers to the groups, and asked them to write their second drafts according to the feedback they had

received in the previous week. After they finished, the teacher requested one team member from each group to take the lead and present their work. Then the teacher provided complete feedback for each work. The second and third cycles followed a similar procedure as in the first one. In each set, it was up to students to find a problem area and study it by changing the roles assigned to them. In the seventh week, the post-test was administered. They received their post-test on the same topic after having completed six weeks of CL courses. It was important to have them write in the same genre for all students because it would be more realistic to use the grades of the works in the same genre as post-test data at the end of the study. In addition to this, the teacher also asked the students to write a reflection paper about the whole process to gain a better visualization of the image they have in their minds. At the end of the study, one member of each group read their reflections on the activity in front of the class.

Data Analysis Procedure

Before and after the study, the written outputs of students' were graded by two teachers to ensure inter-reliability since one of the aims of the study was to see the effects of integrated writing on students' writing scores. To ensure the reliability of the rating, students' writings were evaluated by the researcher and another experienced rater independently using the writing rubric. Inter-rate reliability was measured by averaging the scores given to each student by the two raters. Apart from this, while grading papers, a reliable and valid rubric was benefitted. The rubric was designed by the testing unit of the School of Foreign Languages of the university where the study was conducted. As Silvestri and Oescher (2006) state, a reliable rubric gives objectivity and sets of standards which detain the grader from subjectivity. Another data analyzing method is using SPSS. According to Chen (2010), SPSS is both professional statistical software and a tool with powerful functions for teachers to carry out research in language teaching. The writing grades of both groups were scientifically and statistically analyzed via SPSS.

Findings

The study aims to investigate whether model text use in writing instruction in a cooperative way has an effect on students writing performances. For the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics are presented with frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation values. The Kolmogrov-Smirnov test was used to examine the normality levels of the distributions of test scores. As a result of the analysis, it was observed that the distribution of pre-test, post-test and developmental levels were in accordance with the normal distribution ($p > 0.05$). In addition, since the Skewness-Kurtosis levels were between 1.5 and -1.5, it was observed that the normal test assumption was met.

Table 1. Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	p	Skewness-Kurtosis
Pre.Experiment	0,961	0,144	1,10-0,89
Post.Experiment	0,978	0,549	0,87-1,03
Progress %	0,132	0,054	1,33-1,25

In order to investigate the pre-test and post-test score differences of the students, a paired *t*-test was used. In addition, an independent sample t-test was applied to examine the difference in test scores according to gender. The chi-square test was applied to examine the difference in gender distributions in the groups. P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant in the study. Analyses were made with the SPSS 22.0 package program.

The Effect of Model Text Use on Writing Performance

There are two research questions of the study. The first one is "Does model text use in writing instruction affect learners' writing performances?" and the other one is "Is there a relationship between gender and writing performance?" In order to reach conclusions for these two questions, the findings of the analysis are given in this section.

Table 2. Test Scores in Groups by Gender

		Gender	X±s.s.	p
Control	pre. experiment	Female	64,1±9,43	0,71
		Male	66,17±14,73	
	post. experiment	Female	66,9±9,87	0,65
		Male	69,42±14,93	
	Progress%	Female	0,05±0,08	0,82
		Male	0,06±0,14	
Experimental	pre. experiment	Female	69,5±12,39	0,50
		Male	65,5±11,18	
	post. experiment	Female	81,94±9,88	0,20
		Male	75,5±10,97	
	Progress%	Female	0,2±0,14	0,54
		Male	0,16±0,08	

It was observed that the pre-test, post-test and progress levels of both control and experimental groups were not different according to gender ($p>0.05$). It can be stated that the pre-test and post-test scores of the participants are not different in the groups according to their genders. Furthermore, when the experimental group is considered, the training given is perceived similarly on the basis of male and female individuals, and their development does not differ.

Table 3. Score Distribution

	Control X±s.s.	Experimental X±s.s.	
Pre. Experiment	65,23±12,36	68,41±11,95	0,39
Post. Experiment	68,27±12,66	80,18±10,34	0,01*
Progress %	%5±%11	%19±%13	0,01*

*Significant difference at 0.05 level

The result of the analysis showed that the pre-test scores were not significantly different in the control and experimental groups (p=0.39). It was determined that the post-test scores were at significantly different levels in the control and experimental groups. In addition, it was observed that the post-test scores of the experimental group were higher than those of the control group (p=0.01). The experimental group showed significant improvement in the post-tests compared to the pre-test levels. Improvement was not significant in the control group. Compared to the initial level, the control group showed an average of 5% improvement, while the development of the experimental group was 19% on average and significantly higher than the control group (p=0.01).

Table 4. Within-Groups

	Pre. Experiment X±s.s.	Post. Experiment X±s.s.	p
Control	65,23±12,36	68,27±12,66	0,07
Experimental	68,41±11,95	80,18±10,34	0,01*

*Significant difference at 0.05 level

The results indicate that the pre- and post-test scores in the control group were not significantly different (p=0.07). In the experimental group, it can be stated that the pre-test and post-test levels differed significantly. It was also found that the post-test scores were significantly higher than the pre-test scores, and the experimental group showed significant improvement (p=0.01). In sum, while the experimental group showed significant improvement, no significant improvement was observed in the control group. Therefore, based on the results of the analysis, it can be stated that the education given in which the experiment was successful has a developing effect on the writing development of the students.

Learner Reflections

In recent years, the use of reflection to promote meaningful learning has found increasing support from educators. Basically, reflection can be defined as "a form of thinking" used to organize partially "complicated, ill-structured ideas". It is the act of building on what is already known to reach a solution that may be either anticipated or unexpected. (Moon, 2013). Bearing in mind that there were some biased and unrealistic comments due to the level of the classroom and the students' attitude towards lessons and based on the data I obtained, I can say that the study was mostly beneficial for students. The study consisted of 4 groups of 4 and 2 groups of 3 with a total population of 22 students. One group of four female students stated that they liked the activity, but it would better be in reading lessons as the study is mostly based on speaking skills. They further suggested that writing sample sentences on the vocabulary they learned would be better prior to the writing activity. Another group which consists of three male students said that working individually was a lot better than group work but collecting ideas as a group was easier. They also stated that the activity was informative but difficult to follow since one of the group members was writing, others were just watching him. They further added that they were able to write a paragraph in a shorter time, but they were not happy about not getting individual feedback. The third group consisting of four female students said that they did not like writing together as they believed that they could write better individually. They also stated that they collected more ideas than when they were writing alone, but sometimes they could not agree on the ideas they gathered. For the feelings

about the activity one of the students said, she felt angry because her partner did not understand her, and added that she did not want to study in the same way as she could not get along well with other team members. One other group consisting of two male and two female students said that they were able to gather more ideas. They also expressed their satisfaction about the activity by claiming to have understood each other while working together. They said that they were able to learn the unknown vocabulary via brainstorming as well as writing. They were also happy to study cooperatively as it made the activity easier. In addition, they highlighted the value of reading prior to writing. They also added that the activity was different, but they liked it and suggested conducting more activities like this one because while sharing ideas, better thoughts came into existence. They stated that more heads are better than one. Another group with four female students also made positive comments on the activity. They said that writing in collaboration meant more distinct ideas, and it took less time to finish writing the paragraph. They suggested doing all activities like that as that one was much easier and relaxing because working with others lowered the pressure they felt while writing. The sixth and final commentary was from two female and a male student forming a group. They claimed that the activity was really beneficial for them because they practised teamwork and were able to gather more ideas. They added that it was different because they were used to study individually while performing such tasks. However, they stated that even though they liked the activity, they did not want other activities to be studied in the same way as it took time and caused a mess, which resulted in tiredness. In the light of the comments made on the study; however, the positive ones outweigh the negative reflections, and the number of comments and their reasons for the negative ones are also remarkable.

Limitations

Considering the study entirely, it is possible to consider the activity as a beneficial one, but there are also some limitations. The first limitation is the motivation of the students. It affects the activity a lot as some participants may show no sign of engagement. In the current study, few of the participants wrote unrealistic reflections even though they were not aware of what was being studied. The other limitation is about the freedom given to students while forming group members to study with. At the end of the study, some claimed that they were not able to study with others, but it was their choice to work together. At this point, it could be better for a teacher to assign students into groups according to their levels, but personal relations would still cause a problem. Apart from that, some groups could make totally negative comments, but thanks to observations, it was apparent that these members just leaned on the high-level students in their groups. Another limitation is setting the correct time because as they are university students, it is difficult to conduct a study with a whole class participation. The final limitation is the use of smartphones. During the investigation phase, most of the learners use their smartphones to search for model texts, so this can create a distraction. They may surf on the net, especially on social networking websites, without paying attention to the studied topic.

Discussion and Conclusion

Bearing in mind that there were some biased and unrealistic comments due to the nature of the activity and the students' attitudes towards writing lessons, the study was mostly beneficial for the students. Based on the results of the data, it can be interpreted that model text use in writing instruction improves students' writing skills. It was apparent by the

observations that during the process in all the sessions, most of the students were engaged with the activity. In the first week, after forming their groups, they brainstormed for ideas and topics to write about. Most of them were observed to study eagerly because such freedom to choose friends to study with and the opportunity to find their own topics was given them for the first time. As a result, they began to develop positive attitudes from the very beginning. Writing was the skill that they had more problems with, but through collaborative and cooperative work, it was surprising to observe them working in confidence. Compared to other writing classes, they were so relaxed, and they seemed to know what they were doing even if there was no intervention by the teacher. This brings to mind the concept of learner autonomy. Nunan`s (1999) theory concentrates on classroom-based foreign language learners, whose autonomy grows and changes through five stages: (1) awareness - the learner is the recipient of the information; (2) involvement - the learner is the reviewer and selector among given options; (3) intervention - learner adopts official goals; (4) creation - the learner is the inventor, originator and creator of his/her own goals; (5) transcendence – learner identifies their own interests and creates goals relevant to those. In addition to that, students felt the confidence of not being alone. Writing is commonly viewed as one of the individually studied skills, but in contrast to that view, the learners studied in groups and as a result of that, they have developed a sense of confidence in a positive way. Furthermore, different from their usual writing lessons, this set of lessons was planned based on a model text use which aids students and gives them relevant knowledge about the structure and type of writing they are expected to produce. From this perspective, the activity also hosts a kind of reading-writing integration in it. According to Krashen (1993), learners do not learn to write by writing; instead, they develop writing style through reading. The division between teaching reading and writing in the EFL classroom, which entails a considerable lack of emphasis on the reading–writing connections, is a major cause of the weakness in the students' writing ability. Hao and Sivell, (2002) argue that teaching writing in isolation of reading probably hinders the development of writing skills. They add that when reading is not integrated into writing instruction, "the knowledge and skills students have acquired in reading cannot be transferred to writing". Therefore, the division could lead the EFL students to experience much difficulty in both language and rhetoric when they start a writing assignment. Moreover, students can broaden their vocabulary and deepen their knowledge by reading. Reading appears to play a key role in the development of expressive language abilities and "writing" is one of these (Yakıcı et al., 2006). In addition to observations, students' reflections also provided valuable data about students' improvement. Except for some, most of the students pointed out that they liked the activity and got benefit from it. More than half said they managed to fulfil the activity easier and faster than the usual writing lessons, which is another significance of the study as they struggle to write their paragraphs within a time limitation. Some also stated that because they studied with friends, it was easy for them to learn unknown vocabulary by asking each other. In this way, they also experienced the value of collaboration. Considering the process as a whole, this insight will make a lot of contributions to their studying habits. They gained an understanding of how to overcome problems in skills learning and it is apparent that most of the learners will apply what they learned throughout the sessions to other subject areas. In this context, a study by Soori and Zamani (2012) revealed that most language features were used equally by male and female writers. Based on this, it is possible to conclude that there is no relationship between gender and writing success. All in all, through the data, gathered both during and at the end of the activity, although the results of the study revealed no relationship

between gender and writing performance, it is understood that model text use in writing instruction worked well in developing learners' writing skills and aided students to create positive attitudes towards writing as well as being more autonomous. It is advisable for language teachers to conduct their writing lessons with the aid of a model text use approach in order to lower students' level of stress, let their students discover, and help them to be more autonomous learners.

References

Ahangari, S., &Samadian, Z. (2014). The effect of Cooperative Learning activities on writing skills of Iranian EFL learners. *Linguistics and Literature Studies, 2*(4), 121-130.

Anderson, R., Hiebert, E., Scott, J., & Wilkinson, I. (1985).Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education and the Center for the Study of Reading.

Artz, A. F., & Newman, C. M. (1990). Cooperative learning. *Mathematics Teacher, 83*, 448-449.

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT journal*, *54*(2), 153-160.

Bastian, H. (2010). The genre effect: exploring the unfamiliar. *Composition Studies*, *38*(1), 29-51.

Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Parlor Press LLC.

Brown, H. D. (1987). Principles of LanguageLearning and Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: PrenticeHall.

Chen, R., & Hird, B. (2006). Codeswitching in EFL group work in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(2), 208-219.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Doff, A. 1990. *Teach English.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*

Hammond, J. (1992). *English for social purposes: A handbook for teachers of adult literacy*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie Univ.

Hao, X., & Sivell, J. (2002). Integrating Reading and Writing in EFL Composition in China.Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*, 17-29.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2000). *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-analysis.* Minneapolis: Cooperative Learning Center at the University of Minnesota.

Krashen, S. D. (1993). The case for free voluntary reading. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *50*(1), 72-82.

Macbeth, K. P. (2010). Deliberate false provisions: The use and usefulness of models in learning academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*(1), 33-48.Mandal, R. R. (2009).

Cooperative Learning strategies to enhance writing skills. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*, 93-102.

Moon, J. A. (2013). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice.* Routledge.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 7625 Empire Dr., Florence, KY 41042-2978.

Pica, T. (1987). Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied linguistics*, *8*(1), 3-21.

Rao, Z. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT journal*, *61*(2), 100-106.

Richards, J. C., &Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2002). Schmidt. R. *(2002. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd ed). London: Pearson Education Limited*.

Silvestri, L., & Oescher, J. (2006). Using rubrics to increase the reliability of assessment in health classes. *International Electronic Journal of Health Education*, *9*, 25-30.

Slavin, R. E. (1980). Cooperative learning. *Review of educational research*, *50*(2), 315-342.

Smagorinsky, P. (1992). How reading model essays affects writers. *Reading/writing connections: Learning from research*, 160-176.

Soori, A., & Zamani, A. A. (2012). Language features in the writing of male and female students in English and Persian. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *33*(2), 324-329.

Swales, J. M., & Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge university press.

Yakıcı, A., Yücel, M., Doğan, M., & Yelok, V. S. (2006).Üniversiteler için Türkçe-1: Yazılı anlatım. (BirinciBaskı).Gazi Kitabevi.

Copyrights