



UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA DE AMBATO

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS Y DE LA EDUCACION

**CARRERA DE PEDAGOGÍA DE LOS IDIOMAS NACIONALES Y
EXTRANJEROS**

**Informe final del trabajo de Titulación previo a la obtención del título de
Licenciado/a en Pedagogía del Idioma Inglés.**

Theme:

Text-based teaching and writing skills development

Author: Pérez Barahona Abner Steeven

Tutor: Mg. Calero Sánchez Ximena Alexandra

Ambato – Ecuador

2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. PRELIMINARY PAGES	i
COVER PAGE.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
INDEX OF TABLES	iii
SUPERVISOR APPROVAL	iv
DECLARATION PAGE.....	v
TO THE DIRECTIVE COUNCIL OF FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS Y DE LA EDUCACIÓN	vi
COPYRIGHT REUSE	vii
DEDICATION	viii
AKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
ABSTRACT.....	x
RESUMEN.....	xi
B. CONTENT	12
CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	12
1.1 Research Background.....	12
Theoretical foundation of the variables.....	16
Independent Variable	16
Teaching methods and approaches.....	16
Scaffolding	18
Genre-based approach.....	19
Text-based teaching	21
Dependent Variable.....	25
Communicative competences.....	25
Writing skills	26
Writing production	27
Writing skills development	29
1.2 GENERAL OBJECTIVE.....	34
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	34
1.3 Fulfillment of objectives	35
CHAPTER II. METHODOLOGY	36
2.1 Materials.....	36
2.2 Methods.....	36
2.2.1 Research Approach	36
2.2.2 Pre-experimental research	36

2.2.3 Level or Type of research.....	37
2.2.4 Instruments	37
2.2.5 Data collection.....	38
2.2.6 Procedure.....	39
2.2.7 Population	44
2.3 Hypothesis.....	45
2.3.1 Variable identification.....	45
CHAPTER III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	46
3.1 Analysis and discussion of the results.....	46
3.2 Verification of hypotheses	60
CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
4.1 Conclusions	65
4.2 Recommendations	66
C. REFERENCES	67
D. ANNEXES.....	77

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1. Population.....	45
Table 2. Pretest results	47
Table 3. Frequency of pretest.....	47
Table 4. Students' pretest-criteria, Part 1.....	49
Table 5. Students' pretest-criteria, Part 2.....	49
Table 6. Posttest results	51
Table 7. Frequency of posttest.....	51
Table 8. Students 'posttest-criteria, Part 1	53
Table 9. Students' posttest-criteria, Part 2	54
Table 10. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Content	55
Table 11. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Communicative Achievement.....	55
Table 12. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Organization	56
Table 13. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Language	57
Table 14. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Content	57
Table 15. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Communicative Achievement.....	58
Table 16. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Organization	59
Table 17. Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Language	60
Table 18. Test of Normality.....	61
Table 19. Non-parametric test.....	62
Table 20. T-test-paired samples statistics	62

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

CERTIFY:

I, M.Sc. Ximena Alexandra Calero Sánchez, holder of the I.D No. 1802884062, in my capacity as supervisor of the Research dissertation on the topic: “TEXT-BASED TEACHING AND WRITING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT” investigated by Mr. Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona with I.D No. 185075582-6, confirm that this research report meets the technical, scientific and regulatory requirements, so the presentation of it is authorized to the corresponding organism in order to be submitted for evaluation by the Qualifying Commission appointed by the Directors Board.

M.Sc. Ximena Alexandra Calero Sánchez
C.C. 1802884062
SUPERVISOR

DECLARATION PAGE

I declare this undergraduate dissertation entitled "TEXT-BASED TEACHING AND WRITING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT" is the result of the author's investigation and has reached the conclusions and recommendations described in the present study.

Comments expressed in this report are the author's responsibility.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'A' followed by a vertical line and a horizontal line, all enclosed within a large, irregular oval shape.

.....
Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona
I.D 1850755826
AUTHOR

**TO THE DIRECTIVE COUNCIL OF FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS Y
DE LA EDUCACIÓN**

The Board of Directors which has received the defense of the research dissertation with the purpose of obtaining the academic degree with the topic "**TEXT-BASED TEACHING AND WRITING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT**" which is held by Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona undergraduate student from Carrera de Idiomas, academic period September 2023-February 2024, and once the research has been reviewed, it is approved because it complies with the basic, technical, scientific and regulatory principles.

Therefore, the presentation before the pertinent organisms is authorized.

Ambato, January, 2024

REVISION COMMISSION

Mg. Edgar Encalada
REVISER

Mg. Marbella Escalante
REVISER

COPYRIGHT REUSE

I, Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona with I.D. No. 185075582-6, confer the rights of this undergraduate dissertation "**TEXT-BASED TEACHING AND WRITING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT**", and authorize its total reproduction or part of it, as long as it is in accordance with the regulations of the Universidad Técnica de Ambato, without any kind of profit from it.



.....
Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona

I.D 1850755826

AUTHOR

DEDICATION

TO:

God for being with me in every moment of my life and my parents for supporting me to accomplish every goal I have proposed, Elvia and Julio, this achievement is also yours, dear parents.

Steven.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I thank God for allowing me to achieve my goals, providing me with the necessary knowledge, and blessing me with wonderful parents (Elvia and Julio) and brothers (Brian, David and Alan) who have supported me both, financially and emotionally. Mom and dad, thank you for being my inspiration and my support at every moment, allowing me to fulfill my dreams. I also express my gratitude to all my teachers in PINE program, who were an important part of my education, especially my thesis advisor Mg. Ximena Calero for her guidance, patience and dedication in guiding me through this process. To all my friends and classmates, thank you for being by my side. I appreciate every laugh and tear we shared together. To those who are no longer with me, I will never forget you.

Steeven.

ABSTRACT

The current study aimed to identify the effectiveness of Text-based teaching in writing skills development in second semester students of Pedagogía de los idiomas nacionales y extranjeros at Universidad Técnica de Ambato. The methodology used in this study was pre-experimental with a quantitative approach. A total of 40 university students (33 females and 7 males ranging in age from 19 to 23 years old) participated in this research, who were assessed through a pre and post-test using a Cambridge B1 preliminary test, writing section, to collect information about their writing skills in relation to 4 criteria (content, communicative achievement, language, and organization). The duration of the treatment was 4 weeks, with a series of 8 interventions through Text-based teaching, in which a variety of physical and technological resources were used, always based on a reading text as the basis for each lesson. An automated writing evaluation tool (Perplexity) was used to support the review and provision of feedback on the written outcomes of each lesson. The collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS, Shapiro Wilk Statistic, and T-test to verify the hypothesis. The data for the pre-test and post-test were obtained based on the 4 Cambridge criteria of writing. In this study was found that Text-based teaching had a significant impact on the development of writing skills, specifically on 2 assessed criteria: communicative achievement (how appropriate the writing is for the task) and organization (the way students put the writing together, whether it is logical and orderly), as demonstrated by a comparison of the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test,

Key words: Text-based teaching, writing, skills, development.

RESUMEN

El presente estudio tuvo como objetivo identificar la efectividad de la enseñanza basada en textos en el desarrollo de habilidades de escritura en estudiantes de segundo semestre de Pedagogía de los idiomas nacionales y extranjeros de la Universidad Técnica de Ambato. La metodología utilizada en este estudio fue pre-experimental con un enfoque cuantitativo. Participaron en esta investigación un total de 40 estudiantes universitarios (33 mujeres y 7 varones con edades comprendidas entre los 19 y 23 años), quienes fueron evaluados a través de una preprueba y la posprueba utilizando una prueba preliminar B1 de Cambridge, sección escritura, para recoger información sobre sus habilidades de escritura en relación a 4 criterios (contenido, logro comunicativo, lenguaje y organización). La duración del tratamiento fue de 4 semanas, con una serie de 8 intervenciones a través de la Enseñanza basada en textos, en la que se utilizaron diversos recursos físicos y tecnológicos, partiendo siempre de un texto de lectura como base de cada lección. Se utilizó una herramienta automatizada de evaluación de la escritura (Perplexity) para apoyar la revisión y proporcionar retroalimentación sobre los resultados escritos de cada lección. Los datos recogidos se analizaron mediante IBM SPSS, Shapiro Wilk Statistics y T-test para verificar la hipótesis. Los datos de la preprueba y la posprueba se obtuvieron basándose en los 4 criterios de Cambridge sobre escritura. En este estudio se encontró que la enseñanza basada en textos tuvo un impacto significativo en el desarrollo de las habilidades de escritura, específicamente en 2 criterios evaluados: el logro comunicativo (qué tan apropiado es el escrito para la tarea) y la organización (la forma en que los estudiantes arman el escrito, si es lógico y ordenado), como lo demuestra la comparación de las puntuaciones medias entre la preprueba y la posprueba.

Palabras clave: Enseñanza basada en textos, escritura, habilidades, desarrollo

B. CONTENT

CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1 Research Background

Writing has been recognized as a basic skill for language learning, therefore there are several reasons for the importance of writing skills and its teaching to EFL learners, including reinforcement, language development, learning styles, and writing as an independent skill (Faraj, 2015). That is the reason in this study it has been thought of an approach that works for the good development of writing skills.

Durán (1999) conducted a study in order to examine the impact of a Text-based approach to teaching writing on ESL student writing performance. The study was a large-scale project carried out by a team of researchers from a local university to test a Text-based approach to teaching writing at the secondary school level in Brunei. The level of the participants was the fourth-grade class of a secondary school, with students aged between thirteen and fifteen years old. The instruments used were pre- and post-instruction written scripts produced by the learners. It was found in this study that students were able to transfer the structural, textural, and textual features learned during their writing classes after a period of text-based method instruction. The Text-based approach had a positive impact on students of different levels of language ability.

Nomasomi and Bulelwa (2022) determined the effectiveness of the Text-based approach (TBA) in English Second Language (ESL) classrooms in his research. It used an interpretive paradigm inserted in a qualitative approach to investigate the factors hindering effective implementation and promotive measures of the TBA. They used a case study design and semi-structured interviews to collect data from twelve conveniently selected participants in the Oliver Reginald Tambo Region in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. It was also used in interpretive phenomenological analysis and thematic analysis to analyze the data. The results showed that inadequate knowledge of curriculum stipulations, misinterpretation of the TBA, language barriers, and lack of teacher training were the main factors hindering effective implementation of the TBA. It was concluded in this research that TBA can be an effective approach to language teaching if

implemented correctly, and that teachers need to be trained and supported to use it effectively.

Iftain (2017) investigated the effectiveness of Text-based learning (TBL) model in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) to adult learners. The study was conducted at the post graduate program of State Islamic Institute of Tulungagung, involving 62 participants majoring in Islamic Religion Education, Management of Islamic Education, and Islamic Philosophy. The participants learned english for the whole semester, with 14 meetings using the TBL model. The texts used in this model was selected based on the students' major studies, Islamic Education Management, Islamic Elementary Education Science, Islamic Religion Education and Philosophy of Religion. The evaluation of implementing this model was done through ongoing assessment. The results showed that the TBL model was effective in improving the practical understanding of english language skills among adult EFL learners. The study recommends further research to scientifically prove the effectiveness of TBL model in teaching EFL learners.

Quvanov and Jabbarova (2023) discussed the advantages of Text-based language teaching, which is a method of teaching foreign languages through the use of written texts. The aim of this research was to explore the effectiveness of this method in developing students' reading and comprehension skills, as well as their ability to analyze, interpret, and evaluate information. The methodology used in the research includes both experimental and empirical methods. The results of the research show that Text-based language teaching can be an effective way to improve students' overall communication skills and fluency. However, there are also potential drawbacks to this method, such as a lack of cultural context and difficulty with motivation. Overall, the research suggests that Text-based language teaching can be a valuable tool for language educators, but it should be used in conjunction with other teaching methods to ensure a well-rounded language learning experience. It was also stated some advantages of using Text-based teaching in an EFL classroom such as: the exposure to an authentic language, increase of a rich variety of vocabulary and the flexibility, this teaching model can be used to teach a wide range of language skills.

Rustipa et al. (2021) explored the challenges faced by EFL teachers in implementing Text-based teaching to achieve communicative competence, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. The methodology used in this study involved collecting data based on open-ended survey questions and teacher self-reflection. The findings

revealed that the common challenges faced by EFL teachers in implementing Text-based teaching include designing tasks that align with TBA theory and challenges in implementing Text-based online teaching. The study emphasizes the importance of understanding teachers' perceptions of Text-based teaching to improve teaching practices and provide information to policymakers. Overall, the study highlights the need for strategies to overcome the challenges of Text-based teaching in the new-normal era.

Ragawanti (2018) examined the problems and strategies of EFL pre-service teachers in implementing Text-based learning seen from a sociocultural perspective. The methodology used in this study was grounded theory, which involved data collection through reflective journals, critical-friends-group reflective writing, and post-observation reflective writing. The data were analyzed by categorizing the chunks of words into three classifications of problems: problems on the part of the teacher, problems on the part of the students, and problems on the part of teaching and learning. The findings showed that EFL pre-service teachers faced difficulties in choosing authentic materials, managing time, and dealing with students' language proficiency levels. The sociocultural approach helped teachers better understand and address these problems. Effective strategies included using scaffolding techniques, providing clear instructions, and using authentic materials that suit students' proficiency levels. In conclusion, this study provides insights into the challenges and strategies of implementing Text-based learning in EFL classrooms and highlights the importance of the sociocultural approach in addressing these challenges.

Winarsih and Munir (2021) investigated how Text-based teaching can promote dimensions of literacy skills in EFL classrooms. The methodology involved observing and interviewing high school teachers in Central Java to reveal their methods for equipping students with literacy skills and promoting critical thinking. The results showed that teachers who promoted critical thinking and encouraged students to find the meaning of the whole text were more successful in developing students' cognitive dimension of literacy. Teachers who used students' knowledge of generic structural and linguistic features, as well as memory recall of the meaning of the words in the text, were also found to be effective in promoting literacy skills. It was concluded that Text-based teaching can be an effective way to promote dimensions of literacy skills in EFL classrooms, and teachers should focus on promoting critical thinking and encouraging students to engage with the whole text.

Ho and Henry (2014) examined the impact of Text-based instruction on ESL writing. The study was conducted in an ESL classroom in Brunei over a three-month period, focusing on three text types: report, personal recount, and narrative. The Text-based approach was implemented through three hours of training sessions with the teacher, which included co-construction of Text-based material and activities. A pre- and post-test for the report text type was given to students before and after instruction, and the scripts were analyzed for detailed assessment of student performance. The results showed an overall improvement in student writing after instruction, with a significant increase in the use of the three dimensions of meaning in texts. The conclusion of the study was that the Text-based approach is an effective method for teaching writing in the ESL classroom.

Arimbawa et al. (2012) refuted the implementation of a Text-based approach in English language teaching by conducting EFL teaching and learning based on a genre-based approach, which was carried out in two cycles (oral and written cycles) and each cycle consisted of four stages: construction of the context, modeling, joint production of the text and independent production of the text. The results obtained from the research showed that the Text-based approach is effective in developing students' language skills, as well as their character building, such as cooperation, critical thinking, hard work, and creativity. It was concluded that the Text-based approach is based on Halliday's Functional Linguistics and uses "text" as the basis for designing a teaching and learning syllabus. The texts vary in terms of purpose, structure and lexicographic features, and the overall approach is effective in developing students' language skills and building their character. The research also highlights the importance of the process standard, which included exploration, elaboration, and confirmation, and the character building that was implied in each stage.

Mohlabi-Tlaka et al. (2017) explored the Text-based approach and its contribution to FAL (English First Additional Language) teaching for the development of learners' communicative competence in Grade 4. The methodology involved non-probabilistic purposive sampling of three participants from disadvantaged public schools who represented a homogenous target population of teachers. Classroom observation and interviews were conducted to clarify actual teaching practice and the participants' knowledge and understanding of curriculum matters. The results showed that while the participants responded favorably to the Text-based approach, they had limited knowledge

and understanding of curriculum matters (content and delivery of the curriculum in South African public schools) and the text-based teaching.

These studies played a crucial role in the development of this research project, as they demonstrate the significant impact of Text-based teaching on the development of writing skills. These studies further demonstrate the effectiveness of Text-based instruction in facilitating the understanding of this teaching model. Furthermore, they provide a solid basis for the development of Text-based teaching programs and strategies that seek to improve writing skills and reading comprehension in students at different educational levels.

Theoretical foundation of the variables

The purpose of this section is to provide a detailed description of the two variables and their key categories that supported this study. Various research materials were employed to underpin this study. Data was gathered from diverse academic repositories, including but not limited to Taylor and Francis, ResearchGate, Google Scholar, Scielo, and Eric. The chapter also includes several ideas that aid in comprehending the problem of this study.

Independent Variable

Teaching methods and approaches

Teaching approaches are commonly categorized into two main groups: teacher-centered methods, also known as direct instruction, and learner-centered methods, alternatively labeled as indirect instruction or inquiry-based learning (Naqvi, 2012). A skilled educator is familiar with various methods, encompassing both those led by the teacher and those driven by the learners. When planning a lesson, a teacher strategically chooses the method or combination of methods that best aligns with the objectives of that specific lesson and the characteristics of the student group involved. Teaching method is also defined by Yaqub (2019) as the general principle of pedagogy (the method and practice of teaching) and management strategies used for classroom instruction. The selection of a teaching approach is influenced by several factors, such as the teacher's educational philosophy, the composition of the classroom, the subject area(s) being addressed, and the school's overall mission.

Since there are several factors, teachers can use a variety of teaching methods and approaches, including direct instruction, inquiry-based learning, personalized learning, hands-on activities, and the genre-based approach, to cater to the diverse needs and abilities of their students and provide them with the best possible learning experience.

In a Teacher-centered learning, teachers have key roles. They give information and check if students get things right. Students are seen as people who just listen and learn without being very active (Zohrabi et al., 2012). According to Acat and Dönmez (2009), teachers typically rely on specific textbooks that mainly focus on grammar and compare the language structures of the native or target language. Class activities take less time to complete with this method, teaching materials can be well organized, teachers can feel less nervous, embarrassed or tongue-tied, teachers can engage students to speak more in English because they can set the criteria for when students want to use English to communicate in class (Nagaraju et al, 2013).

On the other hand, Student-centered learning is a method where students have the freedom to decide not only what to learn but also how and why they want to learn it. The focus is on the students taking charge of their learning and actively participating, rather than the teacher being in control and just covering the material in a traditional, lecture-style teaching (TEAL Center staff, 2010). In this method, basically, the learning environment has learner responsibility and activity at its core, in contrast to the emphasis on teacher control and coverage of academic content found in much conventional and didactic teaching (Cannon, 2000).

The primary pedagogical methods in education include the Constructivist approach, Collaborative approach, Inquiry-based approach, Integrative approach, and Reflective approach. The Constructivist approach is based on the belief that learning occurs as learners are actively involved in a process of meaning and knowledge construction (Guil-an, 2018). The Collaborative approach involves two or more people learning or attempting to learn something together. The Inquiry-based approach initiates the learning process by presenting questions, problems, or scenarios, instead of merely presenting established facts or providing a straightforward path to acquiring knowledge. The Integrative approach involves integrating different subject areas and disciplines to create a more holistic and meaningful learning experience. The Reflective approach involves students reflecting on their own learning and experiences and using this

reflection to guide their future learning. Teachers can use a combination of these approaches to create a teaching style that fits their personality and meets the needs of their students (Guil-an, 2018).

Scaffolding

The term 'scaffolding' originated from the research of Wood et al. (1976). It serves as a metaphor to illustrate the kind of support provided by a teacher or peer to facilitate learning. In the process of scaffolding, the teacher assists the student in mastering a task or concept that the student initially struggles to understand independently. The teacher provides guidance specifically for skills that exceed the student's current capabilities. "Scaffolding functions as a bridge, leveraging existing student knowledge to reach new understanding. When administered effectively, scaffolding serves as an enhancer, not an inhibitor." (Benson, 1997).

Scaffolding has been broadly defined as "a type of assistance for the growth and learning of children and young individuals" (Rasmussen, 2001). This term can be employed as a comprehensive metaphor to characterize how "teachers or peers provide students with the necessary tools for the purpose of learning." (Jacobs, 2001). Derived from construction terminology, the scaffolding metaphor refers to support that "empowers a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal that would be beyond their unaided efforts" (Wood et al., 1976). Vygotsky et al. (1978) asserted that learning initially occurs on the social plane, through interaction with others, before internalization on the psychological, individual plane. Specifically, Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development is closely tied to the concept of scaffolding. The zone of proximal development denotes the gap between what a learner can accomplish independently and what they can achieve with the assistance of a more knowledgeable individual. Scaffolding is viewed as a form of support, with specific characteristics, provided within the zone of proximal development.

Scaffolding is a teaching technique that involves taking complex tasks into smaller, more manageable steps, and providing support and feedback as students work through each step (Sager, 2021). There are various ways to use scaffolding in the classroom, such as modeling and demonstrating, explaining concepts in several ways, interactive or collaborative learning, building on prior knowledge, presenting the concept and talking it through, discussing the concept in small groups, getting the whole class

involved in the discussion, giving students time to practice, and checking for understanding. Scaffolding helps learners systematically build their knowledge base and gain confidence when performing tasks independently. It is based on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, which emphasizes the importance of social interaction and collaboration in learning.

Instructional scaffolding comprises two key phases: (1) "formulating instructional strategies that guide students from their existing knowledge to a profound comprehension of new material," and (2) "implementing these strategies, wherein the instructor offers assistance to the students at each stage of the learning journey." (Lange, 2002). There are five distinct approaches within instructional scaffolding: demonstrating desired behaviors, providing explanations, encouraging student engagement, confirming and clarifying student comprehension, and inviting students to contribute insights. These methods are employed to guide students toward self-regulation and autonomy (Lange, 2002). Scaffolding is applied in various situations. Mothers instinctively use this method when guiding their children on how to navigate and enjoy the world around them. Teachers, spanning from early childhood to adult education, recognize the importance and enhanced learning that comes from using these techniques. Non-traditional educational settings, like in business training or sports teams, also use these methods to ensure the success of their members. Even if teachers and trainers aren't familiar with the term, they can naturally use the techniques and strategies of scaffolding. It's a straightforward and effective approach to support student learning (Lombardi, 2018).

Genre-based approach

The word "genre" has been used since the 1960s to classify different types of writing, like ballads, novels, plays, poems, prose, and short stories (Abdullah, 2009). In literature, genre theory explores the shared communication goals among people in the same groups or cultural settings. In this context, genre refers to the purpose of writing and the common understanding between writers and readers (Swales, 1990).

"Genre" not only refers to types of literary texts but also to the expected and repeated patterns found in everyday, academic, and literary texts within a particular culture. In Western countries, "genre" or "text-type," whether spoken or written, is often sorted based on its main social purposes (Hammond & Derewianka, 2001). According

to Swale (1990), text-types that share similar purposes belong to the same genres. Derewianka (1990) further identifies six main text-types in schools based on their main social purposes: (1) Narratives: tell a story, usually for entertainment; (2) Recount: To tell what happened; (3) Information reports: provide factual information; (4) Instruction: tell the listeners or readers what to do; (5) Explanation: Explain why or how something happens; (6) Expository texts: Present or argue a viewpoint. These social purposes of text-genres determine the language used in the text (i.e., its linguistic conventions, often in the form of structural organization and language features). Specifically, structural organization refers to the internal structure of the text, such as introduction, body, and conclusion, while language features include aspects like grammar, vocabulary, connectors, and so on, that writers use to convey information/ideas in a readable text.

Genre-based approach places great emphasis on the relationship between text-genres and their contexts (Hyon, 1996). In doing so, it aimed to help students become effective participants in their academic and professional environment as well as in their broader communities (Hammond & Derewianka, 2001). Here are some features of the Genre-based approach: this approach underscores the importance of understanding the social and cultural background when writing. The context determines a text's purpose, overall structure, and language features, often following linguistic conventions (Hammond & Derewianka, 2001). The approach emphasizes the significance of considering readers and adhering to linguistic conventions for a piece of writing to be well-received by its audience (Muncie, 2002). When instructing writing through the Genre-based approach, the focus extends beyond subject matter, writing processes, and language forms. Instead, it views a text as an effort to communicate with readers. The approach aims to teach learners how to use language patterns to create coherent and purposeful prose writing. Its core belief is that "we don't just write; we write to achieve a specific purpose" (Hyland, 2021).

This approach looks at how language is connected to its social purposes and aims to demonstrate that language is a system that users use to convey meaning by making choices (Halliday and Hasan, 1989). Halliday suggests that users need to use and learn specific ways of using language to achieve goals, connecting texts to social contexts and other texts. In simple terms, when a group of texts has the same purpose, they often have the same structure and are considered part of the same genre.

Text-based teaching

A fundamental idea in Text-based teaching is that in our daily lives, whether we are speaking or writing in a language, we engage in various forms of communication that follow the specific cultural norms. This includes everything from saying hello to listening to the news, reading books, attending business meetings, having casual conversations, completing school assignments, sending text messages, and more. When learning a new language, it's crucial for learners to grasp the structures and language patterns that underlie these longer forms of communication, especially when they differ culturally from what they are used to. Burns (2012) remarks that Text-based teaching has become more prominent in the last 20 years because people are increasingly interested in how those learning English can acquire the skills necessary to participate in different kinds of written and spoken communication in various social situations.

The Text-centered method begins with the idea that text serves as the foundation for creating assignments, exercises, and evaluating learning. It focuses on the actions language learners perform with language and their understanding of how language operates within specific situations. Feez (1998) outlines a text as "any continuous segment of language that maintains coherence through meaning".

Text-based teaching developed from advances made in the second half of the 20th century in a field called discourse analysis. This field draws knowledge from various sources, such as sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, linguistics, and artificial intelligence (McCarthy & Slade, 2002). What connects these different approaches to discourse analysis is the research of how spoken and written language is used in real-life situations. Discourse analysts want to understand what spoken or written language conveys within its specific context. They ask questions like: Who is talking or writing in this conversation? What roles do the speakers or writers have, and how are they related? What are they trying to express? What are their social or personal reasons for communicating? How does the situation affect what they say or write and the language they use? What meanings are they trying to share, and how successful are they in doing so? (Burns, 2012).

Unlike the Task-based approach, Text-based approach takes texts as the primary starting point for developing the curriculum (Van den Branden, 2006). In devising activities that help learners successfully use a variety of texts, the teacher can incorporate

elements of many other types of curricula (e.g., situational, topic-based, notional-functional, task-based), depending on the needs of the learners and the contexts outside the classroom in which they wish to communicate. The teacher's role in a Text-based curriculum is to diagnose the extent to which learners control the linguistic features and patterns of various texts and to help them become more independent in their ability to engage successfully with these texts (Hammond et al. 1992; Feez 1998). Thus, when creating the Text-based approach, teachers strive to use their teaching skills and knowledge comprehensively, including their understanding of the language patterns in a text.

Text-based methods are extensively applied in various settings, including the English language teaching program in Singapore and the national curriculum frameworks in Australia, as noted by Chew (2005) and Christie (2003) respectively. Furthermore, these approaches have had an impact on the formulation of language benchmarks for adult learners in Canada, as observed by Pettis (2007), and on the establishment of programs in New Zealand, as highlighted by Roach and Roskvist (2007). There is now considerable interest in Text-based approaches in European countries such as Sweden (Olofsson, 2010) in primary, secondary and adult education.

Basically Text-Based Teaching or Text-Based Instruction (TBI) is an approach built on a few key ideas: teaching explicitly about the structures and grammatical features of spoken and written texts, connecting these texts to their social and cultural contexts, designing lessons that focus on building skills related to entire texts, and giving students guided practice to develop language skills for effective communication through complete texts (Feez, 1998). Originally developed in Australia by educators and applied linguists focusing on literacy and drawing from the work of Halliday (1989), Derewianka (1990), and others, it has also influenced language teaching approaches in various countries like New Zealand, Singapore, Canada, and European countries like Sweden. The Common European Framework of Reference also outlines goals for what students should be able to do with texts. TBI shares many ideas with the Genre-based approach to course design, often used in creating courses for English for Academic Purposes. (Paltridge 2006).

Key issues

There is a range of key issues to consider when using a Text-based approach to teaching. These include understanding the concepts of text and genre, providing learners

with authentic samples of language, highlighting the differences between spoken and written language, adopting an explicit and scaffolded pedagogical approach, and incorporating assessment processes to diagnose ongoing needs (Burns, 2012).

Models based on authentic language use

In Text-based language teaching, we use real-life conversations and writings as much as possible. We find it helpful to classify these texts into different categories called "genres." Genres are a bit different from just types of texts because they represent the way people use language for common tasks in different cultures (Paltridge, 2006). For example, when you think about a doctor's appointment, there's a typical way it starts, progresses, and ends, with specific language patterns used at different points in the conversation. This "genre" might differ between cultures, but within a culture, people generally know how it usually goes. What's actually said during a specific appointment is the "text" for that occasion.

Understanding these genres or types of texts, along with their usual structures and language features, can be very useful in teaching language. According to Macken and Horarik (2002), some common types of texts in both fiction and nonfiction writing are:

1. Narrative: This is like a story with an introduction to events, a problem, and a solution.
2. Recount: It's like retelling events, often with an introduction and a sequence of what happened.
3. Procedure: These are like instructions for making or doing something. They include the goal, materials and steps.
4. Argument: Here, you take a position and give reasons for it. You highlight the issue, present arguments, and state your recommendations or conclusions.
5. Discussion: This involves presenting different points of view on an issue. You introduce the issue, present arguments for and against it, and then wrap up with a conclusion.
6. Information Reports: These organize and present factual information on a topic, usually starting with a general overview and then describing specific aspects.

7. Explanation: This type of text explains how or why things work or develop. It often starts by stating the phenomenon being discussed and then provides a step-by-step explanation of how it happens.

Assessment in Text-based teaching

In Text-based teaching, the assessment and understanding of how students are progressing are really important throughout the learning process. This begins with placing students in the right classes and understanding their specific learning needs. As students work on learning new texts, their ability to get close to the texts they're trying to understand is continuously checked. Teachers can evaluate how well students are doing by looking at specific aspects and patterns in the text. If students are struggling with certain parts, teachers can go back and help them in various ways, like practicing specific text structures or getting extra support in creating their own texts (Burns, 2012).

Advantages and disadvantages of Text-based teaching

Text-based language teaching focuses excessively on "fixed" texts that often favor native or standard English models. They argue that it can be tough for teachers to analyze real texts (Burns, 2002). This approach might also lead to using simple, everyday communication examples instead of more complicated or loaded texts, like those used in the workplace or texts that control access to certain things (where non-native speakers may have less power). Critics also think that teaching using this method can become too much like following a recipe, which doesn't encourage creativity.

However, recent research on language as it's used in real conversations has given teachers better access to genuine examples of language in action. Tomlinson (2012) remarked that teachers can also check if the materials they use reflect actual, natural conversations or if they're just made-up and overly simplified dialogues. As Roberts and Cooke (2009) pointed out, materials based on research that show the realities and challenges of real language are more useful than made-up examples or overly simplified ones. This kind of focus aligns with the principles of Text-based teaching, which stress the importance of using language in its social context and based on meaning.

Differences in spoken and written language

The developments in discourse analysis have allowed for important differences between spoken and written language to be identified for language teaching purposes (Carter &

McCarthy, 2006). In spoken language, people talk on the spot and together. They use feedback like "yeah" or "right" to show they're following the conversation. Often, they don't name things directly but use context (like "it" or "that thing"). They rely on verbs, pronouns, and words like "and" and "but" to connect their ideas. They don't speak in sentences but use phrases that weave together, sometimes with interruptions or pauses as they choose their words (Burns, 2012).

Written language is different. It has to communicate across time and space, so it needs to set up the context for the reader. It's usually written by one person, often without direct feedback from the audience, and it can be revised many times. Writing leans more on nouns and noun groups to convey meaning. It often turns actions (verbs) into things (nouns), like "Jenny completed the document" becomes "The completion of the document was the team leader's responsibility." When we teach language using Text-based approach, we can show these differences to learners. For instance, we can help them practice the features and strategies used in spoken conversations that aren't usually in textbooks. We can also teach them how to transform spoken ideas into more formal written versions (Burns, 2012).

Dependent Variable

Communicative competences

Communicative competence (CC), a term in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature, has evolved in its definition over the past fifty years. Its subsequent concept, interactional competence (IC), should influence the decisions made by second-language teachers as they aim to assist their students in effectively engaging in situations where using the second language (L2) is a regular part of their daily activities (Tarvin, 2015).

To put the original definition differently, communicative competence (CC) can be described as the skill to use language appropriately in a cultural context, allowing individuals to convey meaning and achieve social goals effectively and smoothly through extended interactions. Breaking down this definition, it means that individuals learning a second language (L2) should be capable of using the language itself, forming grammatically correct expressions (Hymes, 1972). For many adult and postsecondary English Language Learners (ELLs), the objective is not only to enhance knowledge of language components, including reading and writing skills, but also to improve their

ability to communicate effectively (Sun, 2014). In the realm of second language acquisition (SLA), engaging in conversations plays a crucial role in developing communicative competence in the second language (L2) (Mackey, 2007).

Having conversations is really important for developing good communication skills. According to social learning theory (Vygotsky et al., 1978), interaction, like conversations, is fundamental to all learning. The theory suggests that more advanced abilities come from social interactions, especially when people are at different stages of learning. Some experts in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) have suggested a different or additional idea called interactional competence, which looks at how well you can interact with others while using a second language (He & Young, 1998).

Based on Canale and Swain's (1980) communicative competence model, a person's language abilities can be divided into three main parts: grammatical competence (including vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation), sociolinguistic competence (knowing the rules for using language appropriately), and strategic competence (using verbal and nonverbal strategies to handle communication breakdowns).

Writing skills

In general, language skills are divided into four dimensions: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. All students are expected to master all these abilities.

According to Spratt et al. (2005), writing is considered one of the fundamental skills for language learners. Meanwhile, Troia (2014) suggests that writing offers students opportunities to reflect on and modify their ideas, meanings, opinions, and confusions in a piece of writing. This is because writing is lasting, engaging, tangible, and involves creative thinking processes that enhance students' knowledge. Additionally, Pranoto (2004) assumes that writing involves expressing thoughts in a written form or communicating messages to others through writing, essentially allowing for indirect communication. However, for the ideas in writing to be well-understood, it is essential to avoid errors. Therefore, writers should pay attention to the mechanics of correct writing skills, including punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.

Writing and speaking differ somewhat in their communication context. Speaking is designed for direct, in-person communication with the audience present, while writing

serves as a means for writers to express and communicate their ideas to readers who are physically separated by both time and space (Bachani, 2003). The distinctions between speaking and writing also extend to language characteristics. Permanence, production time, distance, orthography, complexity, vocabulary, and formality are some features that set written language apart from spoken language. (Brown, 2000).

There are four aspects of writing skills: fluency, accuracy, complexity, and appropriacy. Fluency refers to the ability to write quickly and easily, while accuracy refers to the ability to write without making grammatical errors. Complexity refers to the ability to use a wide range of vocabulary and sentence structures, and appropriacy refers to the ability to write in a way that is appropriate for the intended audience and purpose (Spratt et al., 2005).

The skill of writing has always been recognized as crucial in the process of acquiring the English language. This significance arises from its role in reinforcing grammatical structures and vocabulary, which educators often find challenging to teach their students. It is the aspect in which learners require sufficient time to enhance their writing abilities. Therefore, classrooms with English Language Learners (ELLs) should allocate more time to this skill, ensuring that students are well-prepared to communicate effectively in both real-life and academic scenarios (Ismail, 2011). Introducing them to the writing process through various approaches proves to be an excellent method for achieving this goal. Additionally, developing writing skills is achievable when learners' interests are acknowledged, and they are provided with frequent opportunities to practice writing (Ismail, 2011).

Writing production

Writing production is the process of generating written texts, which involves several stages such as planning, drafting, revising, and editing. It is a complex cognitive activity that requires the writer to use various skills and strategies to produce a coherent and cohesive text that conveys a message to the reader (Briesmater & Etchegaray, 2017). Writing production can be influenced by various factors such as the writer's background knowledge, motivation, writing experience, and the purpose and audience of the text. Effective writing production involves the use of metacognitive strategies, which enable the writer to monitor and regulate their writing process, and to reflect on their writing to improve its quality. Johansson et al. (2021) also delineate writing production as the

process of generating written text, including planning, organizing, and executing the writing task. It encompasses all aspects of the writing process, from generating ideas to editing and revising the final product. In this category there are some important aspects to discuss:

Task complexity

Increasing task complexity can improve certain aspects of writing production, such as syntactic and lexical complexity, content, organization, and writing quality (Rahimi & Jun, 2017). However, accuracy and fluency may decrease as task complexity increases. Hyland (2003) emphasizes the importance of tasks in the writing process, asserting that creating educational writing tasks and organizing them in a sequence is crucial for enhancing learners' linguistic and genre knowledge, along with their writing skills. Manchón (2011) similarly affirms that participating in writing activities can play a role in both learning to write and using writing as a tool for learning. However, there are not many studies that investigate how writing tasks are designed and how individual differences in learners can affect task design and sequencing. Some experts believe that the findings of such studies can help confirm the criteria for task complexity (Robinson, 2011).

Vocabulary use

Having a strong vocabulary is essential for effective writing, as vocabulary plays a crucial role in creating successful compositions. Challenges faced by writers using English as a Foreign Language in terms of vocabulary include encountering gaps in their vocabulary, fully understanding certain aspects of known words, and experiencing difficulties in recalling specific aspects of words when writing in their second language (L2). To address these challenges, communication strategies like paraphrasing, using circumlocution, message replacement, and incorporating body language can be helpful (Alharthi, 2020).

The significance of having an extensive and well-understood vocabulary, encompasses knowledge of words in terms of their form, meaning, and usage. Successful writing involves possessing a productive understanding of words, including those commonly used, those specific to academic contexts, and technical terms related to specific disciplines (Brun-Mercer & Zimmerman, 2015). Writing demands a rich lexicon,

meaning the ability to use an appropriate mix of commonly used words and academic vocabulary.

Prewriting strategies

The use of prewriting strategies, such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating one's own production, can improve coherence and cohesion in writing production. Using activities before writing can help people get better at writing. Experts in language know that this is a useful skill (Sagvan et al., 2023). Before writing, doing things like thinking and planning can be helpful. Studies have found that students who use these activities tend to become better writers than those who do not (Deng et al., 2003). That is the reason why ESL teachers might teach these activities early on to help their students become good at language (Go, 1994).

Prewriting activities help writers get their thoughts in order according to the rules and style of different types of writing. In English as a Foreign Language classes, various techniques and strategies are taught as prewriting exercises, but this doesn't always make students better writers. Often, this is because students may not be motivated to do these activities or may not realize that what works for one type of writing may not work for another. It seems that writers are more successful when they start with a good plan (Kucer, 2009).

Writing skills development

Various definitions have been attributed to writing as a means of communication. According to the Online Encyclopedia of Writing Systems and Languages, "writing is a method of representing language visually or tactilely". Writing systems use sets of symbols to represent the sounds of speech and may also have punctuation symbols and numbers. However, writing is more than just putting spoken words into written symbols; it involves deliberately choosing and arranging expressions (Brooks, 1960). This includes elements like grammar, vocabulary, handwriting, spelling, formatting, and punctuation (Harmer, 2001). Another equally crucial part of writing is elaboration, which Hedge (1988) describes as "the way a writer arranges the parts of text, building ideas through sentences and paragraphs within an overall structure."

Bouzar (2021) points out that this skill is very complex, encompassing a multitude of processes to arrive at the final product. It is not merely a representation of ideas, but

the exposition of multiple processes involving the writer, namely cognition, problem solving, and social connection.

The Importance of Writing

Even though writing is a vital skill for learning any language and serves as a significant form of communication, its position in our daily lives suggests that it tends to be overlooked. Numerous researchers have highlighted this perspective, as seen in Allen's (1995) statistical analysis. He asserts that "most (40%) of our daily communication is dedicated to listening, thirty-five (35%) to speaking, sixteen (16%) to reading, and only nine (09%) to writing" (ibis: 02). Hence, there is a need to underscore learners' awareness regarding the importance of this skill in the language learning process.

Writing is actually quite important in our lives, offering various benefits. According to Chappell (2011), writing allows us to express our personality, fosters communication, and enhances thinking skills. Moreover, Klimova (2013) disputes any doubts about the advantages of writing. She argues that writing, as a productive skill, helps in "developing logical and persuasive arguments, providing an opportunity for individuals to later reflect on and reassess their ideas, facilitating feedback, and preparing for school and employment." Additionally, Walsh (2010) underscores the significance of writing, especially in academic and professional settings. In reality, most of our daily or professional communications involve writing. This crucial skill is evident in various scenarios, like writing proposals, memos, reports, applications, emails, and many other instances where written messages are needed. Hence, if students struggle to express their ideas clearly to teachers and peers, they may face challenges in communicating effectively with employers and colleagues later on, as their intended messages may not reach the recipients accurately.

Being proficient in a language involves mastering the four skills that form the foundation of language learning. Writing, as a skill that involves creating content, is closely connected to the other language skills. Achieving expertise in writing requires extensive practice and the application of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Therefore, providing students with opportunities to produce freely written compositions will stimulate their creativity and enhance their writing abilities. In this context, Maley (2009) outlines several advantages associated with creative writing. According to this scholar, creative writing contributes to language development across various aspects such

as grammar, vocabulary, phonology, and discourse. This is because it prompts students to manipulate language in novel and engaging ways as they strive to express their feelings and ideas. Additionally, creative writing is believed to boost the self-confidence and self-esteem of learners, who often uncover hidden aspects of the language and themselves. This, in turn, fosters both personal and linguistic skills, along with the motivation to continue writing. Lastly, creative writing promotes reading among students. Through active participation in the writing process, students gain a deeper understanding of how texts are structured, motivating them to read more in order to apply similar structures in their own writing.

Writing Difficulties

Writing as a skill indicates the student's mastery of language and his or her ability to express ideas correctly and coherently. As a difficult task, EFL learners face several obstacles, such as grammar, vocabulary, interference, and other factors.

Regarding grammar, Harmer (2001) offers a detailed definition in which he referred to grammar as "the description of the ways in which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language. Learners who do not know the rules of the target language will have difficulty writing correct and coherent texts. Grammatical rules mostly incorporate different rules that learners need to keep track of, such as verb tenses, prepositions and adverbs. Therefore, it is necessary to take into consideration this use of the language.

Concerning the use of vocabulary, it stands out as a major challenge for EFL learners. When engaged in writing, the task of selecting suitable words to convey their ideas poses a significant obstacle. Throughout their learning journey, students encounter a diverse range of words. Some are familiar, and these are easily incorporated into their writing. However, there are others that present difficulties, appearing ambiguous or not entirely understood in meaning. In this regard, Seely (1998) categorized vocabulary into significant components: active, passive, new, and ambiguous. The first pertains to words that learners frequently use in their writing. The second type includes words that learners comprehend but refrain from using in their writing. The third category comprises words that have not been encountered before, and the last type of vocabulary is linked to linguistic elements similar to those mentioned earlier, but with ambiguous meanings.

Talking about spelling, Yakhontova (2003) mentions that English spelling can be tough and not always following a regular pattern. She suggests that in academic writing, it's important to keep the spelling consistent, whether following American or British conventions. Proofreading becomes crucial in academic writing, where you finish writing, read through it, find mistakes, and fix them. Doing this is easier when the writer checks the spelling while working on the texts.

When it comes to punctuation, it adds an extra challenge for writers who need to learn its rules. Correct punctuation is crucial because it helps give meaning to written text. If punctuation marks are used in the wrong places, it can change the meaning of the message and confuse the reader. Seely (1998) highlighted this point, saying that understanding how to write means knowing where and how to use punctuation. This skill shows that the writer has a good grasp of their ideas and can express them in writing. Another challenge for EFL writers is interference from their first language. This happens when learners try to use their native language knowledge in the foreign language, leading to a shift in meaning. This is common because of how the target language is learned and the learner's familiarity with the target culture. Translating ideas from the mother tongue to the target language can also change the message's meaning, often causing mistakes and uncertainties in written texts (Bouzar, 2021).

Types of register

Known as the colloquial register, the *familiar register*, as described by Harmon (2014), is typically used among individuals who share a close relationship. This register exhibits characteristics such as a lack of strict adherence to grammar, spelling, and punctuation rules, often incorporating slang and jargon. On the other hand, *informal writing*, as outlined by Fromkin et al. (2011), is characterized as more relaxed and spontaneous. It is employed when communicating with friends or family, whether in writing or conversation. Informal language, also referred to as the casual register, is commonly found in personal emails, text messages, and certain types of business communication. The tone in informal language is more personal compared to the formality often associated with formal language.

The *formal register*, commonly employed in academic writing, stands apart from colloquial and personal styles. Unlike informal language, the formal register maintains a

less personal tone and is utilized to articulate professional or academic thoughts (Kortmann, 2005). *Ceremonial*: Lund (2018) notes that the ceremonial register is infrequently used in contemporary academic writing. This register finds application in scenarios such as reading transcripts of speeches or historical documents. Despite its similarity to formal registers, confusion can arise due to the utilization of specific vocabulary. *Neutral*: According to Lund (2018), the neutral or frozen language register is effective in conveying non-emotional topics and information. Neutral writing does not inherently adopt either formal or informal language and typically maintains a balanced, neither positive nor negative tone. This register is particularly useful for communicating facts, and some writing is intentionally crafted in a neutral register, lacking explicit formality or informality (Lund, 2018).

1.2 GENERAL OBJECTIVE

- To identify the effectiveness of Text-based teaching in writing skills development.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

- To determine the benefits of Text-based teaching in writing skills development.
- To diagnose students writing skills through a pretest.
- To evaluate the effects of Text-based teaching on writing skills development of the participants.

1.3 Fulfillment of objectives

The main objective of this research was to identify the effectiveness of Text-based teaching in writing skills development and to fulfill that, there were three main specific objectives to support it. First, one of the specific objectives was to determine the benefits of Text-based teaching in writing skills development. Therefore, extensive research was conducted to gather enough information to understand these benefits. In addition, 10 interventions focused on Text-based teaching were conducted in order to determine their benefits in the development of writing skills.

Furthermore, to fulfill the second objective: to diagnose students writing development through a pretest. A pre-test was conducted before the interventions with the purpose of knowing the level of the students' skills and then proceeding with the interventions, in this case using Text-based teaching and applying the AWE tool PERPLEXITY as a support in the revision of the written product by the study population.

Finally, to fulfill the third specific objective of this study: to evaluate the effects of Text-based teaching on writing skills development of the participants. A post-test was applied to compare the results before and after the interventions focused on text-based teaching.

CHAPTER II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides insights into comprehending the data collection process, encompassing the research methodology, which involves the tools, instruments, techniques, and procedures utilized, as well as the sources employed for the study. Furthermore, it concentrates on explaining how the data is organized to make it easy to evaluate later.

2.1 Materials

The present study considered a variety of resources, including materials, economic resources, and human resources. The second-level students at the "Universidad Técnica de Ambato" constitute the institution's human resources. Moreover, financial resources were used to conduct the research, such as copies and worksheets. Finally, physical and technological materials like books, laptops, pencils, cellphones, websites and the automated writing evaluation tool "Perplexity" were needed.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Research Approach

This research was conducted using quantitative methodology. This is a research approach that involves collecting and analyzing numerical data to test hypotheses and answer research questions. It is a systematic and objective way of investigating phenomena by measuring variables and analyzing the relationships between them (Moran, 2019). According to Pandey et al. (2023), quantitative approach is very useful for identifying patterns and averages, predicting outcomes, testing causal relationships, and generalizing results to a group or population.

2.2.2 Pre-experimental research

In accordance with Creswell (2009), pre-experimental research attempts to determine whether a specific treatment influences an outcome. This impact is assessed by providing a specific treatment to one single group and then determining how this group improved after the interventions. This design does not involve a control group to contrast with the experimental group.

This research was pre-experimental because the participants were selected from a specific group of Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros program (students

of second semester) who were assessed through a standardized Cambridge FCE writing pre-test and post-test used at the beginning and end of the treatment to demonstrate the progress of the research and to determine the feasibility of employing text-based teaching in the development of writing skills within a controlled environment and time-controlled setting.

2.2.3 Level or Type of research

Correlational Research

The correlational design is a type of non-experimental study to examine the relationships between two or more variables of the same group, which may occur at various levels (Devi et al., 2023). Furthermore, the type of research in this study was correlational due to the fact that it focused on the use of "Text-based teaching" to analyze "writing skills development". Therefore, to investigate the correlation between the use of this teaching method and the specific results in the development of writing skills, a correlational study was considered.

Exploratory Research

The present study aimed to identify the specific issues and provide possible solutions to the problem by analyzing the data. It also determined the association between the two variables and showed whether the independent variable (Text-based teaching) had a favorable or unfavorable effect on the dependent variable (writing skill development) through the use of different forms of real-life communication such as sending text messages, e-mails, movie reviews, completing school assignments and more.

According to Aithal (2023), exploratory research (usually qualitative), reports the reasons for the problem identified in the research question, which is not clearly defined. This method usually seeks postulates based on the information collected and analyzed to develop hypotheses rather than test them.

2.2.4 Instruments

In order to achieve the main objective of this research, it was important to consider the main instrument that was applied during the interventions with the students, which was the Cambridge Preliminary Test (PET), writing part. The PET Test corresponds to level B1 of the Common European Framework and is provided by Cambridge English Language Assessment. The writing test (Annex 4) consisted of 2 parts, all of which were

administered to the students. The first part consisted of writing the answer to the e-mail previously presented, while in the second part the students selected between writing an article with the proposed topic or writing a story using the proposed sentence. In addition, an AWE tool (Perplexity) was used to help students develop their writing skills. To assess the written production, the researcher used a B1 assessment scale standardized by Cambridge. This scale measured several parameters, including content, communicative achievement, organization and language (Cambridge, 2023).

Content: Focuses on how well the candidate has performed the task, i.e., whether he/she has done what was asked of him/her

Communicative achievement: Focuses on the appropriateness of the writing to the task and whether the candidate has used the appropriate register.

Language: Focuses on vocabulary and grammar. It includes the variety of language and its accuracy.

Organization: Focuses on how the candidate organizes the writing, i.e., whether it is logical and orderly.

Finally, the pre-test and post-test had a total of 2 questions and a duration of 45 minutes each one. The tests were evaluated on 40 points. The rubric was taken from the Cambridge B1 Preliminary Test, that evaluated the four criteria (content, communicative achievement, language, and organization) on a scale of 0 to 5 for each one.

2.2.5 Data collection

Data collection was carried out by means of pre- and post-test evaluations. The results of both assessments were compiled in descriptive tables using Excel. The data were categorized into three tables: e-mail answer, review, and story. Each table included student ratings based on several evaluation criteria, such as content, organization, communicative achievement, and language. In addition, a comparison table was created to compare the pre-test and post-test scores.

Next, the hypothesis was evaluated using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Using this software, the null and alternative hypotheses could be accepted or rejected. Since the distribution of the information turned out to be nonparametric, the

Wilcoxon test was applied, with which it can be verified that the result obtained accepted the alternative hypothesis and rejected the null hypothesis. In addition, to contrast the results of the pretest and the post-test of both groups, the control and the experimental, it was necessary to apply a t-test.

2.2.6 Procedure

Over the investigation of four weeks, this study involved a series of 10 interventions of 60 minutes conducted in face-to-face modality. The interventions applied to the students were two and three times a week. The method used was Text-based teaching.

Pre-task: In the first phase, clear instructions and specific tasks were applied to provide an introduction to the topic.

While task: At this phase, students completed the writing assignment by applying what they learned during that intervention, developing their writing skills.

Post-task: During this stage, the students used an automated writing evaluation tool (Perplexity) in order to receive feedback and a final report on their writing assignment, as well as receiving feedback provided by the teacher on the final product of their assignment.

The initial phase consisted of the researcher's introduction to the class, along with a comprehensive overview of the objectives that would be covered. Following this, the participants were instructed to complete a pre-test and each activity of the same was clarified. Then, the test began. The pre-test was scored using the B1 Cambridge English Qualifications scale to determine the final scores.

In the second intervention, the teacher introduced the topic of the lesson with a brainstorming activity on the board in which the students answered the question 'What are the qualities of a good friend?'. Then, the teacher shared a reading text, in this case an e-mail from the teacher describing his best friend and proposed an 8-part structure for writing an e-mail (Greeting, introductory paragraph, idea 1, idea 2, idea 3, farewell paragraph, farewell and signature). Then, the teacher asked the students to write on a piece of paper a list of the qualities of their best friends. When they finished, we continued with the while-writing task in which the teacher asked the students to organize their ideas

and use them according to the structure proposed above to write an email to the teacher describing their best friends, this in a range of 100 to 150 words. When the students finished their writing, the teacher asked them to review their writing and correct it considering correct spelling, capitalization and grammar. Finally, as post task activity, the teacher introduced to the students the use of an automated writing evaluation tool called Perplexity in which they had to upload their writing and ask the tool to identify the errors in their writing. They uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the third intervention, as a pre-writing task the teacher presented a series of images showing different activities and places seen by him during his last vacation and invited the students to describe what they could see in those images. Then the teacher shared a reading text, in this case the description of his last vacation which was shown in the images, after having read the text, the teacher briefly presented the process he followed to write his description (Topic sentence, the first main idea followed by its examples, the second main idea followed by its examples and the summary). After the explanation the teacher asked the students 'What was your best experience?' and asked them to use the Padlet virtual platform to write 5 sentences describing their best experience.

When they finished the activity, the teacher presented the students a list of linking words that they might need for the while-writing stage activity, which was the next activity in which the students on a sheet of paper wrote a paragraph of between 80 and 120 words describing their memorable experience following the procedure proposed above. Finally in the post-writing phase, the teacher asked students to review their writing and correct it considering correct spelling, capitalization and grammar, Then, the students had to upload their writing and ask the tool to identify the errors in their writing. They uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the fourth intervention, pre-writing phase started with the game 'Guess the movie' on the Wordwall platform, the students had to read the description of a movie and decide which movie of the shown options the description belonged. Then, the teacher started the

lesson by sharing a reading text, in this case a movie review. The students read this text and the teacher asked some questions about what they understood from it, also the teacher established the process of writing the movie review (Start with the film's title, the type of film, when it was released. explain the film's story but don't explain the ending! opinion of the film, should people go and watch the film? Why?). Then, the teacher conducted a brainstorming in the board, in which the students chose a movie and wrote down the information about it. As a while-writing phase the teacher handed out a review form and asked the students to select a movie and write a 120–150-word review following the process shown above. Finally, as a post-writing phase the teacher asked the students to review their writing and correct it considering correct spelling, capitalization and grammar. As a last activity the teacher asked the students to transcribe their writing in the shared folder provided by the teacher and then upload it to the Perplexity tool to identify errors in their writing. They uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the fifth intervention, the teacher started with the pre-writing phase by showing a video to the students about the conversation between a client and the receptionist of a hotel, before playing the video the teacher asked the students to write down in their notebooks 3 questions that they had to answer based on what happened in the video. Then the teacher shared with the students a reading text, in this case a hotel review, the students took a few minutes to read it and then the teacher highlighted the most important information that was added in that review (Name of the site, where is it located?, what services are offered?, what makes it special?, personal opinion). After that the teacher asked the students to think of a hotel they have visited before or if they did not know any suggested that they go to TripAdvisor or booking and choose a hotel that catches their attention and then write down in their notebooks the information of that hotel based on the information needed to add to a review (presented earlier by the teacher).

During the while writing phase the teacher asked the students to organize their ideas and use them to write a review of that hotel in a range of 100 to 200 words in a word document, in addition the teacher presented a list of linking words they could use. Finally, as a post-writing phase the teacher asked the students to review their writing and correct it considering correct spelling, capitalization and grammar. As a last activity the teacher asked the students to upload their writing in Perplexity tool to identify errors in their

writing. They uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the sixth intervention, the teacher started the pre-writing phase with a game on Wordwall platform in which the students looked at some images of different objects and then described them physically. Afterwards, the teacher shared a Reading text with the whole class, in this case a letter from an employee providing information about a product to a customer, the students read the text and then the teacher suggested a series of steps when writing a letter (address, date, opening, body text, closing and signature). Then, the teacher asked the students to think of a common product from a store and write 10 characteristics of the product in the Padlet virtual platform. As a while-writing phase the teacher handed out some sheets of paper with the format of a letter and asked the students to write a letter there, addressed to a customer, (assuming they work in a store) and to describe there the product they chose in the previous activity.

In addition, the teacher shared with the students the correct order of adjectives when describing objects (opinion, size, age, shape, color, material, purpose). When the students had finished writing, the post writing phase began, for which the teacher asked the students to review their writing and correct errors in spelling, capitalization and grammar if there were any. After that, the teacher asked the students to transcribe their writings in a word document and upload them to the Perplexity tool. Finally, students uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the seventh intervention, the students began with the pre-writing phase for which the teacher showed a short video about 4 friends in a restaurant talking, before playing the video the teacher instructed the students that they should pay close attention to the video and answer 3 questions about it when it finished reproducing, and so the students raised their hand control and answered the question if they knew it. Then the teacher shared with the students a Reading text, in this case a food review, the students took a few minutes to read it and the teacher asked them what the text was about, the students gave their point of view about what they had understood, then the teacher shared the process that was followed when writing this review (Name of the dish, ingredients,

description, recommendations and conclusion). Afterwards, the teacher presented the students a list of adjectives used to describe food and also asked them to choose a typical dish from Ecuador or another country and write its name on a piece of paper. Then, the while writing stage started, in which the teacher asked the students to write in a sheet of paper a review about the typical dish they chose (100 to 150), following the process presented by the teacher. When the students had finished writing, the post writing phase began, for which the teacher asked the students to review their writing and correct errors in spelling, capitalization and grammar if there were any. After that, the teacher asked the students to transcribe their writings in a word document and upload them to the Perplexity tool. Finally, students uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the eighth intervention, the teacher started the pre-writing phase by engaging the students to participate in a game on the Wordwall virtual platform for which the students visualized images of different art objects and chose the correct word that defined the image. Then, the teacher shared a Reading text with the whole class, in this case a description of a piece of art 'The starry night' by Vincent van Gogh. The students read this description and then the teacher suggested some steps to follow to write a description (identify the artwork, general description of the artwork, analyze the technical aspects, impression on the viewer), the teacher also shared a list of useful phrases to use when describing a piece of art. Subsequently the teacher asked the students to think of a famous piece of art (painting, sculpture or musical composition) and write its name in a Word document in the folder shared by the teacher.

As a while-writing phase the teacher asked the students to describe that piece of art in the Word document in 100 to 150 words following the steps and useful phrases shared by the teacher. Finally, as a post-writing phase the teacher asked the students to review their writing and correct it considering correct spelling, capitalization and grammar. As a last activity the teacher asked the students to upload their writing in Perplexity tool to identify errors in their writing. They uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the ninth intervention, the teacher started with the pre-writing phase in which he presented a video about the use of technology nowadays, after that, the teacher asked the students 'What do you think about the use of technology nowadays?' and asked them to brainstorm their ideas on the board, next the teacher shared a reading text to the students, in this case an article about the internet, after the students read the text, the teacher shared the structure that should be followed when writing an article (introduction, second paragraph, third paragraph and conclusion). Then the teacher provided the students a list of topics related to technology and asked them to select a topic that caught their attention and write 5 sentences about it on the Padlet platform provided by the teacher.

When the students finished the activity the teacher continued with the while-writing phase in which he asked the students to organize their ideas in a correct way and use them to write an article about the topic they selected of between 100 and 200 words on a sheet of paper following the structure presented by the teacher. When the students had finished writing, the post writing phase began, for which the teacher asked the students to review their writing and correct errors in spelling, capitalization and grammar if there were any. After that, the teacher asked the students to transcribe their writings in a word document and upload them to the Perplexity tool. Finally, students uploaded to the shared folder the written evidence and results obtained on the tool, then the teacher provided feedback and assigned a grade taking into account the feedback provided by Perplexity and the teacher's rubric.

In the tenth intervention, the post-test was conducted to assess students' skills after the interventions, similar to the pre-test the participants were instructed to complete the post-test and each activity of the same was clarified. Besides, the B1 Cambridge English scale was used as the basis for the scores.

2.2.7 Population

Forty students of second semester (7 males and 33 females) of Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros (PINE) of the "Universidad Técnica de Ambato" were selected as part of this experiment. Creswell (2009) mentions that selecting participants for a research study involves identifying other features in the experimental design that will control the variables that might influence the outcome, selecting participants based on a certain trait, characteristic, ability levels or demographic variables.

Table 1

Population

Population	Number of students	Percentage
Male	07	17.5%
Female	33	82.5%
Total	40	100%

Note: Information extracted from research participants.

2.3 Hypothesis

Null hypothesis

Text-based teaching does not influence the development of writing skills in students in the second semester of Universidad Técnica de Ambato.

Alternative hypothesis

Text-based teaching influences the development of writing skills in students in the second semester of Universidad Técnica de Ambato.

2.3.1 Variable identification

Text-based teaching (Independent variable)

Written skills development (Dependent variable)

CHAPTER III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Analysis and discussion of the results

The following chapter deals with the analysis and discussion of the data obtained after the Cambridge B1 Preliminary Test, writing section, which was used as pre-test and post-test to determine the level of English in terms of writing skills. The participants were 40 second semester students of Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros program from Universidad Técnica de Ambato. The instruments were applied before and after the research interventions during 4 weeks of treatment with the objective of analyzing the influence of Text-based teaching in the development of writing skills.

Text-based teaching for the Development of Writing Skills was analyzed by contrasting the results of the pre-test and post-test of the Cambridge B1 Preliminary Test of English writing section consisting of 2 parts, which were analyzed according to an assessment of 4 criteria which are Content, Communicative Achievement, Organization and Language that correspond to the B1 level according to the CEFR. Thus, each criterion of the scale has a score of 5, which gives a total of 20 points. The maximum score for each criterion is 5, which demonstrates a high level and mastery of language writing skills. On the other hand, the worst score is 0, which demonstrates no proficiency and low knowledge of the language skills of the students. In addition, it was necessary to employ a table that reports the results before and after the interventions, allowing the evaluation of the student's progress in various parameters. These results focus on multiple aspects to evaluate student performance under the pre-test and post-test results. Finally, IBM SPSS statistical software was used to validate the correct hypothesis.

Data interpretation

Evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of the intervention relied heavily on pre- and post-test results as the primary assessment tools. These tests are specifically designed to test an individual's knowledge, skills, or abilities before and after an intervention. In this section the data obtained from these tests was interpreted and provide a detailed analysis of the results.

Table 2

Pretest results

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean	5,8500	
Minimum	3.50	
Maximum	8,50	

Note: Results of 40 students over 10 points.**Analysis and interpretation**

Table 2 reports the results of 40 students obtained from the pre-test administered to assess writing skills using the Cambridge Preliminary B1 test. The assessment was conducted on the basis of the Cambridge writing scale ranging from 0 to 5 in terms of the 4 criteria evaluated (Content, Communicative Achievement, Organization and Language), which was used as reference for the 2 parts of the test. The results provided a final score of 40 points that was converted to a 10-point scale. Analysis of the data in table 2 reveals that the mean score achieved by the students was 5.85 out of 10. The lowest score recorded was 3.50 out of 10, while the highest score recorded was 8.0 out of 10.

The level of English proficiency in writing skills was low, with a mean score of less than 7 points. This demonstrates a limited domain of the language according to the 4 writing criteria evaluated.

Table 3

Frequency of pretest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	3,50	1	2,5	2,5	2,5
	3,75	1	2,5	2,5	5,0
	4,50	1	2,5	2,5	7,5
	4,75	4	10,0	10,0	17,5
	5,00	3	7,5	7,5	25,0
	5,25	2	5,0	5,0	30,0
	5,50	5	12,5	12,5	42,5

5,75	5	12,5	12,5	55,0
6,00	2	5,0	5,0	60,0
6,25	4	10,0	10,0	70,0
6,50	2	5,0	5,0	75,0
6,75	3	7,5	7,5	82,5
7,00	3	7,5	7,5	90,0
7,25	3	7,5	7,5	97,5
8,50	1	2,5	2,5	100,0
Total	40	100,0	100,0	

Note: The table presents the overall frequency of writing pre-test scores.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 3 provides an analysis of the results obtained in the pre-test, displaying the frequency distribution of the scores obtained. It shows that 5 students, who constitute 12.5% of the total population obtained a score of 5.50 points out of 10, similarly 5 students who are also 12.5% of the total population obtained a score of 5.75 points out of 10 while 4 students who are 10% of the total population obtained a score of 4.75 out of 10, while another 10% of the population (4 students) obtained a score of 6.25 out of 10. More specifically, there were only 7 students who scored more than 7, including 3 students who scored 7 points, 3 students who scored 7.25 points and only one student who scored 8.50 out of 10.

Table 3 reports an exhaustive analysis of the results, revealing that more than half of the students scored below seven, indicating their inability to successfully pass the test. Despite being classified at the second level, the students were expected to have a B2 level of proficiency, taking into account their exposure to the language during their primary and secondary education, but they barely reached A2 and in some cases B1. Therefore, it is clear that the students do not currently possess the required level of writing skills.

Table 4

Students' pretest-criteria, Part 1

Assessing writing competences performance over 20					
	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language	Total average over 20
	3,3	2,9	3,1	2,6	12,1
Percentage	27,2%	23.9%	25,6%	21,4%	

Note: Mean of the four criteria considered in part 1 of the pre-test of 40 students

Analysis and interpretation

Table 4 shows the results of the pre-test, part 1, comprising data concerning content, communicative achievement, organization and language. Regarding the content criterion, the students had an average of 3.3 out of 5 (being the highest value of the 4 criteria) which is equivalent to 27.2% of the total result out of 20 points, communicative achievement was 23.9% of the overall score with an average of 2.9 out of 5 points, organization on the other side, representing an average of 3.1 out of 5 points constitutes 25.6% of the total score and lastly as the lowest value obtained by the students, the language criterion with an average of 2.6 out of 5 points represents 21.4% of the total average obtained by the students, being in this case 12.1 points out of 20 points.

The previous table presents the analysis of the pre-test part one results based on the evaluated criteria. It is evident that in both, language and communicative achievement barely exceeded half of the total value (five), indicating a lack of knowledge of vocabulary and grammar as well as an inappropriate use of register. In terms of organization and content, they showed slightly acceptable results. As consequence, the students' writing skills are considered deficient.

Table 5

Students' pretest-criteria, Part 2

Assessing writing competences performance over 20					
	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language	Total average over 20
	3,5	2,4	2,7	2,6	11,3
Percentage	30,9%	21,2%	23,8%	23%	

Note: Mean of the four criteria considered in part 2 of the pre-test of 40 students.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 5 shows the results of the pre-test, part 2, which corresponds to the 4 criteria to be evaluated in writing (content, communicative achievement, organization and language). The results regarding the Content criterion gave an average of 3.5 out of 5 points, equivalent to 30.9% of the total result out of 20 (being the highest value of the 4 criteria). The communicative achievement criterion gave an average of 2.4 out of 5 points, equivalent to 21.2% of the result out of 20 (being the lowest value obtained in this part). On the other side, organization criterion resulted in an average of 2.7 out of 5 points corresponding to 23.8% of the total value obtained, while language criterion resulted in an average of 2.6 out of 5 points corresponding to 23% of the total average obtained in part 2 of the test, which in this case was 11.3 out of 20 points. The result is evident, the writing ability of the students is deficient and even lower than the results of part 1 of the test.

Table 5 presents an analysis from the results of pre-test part two based on the criteria evaluated. As for communicative achievement, it is evident that the students were not able to reach half of the total value (five), which suggests an incorrect use of the language in terms of the use of appropriate register depending on the task. In terms of organization and language, the results showed a value slightly higher than half of the total value (five), which suggests an insufficient knowledge of vocabulary and grammar as well as a lack of logic and order in the writings. Fortunately, the students showed a good performance in the criterion of contentment, which indicates that they know how to fulfill what is demanded as a task. In general, the students' writing skills are deficient.

Table 6

Posttest results

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean	8,6687	
Minimum	5,50	
Maximun	10.00	

Note: Results over 10.**Analysis and interpretation**

Table 6 reports the results obtained by 40 students in the post-test administered to evaluate writing skills using the Cambridge Preliminary B1 test. The assessment was carried out on the basis of the Cambridge writing scale ranging from 0 to 5 points in terms of the 4 criteria assessed (content, communicative achievement, organization and language). This scale was employed as the basis for the two parts of the test, resulting in a score out of 40 points that was converted to a scale out of 10 points. The analysis of the data in Table 6 reveals that the average score achieved by the students is 8.66 out of 10. The lowest score recorded in this test was 5.50 out of 10 while the highest score was 10 out of 10.

Following the interventions, post-test results suggest a mean increase above a score of seven. The test results suggest that the applied strategy effectively improved participants' writing skills after eight interventions.

Table 7

Frequency of posttest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulativ e percent
Valid	5,50	1	2,5	2,5	2,5
	6,75	1	2,5	2,5	5,0
	7,25	2	5,0	5,0	10,0
	7,50	1	2,5	2,5	12,5

7,75	2	5,0	5,0	17,5
8,00	4	10,0	10,0	27,5
8,25	2	5,0	5,0	32,5
8,50	2	5,0	5,0	37,5
8,75	4	10,0	10,0	47,5
9,00	2	5,0	5,0	52,5
9,25	10	25,0	25,0	77,5
9,50	8	20,0	20,0	97,5
10,00	1	2,5	2,5	100,0
Total	40	100,0	100,0	

Note: The table presents the overall frequency of writing post-test scores.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 7 provides an analysis of the results obtained in the post-test, showing the frequency distribution of the scores obtained by the students. It shows that 10 students, who constitute 25% of the total population, obtained a favorable score of 9.25 out of 10 points. In addition, 8 students, who constitute 20% of the total population obtained a score of 9.50 out of 10 points. Additionally, 10% of the total population corresponding to 4 students obtained a score of 8.75 out of 10 points, while another 10% of the population obtained a score of 8 out of 10 points. On the other side, only 2 students scored below the acceptable level, one scored 5.50 out of 10 and another student scored 6.75 out of 10.

Table 7 presents an analysis of the frequencies of the post-test results, indicating that only 2 students from the population obtained a grade lower than 7, although they were close to reach a passing grade. Meanwhile, the majority obtained a grade equal to or higher than a passing grade. These results suggest that the majority of students achieved a B2 level in the written section, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the strategy in improving their abilities.

Table 8

Students 'posttest-criteria, Part 1

Assessing writing competences performance over 20					
	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language	Total average over 20
	4,6	4,5	4,7	3,8	17,7
Percentage	25,9%	25,4%	26,5%	21,4%	

Note: Mean of the four criteria considered in part 1 of the post-test of 40 students.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 8 reports the findings regarding Part 1 of the post-test. This table comprises data relating to the Content, Communicative Achievement, Organization and Language criteria. Concerning the Content criterion, an average of 4.6 out of 5 points was obtained, constituting 25.9% of the total score out of 20 points obtained by the students. On the other side, the Communicative Achievement criterion resulted in an average of 4.5 out of 5 points, representing 24.4% of the total score out of 20 points obtained by the students. The highest value corresponded to the Organization criterion with an average of 4.7 out of 5 points, while the lowest value corresponded to the Language criterion with an average of 3.8 out of 5 points.

The table below presents the analysis of the results based on the criteria of the post-test, part 1. In particular, the students improved considerably in each of the 4 criteria, demonstrating an increase of more than one point in each criterion. In terms of content and organization, students showed a greater ability to understand the assignment and use the language in a logical and orderly manner. In addition, there was a significant increase in the language criterion, which the students had more difficulty in developing, demonstrating a better understanding of grammar and vocabulary learning. These results suggest that students improved their writing subskills.

Table 9

Students' posttest-criteria, Part 2

Assessing writing competences performance over 20					
	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language	Total average over 20
	4,7	4,4	4,4	3,6	17,1
Percentage	27,4%	25,7%	25,7%	21,05%	

Note: Mean of the four criteria considered in part 2 of the post-test of 40 students.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 9 illustrates the results of the post-test, part 2. It corresponds to the results for each of the 4 criteria to be evaluated in writing (content, communicative achievement, organization and language). The results for the content criterion revealed the highest value of the 4 criteria, 4.5 out of 5 points, which is equivalent to 27.4% of the mean score obtained by the 40 students. On the other side, the communicative achievement and language criteria comprise the same percentage level in the final average (25.7%), with an average score of 4.4 out of 5 points in each criterion. In the case of language (the criterion with the lowest score) representing an average of 3.6 out of 5 points, equivalent to 21.05% of the total average score obtained by the students in part 2 of the test. The result is evidently positive, the students' writing skills developed remarkably.

Table 9 shows the analysis of results based on the criteria of the post-test, part 2. In particular, students improved considerably in each of the 4 criteria, showing an increase of almost one point in each criterion. Further development was evident in the content criterion, suggesting that students understand the assignment and perform satisfactorily. As for communicative achievement and organization, it can be inferred that the students use the register correctly, in addition to writing in a logical and orderly manner, making their writing easy to understand. The lowest result among the students is language, which indicates that the students still have difficulties in using correct and appropriate grammar and vocabulary. These results suggest that students improved their writing subskills.

Table 10

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Content

Content- Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	3,3	4,6	5
Percentage	66%	92%	100%

Note: Content comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 1.**Analysis and interpretation**

Table 10 reveals the results obtained in the pre-test and post-test of Content, part 1. In the pre-test the students obtained an average score of 3.3 out of 5 points, equivalent to 66% of the total. On the other hand, the results of the post-test demonstrated a remarkable improvement, as the students obtained an average score of 4.6 out of 5 points, equivalent to 92% of the total. This evidences a positive change of 1.3 points, which represents an increase of 26% from the pre-test to the post-test.

Upon comparing the mean score between the pre- and post-test, part 1, it is evident that most of the students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement may not have been substantial, students have understood the value of completing the assigned task appropriately, as well as understanding the relevance of their writing focused on a target reader.

Table 11

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Communicative Achievement

Communicative Achievement - Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	2,9	4,5	5
Percentage	58%	90%	100%

Note: Comparison of mean between pre and post-test.**Analysis and interpretation**

Table 11 shows the results obtained in the Communicative Achievement pre-test and post-test, part 1. In the pre-test the students obtained an average score of 2.9 out of 5

points, equivalent to 58% of the total. On the other hand, the results of the post-test demonstrated a remarkable improvement, as the students obtained an average score of 4.5 out of 5 points, equivalent to 90% of the total. That demonstrates a positive change of 1.5 points, which represents an increase of 30% from the pre-test to the post-test.

Upon analyzing the mean score between the pre-test and the post-test, part 1, it is evident that most of the students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement may not have been substantial, the students understood the importance of correct register, genre, format and function when writing, always considering the communicative purpose of their writing.

Table 12

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Organization

Organization- Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	3,1	4,7	5
Percentage	62%	94%	100%

Note: Organization comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 1.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 12 exposes the results obtained in the pre-test and post-test of Organization, part 1. On the pre-test the students scored a mean value of 3.1 out of 5 points, equivalent to 62% of the total. In contrast, the results of the post-test evidenced a positive impact, giving a mean value of 4.7 out of 5 points, equivalent to 94% of the total. The results demonstrate a significant positive change of 1.5 points, representing a 30% improvement from pre-test to post-test. Comparison of the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test shows that the majority of students improved significantly in their writing skills after the interventions.

Upon analysis of the mean score between the pre-test and the post-test, part 1. It is evident that most of the students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement may not have been substantial, the students have understood the importance of correctly putting together pieces of writing in a logical and orderly way, in addition to

acquiring a wide variety of linking words, cohesive devices and organizational patterns that will be useful in different types of writing.

Table 13

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 1, comparison of criteria-Language

Language - Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	2,6	3,8	5
Percentage	52%	76%	100%

Note: Language comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 1.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 13 illustrates the results obtained in the pre-test and post-test of Language, Part 1. In the pre-test the students obtained an average score of 2.6 out of 5 points, equivalent to 52% of the total. In contrast, the results of the post-test revealed a positive result of 3.8 out of 5 points, equivalent to 76% of the total. The results demonstrate a significant change of 1.1 points, representing a 22% increase from pre-test to post-test. Comparison of the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test demonstrate that the majority of students significantly improved in their writing skills after the interventions.

After analysis of the mean score between the pre-test and post-test, part 1. It is evident that most of the students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement was not substantial, the students have developed their language skills, acquiring a wide range of vocabulary that fits different contexts, as well as words, phrases, basic tenses and simple clauses that can fit into different types of writing.

Table 14

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Content

Content- Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	3,5	4,7	5
Percentage	70%	94%	100%

Note: Content comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 2.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 14 reports the results obtained in the pre-test and post-test of Content, Part 2. In the pre-test, the students obtained a mean score of 3.5 out of 5 points, equivalent to 70% of the total. In contrast, the results of the post-test revealed a significantly positive result of 4.7 out of 5 points, equivalent to 94% of the total. The results show a significant change of 1.1 points, equivalent to 22% from pre-test to post-test.

When comparing the average score between the pre- and post-test, part 2, it is clear that the majority of students showed improvement after the interventions. Although the improvement may not have been significant, students have gained a better understanding of the importance of completing tasks correctly and focusing their writing on a specific target audience.

Table 15

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Communicative Achievement

Communicative Achievement - Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	2,4	4,4	5
Percentage	48%	88%	100%

Note: Comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 2.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 15 illustrates the results obtained in the pre-test and post-test of communicative achievement, Part 2. In the pre-test the students obtained a mean score of 2.4 out of 5 points, equivalent to 48% of the total, whereas in the post-test the students obtained a favorable score of 4.4 out of 5 points, equivalent to 88% of the total. The results demonstrate a significant change of 1.9 points, equivalent to a 38% difference between the pre-test and the post-test.

After analyzing the average score between the pre-test and post-test, part 2, it is evident that most students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement may not have been significant, students have gained a better understanding of the importance of using the correct register, genre, format, and function when writing, always considering the communicative purpose of their writing.

Table 16

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Organization

Organization- Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	2,7	4,4	5
Percentage	54%	88%	100%

Note: Organization comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 2.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 16 shows the results obtained in the pre-test and post-test of Organization, Part 2. In the pre-test the students obtained an average score of 2.7 out of 5 points, equivalent to 54% of the total. In contrast, the average score obtained by the students was 4.4 out of 5 points, equivalent to 88% of the total. The results indicated a significant change of 1.6 points, equivalent to a 32% difference from the pre-test to the post-test results. The comparison of the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test shows that most of the students significantly improved their writing skills after the interventions.

After analyzing the average score between the pre-test and post-test, part 1, it is evident that most students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement may not have been substantial, students have gained a better understanding of the importance of organizing their writing in a logical and orderly manner, as well as acquiring a wide variety of linking words, cohesive devices, and organizational patterns that will be useful in different types of writing.

Table 17

Students' pre-test and post-test Part 2, comparison of criteria-Language

Language - Score over 5			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Expected average
	2,6	3,6	5
Percentage	52%	72%	100%

Note: Language comparison of mean between pre and post-test Part 2.**Analysis and interpretation**

Table 7 illustrates the results obtained by the students in the pre-test and post-test of Language, part 2. In the pre-test the students obtained an average score of 2.6 out of 5 points, equivalent to 52% of the total. Moreover, the average score of the students in the post-test was 3.6 out of 5 points, equivalent to 72% of the total. The results show a positive difference of 0.9 points, equivalent to an 18% difference of the pre-test and post-test results. Comparison of the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test shows that the majority of the students significantly improved their writing skills after the interventions.

After analyzing the mean score between the pre-test and post-test, part 1, it is clear that most students improved after the interventions. Although the improvement was not substantial, students have developed their language skills, acquiring a wide range of vocabulary that fits different contexts, as well as words, phrases, basic tenses, and simple clauses that can fit into different types of writing.

3.2 Verification of hypotheses

In the research process, the hypothesis was validated through the use of the specialized statistical software called IBM SPSS. As a first step, the normal distribution of the data was highlighted to determine whether a parametric or non-parametric test was necessary. Both tests were compared using Student's Mean T-test. In the final step, the T-test statistic was used to identify and verify the hypothesis adopted in this research.

Null hypothesis

Text-based teaching does not influence the development of writing skills in students in the second semester of Universidad Técnica de Ambato.

Alternative hypothesis

Text-based teaching influences the development of writing skills in students in the second semester of Universidad Técnica de Ambato.

Table 18

Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PRETEST	,089	40	,200	,983	40	,796
POST-TEST	,217	40	<,001	,909	40	,003

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Note: Shapiro Wilk and Smirnov Normality test (Taken from SPSS).

HO=Sig>0,05=The values are normally distributed

Ha=Sig<0,05=The values are not normally distributed

Analysis and interpretation

Table 18 above reports the results obtained from a normality assessment performed to determine the conformity of the data to a normal distribution. Since the sample sizes were less than 50 participants, both the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical normality tests were considered. But since only 40 students participated in the study, the Shapiro-Wilk test was specifically chosen for analysis. The results showed a significant level of 0.796 for the pre-test and 0.003 for the post-test, suggesting that only the pre-test data set adjusted to a normal distribution. By evaluating the parameter 'sig', it can be deduced that a normal distribution of the results was not followed. Therefore, a nonparametric test (T-Wilcoxon) had to be used to ascertain if the hypothesis is accepted or rejected.

Table 19

Non-parametric test

Hypothesis Test Summary				
1	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.^{a,b}	Decision
	The median of differences between Pre-test and Post-test equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	<,001	Reject the null hypothesis.
a. The significance level is ,050				
b. Asymptotic significance is displayed.				

Note: Non-parametric test (taken from SPSS).**Analysis and interpretation**

Table 19 illustrates the results of a non-parametric test, which shows a median difference between the pre-test and post-test equal to 0, with a significance level of 0.001. As the significance level is less than 0, the null hypothesis is rejected. In consequence, the alternative hypothesis is accepted, reaching the conclusion that the use of text-based teaching had a positive impact on the development of students' writing skills after the treatment.

Table 20

T-test-paired samples statistics

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PRETEST	5,8500	40	1,02501	,16207
	POST-TEST	8,6687	40	,77931	,12322

Note: T-test paired Sample Statistics-mean comparison (Taken from SPSS).

Analysis and interpretation

Table 20 comprises a comparison of the mean scores on a paired sample statistic between a pre-test and a post-test. Specifically, the pre-test showed a mean score of 5.8500 among 40 students, while the post-test registered an increased mean score of 8.6687. This means an improvement of 2.8187 points out of 10 between the pre-test and the post-test, which demonstrates a significant improvement. The results obtained support the acceptability of the alternative hypothesis and the rejection of the null hypothesis, suggesting the efficacy of Text-based teaching in developing writing skills.

Discussion

As research outcomes, data were obtained through 2 tests administered at the beginning and the end of the treatment carried out in the research. A favorable development could be evidenced in the results of the pre-test and post-test, showing a positive progress at the end of the treatment, in addition to the support of the automated writing evaluation tool (Perplexity) during the interventions carried out. The students would reach a positive level in their writing skills of English language by implementing the strategies, techniques and tools used during this research.

The findings from this research underscore the crucial role of continuous teacher professional development in fostering the successful implementation of text-based instruction. It is evident that targeted training plays a crucial role in empowering educators with the necessary skills to navigate the complexities of text-based teaching. By engaging in ongoing learning opportunities, teachers can better address the diverse and individualized needs of students, thereby optimizing the overall effectiveness of this pedagogical approach. As emphasized by Nomasomi and Bulelwa (2022), an inadequate understanding or misconstrued interpretation of text-based teaching, coupled with linguistic barriers and insufficient training on the part of educators, can act as significant impediments to the effective application of this instructional method.

The results of this research support text-based instruction as an effective approach to the development of writing skills in English language learners. An understanding of the benefits, the importance of initial assessment, and long-term sustainability provide a solid foundation for continued improvement of instructional practices in this area. Furthermore, this method may differ depending on the purpose, structure or lexicographic

features to be taught, but always taking text as the basis for developing a teaching and learning program (Arimbawa et al., 2012).

Moreover, the results of the research were presented in 4 criteria, which were developed during the research interventions and resulted in a breakthrough according to the results obtained in the post-test, this is corroborated with the study of (Quvanov & Jabbarova, 2023), who examined the advantages of Text-based language teaching and the result showed that this method was effective in improving the communication skills and overall writing fluency of the students. However, this method also has some disadvantages or drawbacks such as lack of motivation or cultural context in the reading materials. This research demonstrated that exposing students to authentic language, a wide variety of vocabulary and fluency can be used as a basis for teaching a wide variety of written skills.

CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

The objective of this study was to examine the impact of Text-based teaching in the writing skills development. Through this research, several findings were obtained, leading to the following conclusions:

The benefits of Text-based teaching in writing skills development regard dimensions of literacy, critical thinking. In addition to exposure to authentic language, increase of a rich variety of vocabulary. Text-based teaching can be used to teach a wide range of language skills. Investigators and teachers evidenced significant increases in writing quality, coherence, and expression. It was demonstrated that this pedagogical method has a positive impact on the development of writing skills. Emphasis was placed on the importance of teaching students explicitly how to write about the texts they read, as it sets the stage for improvement of reading and writing literacy. Providing students with explicit instruction on writing skills and engaging them in written response tasks that draw upon knowledge and language from the text have been shown to support comprehension and writing development. Therefore, text-based teaching plays a crucial role in enhancing students' writing skills and overall literacy.

The Pretest has provided valuable information about the students' level of writing proficiency prior to the implementation of Text-based teaching. Pretest results indicate that students were weak in the Communicative Achievement and language criteria where the majority of students had difficulty and had a low score. This initial assessment not only helps in identifying the starting point of students' writing abilities but also guides the tailoring of instruction to address their specific needs. Therefore, the pretest serves as a foundational tool for understanding students' writing capabilities and monitoring their growth in response to the Text-based teaching.

The post-test results reveal significant improvement in participants' writing skills after the intervention with text-based teaching, demonstrating an increase from an average of 5.85 out of 10 points in the pre-test to an average of 8.66 out of 10 points in the post-test. In particular, a further increase in the organization criteria was evidenced from the mean value obtained in the pretest to the post-test. This finding suggests that the program not only impacts in the short term, but also has positive long-term effects on the sustained development of writing skills.

4.2 Recommendations

The continued integration of text-based instruction into the curriculum is recommended, building on the pedagogical strategies and approaches identified as effective in the research. This will ensure that the benefits observed in the study are sustained and strengthened over time. To achieve this, it is essential to provide teachers with ongoing support and resources to implement text-based instruction effectively. This includes access to high-quality instructional materials, such as authentic and relevant texts, that align with the curriculum and meet the diverse needs of students. Additionally, the use of digital platforms and multimedia resources can enhance the learning experience and provide opportunities for students to engage with texts in new and exciting ways.

Given the importance of instructional materials in the success of text-based instruction, ongoing review and adaptation of instructional resources is suggested. The incorporation of authentic and relevant texts, as well as the exploration of new media, such as digital platforms, can further enrich the learning experience. Teachers can also collaborate with colleagues to share resources and best practices, ensuring that the implementation of text-based instruction is consistent and effective across classrooms.

To optimize the implementation of text-based instruction, a proactive approach to teacher professional development is recommended. Specific training sessions, workshops, and additional educational resources can equip educators with the skills necessary to implement this approach effectively, addressing the specific needs of their students. Professional development opportunities can also provide teachers with opportunities to reflect on their practice, receive feedback, and refine their instructional strategies to better support student learning. Therefore, investing in teacher professional development is crucial to the successful implementation of text-based instruction and the continued improvement of students' writing skills and overall literacy.

C. REFERENCES

- Naqvi, S. (2012). *Methods of Teaching. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)*, https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnaec875.pdf.
- Abdullah, F. (2009). *Assessing EAP needs for the university. VDM Publishing*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281710241_Assessing_EAP_needs_for_the_university.
- Acat, B., & Dönmez, İ. (2009). To compare student centred education and teacher centred education in primary science and technology lesson in terms of learning environments. *Elsevier*, Volume 1, Issue 1, Pages 1805-1809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.320>.
- Aithal, S., & Aithal, S. (2023). *New Research Models under Exploratory Research Method In book: Emergence and Research in Interdisciplinary Management and Information Technology. New Delhi Publisher*, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8078719.
- Alharthi, T. (2020). *Implementation of Communication Strategies for Lexical Difficulties in Writing Production. International Journal of Linguistics*, <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v12i1.16500>.
- Allen, M. B. (1995). *Listening: The Forgotten Skill: A Self-Teaching Guide. Wiley Publishing Company*, <https://www.amazon.com/Listening-Forgotten-Skill-Self-Teaching-Guide/dp/0471015873>.
- Arimbawa, N., Pendidikan, J., & Pasca, F. (2012). Text-based approach to efl teaching and learning in indonesia. *PRASI: Jurnal Bahasa, Seni, dan Pengajarannya*, Vol.8 No.13 PP.9-13. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/PRASI/article/view/431/4647>.
- Bachani, M. (2003). *Teaching Writing. Waymade*, Retrieved from <http://www.waymadedu.org/pdf/Teaching%20Writing.pdf>.
- Benson, B. (1997). *Coming to Terms: Scaffolding. The English Journal*, pp. 126-127. <https://doi.org/10.2307/819879>.
- Bouzar, S. (2021). *EFL Writing Skills Development Through Literature. Education and Linguistics Research*, Vol. 7, No. 2. doi:10.5296/elr.v7i2.18835.

- Briesmaster, M., & Etchegaray, P. (2017). Coherence and cohesion in EFL students' writing production: The impact of a metacognition-based intervention. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, DOI:10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n02a02.
- Brooks, N. (1960). *Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company (Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company), pp. 45-47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100004953>.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning And Teaching*. *TESOL Quarterly*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586319>.
- Brun-Mercer, N., & Zimmerman, C. B. (2015). Fostering Academic Vocabulary Use in Writing. *The CATESOL Journal*, pp.131-148. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1111751.pdf>.
- Burns, A. (2012). Chapter 15 Text-Based Teaching from *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 140 - 148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024778.019>.
- Cambridge. (2023). B1 Preliminary for schools: Handbook for teachers. *Cambridge University press*, <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/168143-cambridge-english-preliminary-for-schools-teachers-handbook.pdf>.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, Pages 1–47., <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>.
- Chappell, V. (2011). *What makes writing so important?* . Retrieved from Retrieved October 16, 2023, from <http://www.marquette.edu/wac/>
- Chew , P. (2005). Change and continuity: English language teaching in Singapore. *Asian EFL Journal* 7(1), http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/March_05_pc.pdf.
- Christie, F. (2003). English in Australia. *RELC Journal*, pp.100-119. DOI: 10.1177/003368820303400107.
- CRESWELL, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications, https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf.

- Deng, L., Liu, H., Chen, P., Chen, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2003). A systematic study of process approach and its implications for the teaching reforms of college English writing. *Foreign Language Education*, 6, 58-62.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). Exploring how texts work. *Primary English Teaching Association*, 978-1-925132-56-4.
- Devi, B., Lepcha, N., & Basnet, S. (2023). Application of correlational research design in nursing and medical research. *Journal of Xi'an Shiyou University*, DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/YRZ68.
- Durán Escribano, P. (1999). Teaching writing through reading: a text-centred approach. *Redalyc*, pp. 55-62. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2870/287026296004.pdf>.
- Faraj, A. K. (2015). Scaffolding EFL Students' Writing through the Writing Process. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol.6, No.13, 2015. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080494.pdf>.
- Feez, S. (1998). Text-Based Syllabus Design. *tional Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University : Ames Quality Language & Literacy Services.*, <https://worldcat.org/es/title/text-based-syllabus-design/oclc/926983745>.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). An Introduction to Language. *Wadworth Cengage Learning*, <https://ces.wu.ac.th/news/03/n25967.pdf>.
- Go, A. (1994). Prewriting Activities: Focus on the Process of Writing. *ERIC*, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED369257>.
- Guil-an, A. (2018). 5 Pedagogical Approaches in Teaching. *Academia.edu*, https://www.academia.edu/35955322/5_Pedagogical_Approaches_in_Teaching.
- Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective (2nd ed.). *Oxford University Press*, 978-0194371544.
- Hammond, J., & Derewianka, B. (2001). The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. *Cambridge university press*, Chapter 27, pp.186-193.

https://ia800507.us.archive.org/24/items/ilhem_20150321_1654/%5BDavid_Nunan%2C_Ronald_Carter%5D_The_Cambridge_guide_t.pdf.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman Harmer, <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820103200109>.

Harmon, P. (2014). *Business Process Change: A Business Process Management Guide for Managers and Process Professionals: Third Edition*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296910595_Business_Process_Change_A_Business_Process_Management_Guide_for_Managers_and_Process_Professionals_Third_Edition.

He, A. W., & Young, R. F. (1998). *Language Proficiency Interviews: A Discourse Approach*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sibil.14.02he>.

Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing (Resource Books for Teachers)*. Oxford University Press, <https://www.amazon.es/Writing-Resource-Teachers-Tricia-1988-07-01/dp/B01K2F55PC>.

Ho, D., & Henry, A. (2014). A Text-Based Approach to Teaching Writing in the ESL Classroom. *Peter Lang*, pp.209-230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-03737-1>.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge university press, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251>.

Hyland, K. (2021). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003198451>.

Hymes, D. (2009). On communicative competence. In *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.IIE (Institute of International Education). , pp.269–293. .

Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in Three Traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, Volume 30, Issue 4. DOI:10.2307/3587930.

Iftanti, E. (2017). Text-based learning (tbl) to activate adult efl learners in learning english: a narrative inquiry. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, Vol. 9, No.1. [10.21274/ls.2017.9.1.121-142](https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.2017.9.1.121-142).

- Ismail, S. (2011). Exploring Students' Perceptions of ESL Writing. *Canadian Center of Science and Education (CCSE)*, doi:10.5539/elt.v4n2p73 .
- Jacobs, G. (2001). Providing the Scaffold: A Model for Early Childhood/Primary Teacher Preparation. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, pp.125-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1012581113983>.
- Johansson, C., Hartelius, L., Wengelin, Å., & Henriksson, I. (2021). Written text production and its relationship to writing processes and spelling ability in persons with post-stroke aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 35:5, 615-632. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2020.1712585>.
- Klimova, B. F. (2013). The Importance of Writing. *Indian Journal of Research, Paripex*, pp. 9-11. <https://doi.org/10.15373/22501991/JAN2013/4>.
- Kortmann, B. (2005). *English Linguistics: Essentials*. Berlin: Cornelsen, 9783476056771, 9783476056788.
- Lange, V. L. (2002). Retrieved from <https://cmapspublic3.ihmc.us/rid=1KDMQQ3X2-N5J29C-W4P/Scaffolding%20Paper.pdf>
- Lombardi, P. (2018). Instructional Methods Strategies and Technologies to meet the needs of all learners. *LibreTexts*, <https://batch.libretexts.org/print/Letter/Finished/socialsci-87116/Full.pdf>.
- Lund, U. (2018). Academic Writing in English. Retrieved from Register types: <https://awelu.lu.se/language/register-and-style/register-types/>.
- Mackey, A. (2007). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*. Oxford University Press., 978-0-19-442326-7.
- Maley, A. (2009). Creative writing for language learners (and teachers). *British Council*, Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/professional-development/teachers/understanding-learners/articles/creative-writing-language>.
- Manchón, R. (2011). Writing to learn the language. *John Benjamins Publishing Company*, Chapter 4. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.31.07man>.
- McCarthy, M., & Slade, D. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Hodder Arnold, DOI: 10.4324/9780429424465-4.

- Mohlabi-Tlaka, N., de Jager, L., & Engelbrecht, A. (2017). Policy, practice, purpose: the text-based approach in contemporary south african efal classrooms. *Per Linguam: A Journal for Language Learning*, PP.22-35. <https://doi.org/10.5785/33-2-713>.
- Moran, K. (2019). A Review of Research Methods Trends in Educational Leadership Journals. *ICPEL Education Leadership Review*, <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-Review-of-Research-Methods-Trends-in-Educational-Jackson/beeef5097aeff0355491631b9e3efef94c8943f4>.
- Muncie, J. (2002). Finding a place for grammar in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.2.180>.
- Nagaraju , C., Madhavaiah, G., & Peter, S. (2013). Teacher-Centred Learning and Student-Centred Learning in English Classroom: the Teaching Methods Realizing the Dreams of Language Learners. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews*, https://www.ijssr.org/down_222.php.
- Nomasomi , H., & Bulelwa, M. (2022). Effective Implementation of the Text-Based Approach in English Second Language Classrooms. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (EHASS)*, pp 488-498. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.20223106>.
- Olofsson, M. (2010). Symposium 2009. Genre and functional language in theory and in practice. *Stockholms universitets förlag*, <https://www.worldcat.org/es/title/symposium-2009-gener-och-funktionellt-sprak-i-teori-och-praktik/oclc/780160227>.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. A&C Black, 082648557X, 9780826485571.
- Pandey Parbati, Madhusudhan, M., & Singh, B. (2023). Quantitative Research Approach and its Applications in Library and Information Science Research. *Access An International Journal of Nepal Library Association*, DOI: 10.3126/access.v2i01.58895.
- Pettis, J. (2007). Implementation of the Canadian language benchmarks in Manitoba: 1996 to present. *Prospect*, Vol. 22 (3), 32-65.

- Pranoto, T. (2004). Creative writing: 72 jurus seni mengarang [Creative writing: 72 techniques for the art of composing]. *PT. Primadia Pustaka*.
- Quvanov, A. Z., & Jabbarova, A. J. (2023). Advantages and Disadvantages of Text-Based Language Teaching to Future Pedagogues. *Eurasian Scientific Herald*, 51–54. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/esh/article/view/3699>.
- Ragawanti, D. (2018). Text-based learning in EFL classrooms: Problems and strategies viewed from the sociocultural approach. *Atlantis Press*, volume 188, page 141-146. <https://doi.org/10.2991/eltilt-18.2019.29>.
- Rahimi, M., & Jun, L. Z. (2018). Effects of Task Complexity and Planning Conditions on L2 Argumentative Writing Production. *Discourse Processes*, pp.726-742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2017.1336042>.
- Rasmussen, J. (2001). The importance of communication in teaching: A systems-theory approach to the scaffolding metaphor. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Volume 33, Issue 5, p.569-582. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220270110034369>.
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2014). Text-Based Instruction. In *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*, pp. 200-214. doi:10.1017/9781009024532.013.
- Roach, K., & Roskvist, A. (2007). ESOL provision for adult immigrants and refugees in New Zealand: Policy, practice and research. . *Prospect*, 22 (3), 44-64.
- Roberts, C., & Cooke, M. (2009). Authenticity in the Adult ESOL Classroom and Beyond. *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)*, pp. 620-642 (23 pages) <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27785047>.
- Robinson, P. (2011). Second language task complexity, the Cognition Hypothesis, language learning, and performance. *John Benjamins Publishing company*, DOI: 10.1075/tblt.2.05ch1.
- Rustipa, K., Yulistiyanti, & Mulatsih, S. (2021). Text-Based Language Teaching in the New-Normal Era to Achieve Communicative Competence: Challenges for EFL Teachers . *CRIPT JOURNAL Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*, Vol. 6 No. 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24903/sj.v6i2.763>.

- Sager, R. (2021, July 06). *Weareteachers*. Retrieved from What is scaffolding?: <https://www.weareteachers.com/what-is-scaffolding-in-education/>
- Sagvan, M., Berivan, A., & Sherwan, T. (2023). The Importance of Prewriting Strategies in the Students' Writing Production. *International Journal on Humanities and Social Sciences*, <https://doi.org/10.33193/IJoHSS.45.2023.573>.
- Seely, J. (1998). *The Oxford guide to effective writing and speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/oxford-guide-to-effective-writing-and-speaking-9780199652709>.
- Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2005). *The TKT (Teaching Knowledge Test) Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 13-978-0-521-60992 0.
- staff, T. C. (2010). TEAL Center Fact Sheet No. 6: Student-Centered Learning. *TEAL teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy*, <https://www.studocu.com/ph/document/rizal-high-school/practical-research/6-teal-student-centered/40585435>.
- Stewart, M., Belle, J., Donner, A., McWhinney, I., Oates, J., Weston, W., & Jordan, J. (2000). The Impact of Patient-Centered Care on Outcomes. *The Journal of family practice*, pp.796-804. <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/central/doi/10.1002/central/CN-00331280/full>.
- Sun, D. (2014). From Communicative Competence to Interactional Competence: A New Outlook to the Teaching of Spoken English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 1062-1070. 10.4304/jltr.5.5.1062-1070.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., 0521338131.
- Tarvin, L. D. (2015). Communicative Competence: Its Definition, Connection to Teaching, and Relationship with Interactional Competence. *ResearchGate*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3214.2807>.

- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Chapter 28: Material development from *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, pp.269-278. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024778>.
- Troia, G. (2014). Evidence-Based Practices for Writing Instruction. *Cedar Center*, Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website: https://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/IC-5_FINAL_08-31-14.pdf.
- Van den Branden, K. (2006). Task-based Language Education. *Cambridge University Press*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667282>.
- Vygotsky, L., Cole, M., Jolm-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., & Souberman, E. (1978). *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4>.
- Walsh, K. (2010). The Importance of Writing Skills: Online Tools to Encourage Success. *Online Tools to Encourage Success*, Retrieved October 16, 2023, from <http://www.emergingedtech.com>.
- Winarsih, D., & Munir, S. (2021). How Text-Based Teaching Promote Dimensions of Literacy Skills in EFL Class. *JURNAL TA'DIB*, Vol 24 (1):33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31958/jt.v24i1.2813>.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, Volume 17, Issue 2 p. 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>.
- Yakhontova, T. (2003). English academic Writing for Students and Researchers. *Ivan Franko: National University of Lviv*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279995442_English_Academic_Writing_for_Students_and_Researchers.
- Yaqub, M. (2019). Choosing an appropriate teaching methodology. *ResearchGate*, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332548905>.

Zohrabi, M., ali Torabi, M., & Baybourdiani, P. (2012). Teacher-centered and/or Student-centered Learning: English Language in Iran. *English Language and Literature Studies Journal*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ells.v2n3p18>.

D. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Authorization Document



UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA DE AMBATO
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS Y DE LA EDUCACIÓN
SECRETARÍA DE FACULTAD

Av. Los Chasquis y Río Guayllabamba (Campus Huachi) / Teléfono (03) 2 990-261/Casilla 334

Ambato-Ecuador

Ambato 03 octubre 2023

Res. Nº FCHE-CD- 2526 -2023

Señores/as

PÉREZ BARAHONA ABNER STEEVEN

Estudiante de la Carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nac. y Extr., Modalidad presencial
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS HUMANAS Y DE LA EDUCACIÓN

Presente

De mi consideración:

Consejo Directivo de la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y de la Educación, en sesión ordinaria realizada el 03 octubre del 2023 en atención a la solicitud presentada por el/la estudiante **PÉREZ BARAHONA ABNER STEEVEN** sobre el tema **"TEXT-BASED TEACHING AND WRITING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT"**, por usted propuesto resuelve:

DESIGNAR A LA DOCENTE **MG. XIMENA CALERO** COMO TUTOR DEL TRABAJO DE TITULACION VINCULADO A UN PROYECTO DE INVESTIGACIÓN: **"TECNOLOGÍAS EMERGENTES EN EL DESARROLLO DE LA DESTREZA ESCRITA DEL IDIOMA INGLÉS COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA EN ESTUDIANTES UNIVERSITARIOS DE LA ZONA 3"** QUIÉN OBLIGATORIAMENTE REALIZARÁ EL REFERIDO PROCESO EN CONFORMIDAD LO ESTABLECE EL **ART.17** "REGLAMENTO PARA LA TITULACIÓN DE GRADO EN LA UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA DE AMBATO

ESTIPULA: Artículo 17.- Del tiempo para el desarrollo del trabajo de titulación. – El estudiante deberá asistir a las tutorías planificadas conjuntamente con el tutor para el desarrollo del trabajo de titulación, concluir y aprobar la modalidad de titulación escogida en el período académico destinado en la malla curricular. Se entenderá que el estudiante concluye y aprueba su trabajo de titulación únicamente cuando haya realizado la sustentación de este.

SE RECOMIENDA QUE EN LA EJECUCION DEL TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN SE TOMA EN CUENTA LA REDACCIÓN, ORTOGRAFIA, EL NOMBRE DE LA CARRERA Y EL TITULO A OBTENER CORRECTO.

Atentamente,

Dr. Mg. Víctor Hernández del Salto
PRESIDENTE

C.C DIRECTOR DE PROYECTO Adj: Proyecto
SECRETARIA DE CARRERA - CARPETA ESTUDIANTIL
ARCHIVO NUMERICO CONSEJO DIRECTIVO

VHS/CVD/JAB

Annex 2: Carta de compromiso

**ANEXO 3
FORMATO DE LA CARTA DE COMPROMISO**

CARTA DE COMPROMISO

Ambato, 05 de Octubre 2023

Doctor
Marcelo Nuñez
Presidente
Unidad de titulación
Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y de la Educación

Yo, Mg. Sarah Iza en mi calidad Coordinadora de la Carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros, me permito poner en su conocimiento la aceptación y respaldo para el desarrollo del Trabajo de Titulación bajo el Tema: "Text-based teaching and writing skills development" propuesto por el estudiante Pérez Barahona Abner Steeven, portador de la Cédula de Ciudadanía, 185075582-6 estudiante de la Carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y de la Educación de la Universidad Técnica de Ambato.

A nombre de la Institución a la cual represento, me comprometo a apoyar en el desarrollo del proyecto.

Particular que comunico a usted para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente.



Lcda. Sarah Jacqueline Iza Pazmiño, Mg.
Coordinadora de la Carrera
0501741060
0984060528
sj.iza@uta.edu.ec



Annex 3: *Formato para solicitar la calificación del informe final del trabajo de titulación*

ANEXO 10
FORMATO PARA SOLICITAR LA CALIFICACIÓN DEL INFORME FINAL
DEL TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN

Ambato, 05 de Enero 2024

Doctor
Víctor Hernández
Presidente
Consejo Directivo
Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y de la Educación
Presente

De mi consideración:

Yo, Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona con cédula de ciudadanía No 185075582-6, estudiante de la Carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros, de la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y de la Educación, habiendo completado los requisitos establecidos en el artículo 10 del Reglamento para la obtención del Título de Tercer Nivel de la Universidad Técnica de Ambato, solicito muy comedidamente se realice la calificación del **INFORME FINAL DEL TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN** con el tema: "Text-based teaching and writing skills development".

Por la favorable atención que se dé al presente, agradezco y suscribo

Atentamente



.....
Abner Steeven Pérez Barahona
185075582-6
0992506534
aperez5826@uta.edu.ec

Annex 4: Pre and Post-test

PRE-TEST FORMAT

Time 45 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Do not open this question paper until you are told to do so.
- **Write your name and date on your answer sheet if they are not already there.**
- Read the instructions for each part of the paper carefully.
- Answer the Part 1 question and one question from Part 2. Write your answers on the answer sheet.
- Write clearly in **pen**, not pencil. You may make alterations, but make sure your work is easy to read.
- You **must** complete the answer sheet within the time limit.
- At the end of the test, hand in both this question paper and your answer sheet.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

Each question in this paper carries equal marks.

Part 1

You must answer this question.

Write your answer in about 100 words on the answer sheet.

Question 1

Read this email from your English-speaking friend Sandy and the notes you have made.

EMAIL

From: Sandy

Subject: Your visit!

Hi,

I'm so excited that you're coming to stay with me for a week!

Me too!

On your first evening here, there's a rock concert in our town. Would you like to go to the concert or would you prefer us to relax at home?

Say which I prefer

Also, shall we go climbing in the mountains while you're here?

No, because ...

Let me know if you have any questions.

Ask Sandy ...

See you soon

Sandy

Write your **email** to Sandy using **all the notes**.

Part 2

Choose **one** of these questions.

Write your answer in about **100 words** on the answer sheet.

Question 2

You see this notice on an English-language website

Articles wanted!

FILMS

What kind of films do you enjoy?

Do you prefer watching them at the cinema or at home? Why?

Write an article answering these questions and we will put it on our website!

Write your **article**.

Question 3

Your English teacher has asked you to write a story.

Your story must begin with this sentence.

As the plane flew lower, Lou saw the golden beaches of the island below.

Write your **story**.

Candidate name: _____

Difficulty: B1 Intermediate level

Time: 45 minutes

ANSWER SHEET

You must write within the grey lines

Write your answer for Part 1 below.

Question 1	

This section for use by Examiner only:

C	CA	O	L

Answer only one of the two questions for Part 2.

Tick the box to show which question you have answered.

Write your answer below.

Part 2	Question 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input type="checkbox"/>

This section for use by Examiner only:

C	CA	O	L

POST-TEST FORMAT

Time 45 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Do not open this question paper until you are told to do so.
- **Write your name and date on your answer sheet if they are not already there.**
- Read the instructions for each part of the paper carefully.
- Answer the Part 1 question and one question from Part 2. Write your answers on the answer sheet.
- Write clearly in **pen**, not pencil. You may make alterations, but make sure your work is easy to read.
- You **must** complete the answer sheet within the time limit.
- At the end of the test, hand in both this question paper and your answer sheet.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

Each question in this paper carries equal marks.

Part 1

You must answer this question.

Write your answer in about **80-100 words** on the answer sheet.

Question 1

Read this email from your English teacher Mrs Lake and the notes you have made.

EMAIL

From: Mrs Lake

Subject: End of year party

Dear Class,

I'd like our class to have a party to celebrate the end of the school year.

We could either have a party in the classroom or we could go to the park. Which would you prefer to do?

What sort of activities or games should we do during the party?

What food do you think we should have at the party?

Reply soon!

Anna Lake

Great!

Explain

Suggest ...

Tell Mrs Lake

Write your **email** to Mrs Lake using **all the notes**.

Part 2

Choose **one** of these questions.

Write your answer in about **80-100 words** on the answer sheet.

Question 2

You see this announcement in your school English-language magazine.

Articles wanted!

WHAT MAKES YOU LAUGH?

Write an article telling us what you find funny and who you enjoy laughing with.

Do you think it's good to laugh a lot? Why?

The best articles answering these questions will be published next month.

Write your **article**.

Question 3

Your English teacher has asked you to write a story.

Your story must begin with this sentence.

Jo looked at the map and decided to go left.

Write your **story**.

Candidate name: _____

Difficulty: B1 Intermediate level

Time: 45 minutes

ANSWER SHEET

You must write within the grey lines

Write your answer for Part 1 below.

Question 1	

This section for use by Examiner only:

C	CA	O	L

Annex 5: Rubric for assessing writing for Cambridge English Qualifications

B1	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language
5	All content is relevant to the task. Target reader is fully informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is generally well organized and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices	Uses a range of everyday vocabulary appropriately, with occasional inappropriate use of less common lexis. Uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control. Errors do not impede communication.
4	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5</i>			
3	Minor irrelevances and/or omissions may be present. Target reader is on the whole informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task in generally appropriate ways to communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is connected and coherent, using basic linking words and a limited number of cohesive devices.	Uses everyday vocabulary generally appropriately, while occasionally overusing certain lexis. Uses simple grammatical forms with a good degree of control. While errors are noticeable, meaning can still be determined.
2	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.</i>			
1	Irrelevances and misinterpretation of task may be present. Target reader is minimally informed.	Produces text that communicates simple ideas in simple ways.	Text is connected using basic, high frequency linking words.	Uses basic vocabulary reasonably appropriately. Uses simple grammatical forms with some degree of control. Errors may impede meaning at times.
0	Content is totally irrelevant. Target reader is not informed.	<i>Performance below Band 1.</i>		

Source: <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/168143-cambridge-english-preliminary-for-schools-teachers-handbook.pdf>

Annex 6: Lessons plans

Teachers' name: Steeven Pérez

Date: 07th Nov, 2023

LESSON PLAN #1				
Topic:		Describing a good friend		
Students:		40 students of Second semester of PINE.		
Time:		60 minutes.		
Main aim:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop a description of a good friend 		
Subsidiary aims:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop students' ability to organize their ideas and connect them coherently. To enhance students' ability to write an Email. To promote a correct use of automated writing evaluation tools. 		
Assumptions:		Students can use the appropriate tenses for the writing activities.		
Anticipated problems:		Students may have difficulties understanding the readings.		
Possible solutions:		Ask students about words they do not understand and show them their meaning.		
TIMING	PROCEDURE	STAGE AIM	AIDS AND MATERIALS	INTERACTION PATTERNS
15 minutes	<p>Pre-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher asks students: What are the qualities of a good friend? and requests them to brainstorm ideas on the board. - Teacher shares a reading text (Email) describing a good friend. - Then, teacher will propose how to write an Email: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Greeting Introductory paragraph Idea 1 Idea 2 Idea 3 	<p>To introduce the topic.</p> <p>To give an example.</p>	<p>Canva presentation (Annex #1)</p> <p>Sheet of paper</p>	Teacher – whole class.

	<p>6. Farewell paragraph 7. Farewell 8. Signature</p> <p>- Teacher requests students to make a list of qualities of their best friends.</p>	To encourage students to share their ideas.		
25 minutes	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher asks students to organize their ideas and write an Email describing their best friends (100-150 words), they will follow the process shown above.</p>	To encourage students to reflect on their friends and practice their writing skills.	Sheet of paper.	
20 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher asks students to revise their first drafts and correct spelling, capitalization and grammar</p> <p>- Then, Students will transcribe their corrected drafts in PERPLEXITY, in order to identify mistakes. Students will upload evidences (screenshots) of their final draft in the google document inside the shared folder.</p>	<p>To identify writing mistakes.</p> <p>To use of automated writing evaluation tools.</p>	Perplexity (Annex #4)	Teacher – whole class.

	The teacher will assign grades and give feedback to students' writing based on the evidence.			
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEXES:

Annex #1: Canva presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFxbH5kfc/_4UNuG4Kn9a42Tpc9A-wGA/edit?utm_content=DAFxbH5kfc&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sharebutton

Annex #2: Rubric

	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language
5	All content is relevant to the task. Target reader is fully informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is generally well organized and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices	Uses a range of everyday vocabulary appropriately, with occasional inappropriate use of less common lexis. Uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control. Errors do not impede communication.
4	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5</i>			
3	Minor irrelevances and/or omissions may be present. Target reader is on the whole informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task in generally appropriate ways to communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is connected and coherent, using basic linking words and a limited number of cohesive devices.	Uses everyday vocabulary generally appropriately, while occasionally overusing certain lexis. Uses simple grammatical forms with a good degree of control. While errors are noticeable, meaning can still be determined.
2	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.</i>			
1	Irrelevances and misinterpretation of task may be present.	Produces text that communicates simple ideas in simple ways.	Text is connected using basic, high frequency linking words.	Uses basic vocabulary reasonably appropriately. Uses simple grammatical forms with some degree of control.

	Target reader is minimally informed.			Errors may impede meaning at times.
0	Content is totally irrelevant. Target reader is not informed.	<i>Performance below Band 1.</i>		

Annex #3: Perplexity

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #4: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/EvvgoOk72uxPoiJ61ntW76UBytQ5hBwz4vFOKlhIsl6Upw?e=4SFepe

Teachers' name: Steeven Pérez

Date: 14th Nov, 2023

LESSON PLAN #2				
Topic:		Sharing life experiences		
Students:		40 students of Second semester of PINE.		
Time:		60 minutes.		
Main aim:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop a description of a memorable experience. 		
Subsidiary aims:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop students' ability to organize their ideas and connect them coherently. To enhance students' ability to write a basic paragraph. To promote a correct use of automated writing evaluation tools. 		
Assumptions:		Students can use the appropriate tenses for the writing activities.		
Anticipated problems:		Students may have difficulties understanding the readings.		
Possible solutions:		Ask students about words they do not understand and show them their meaning.		
TIMING	PROCEDURE	STAGE AIM	AIDS AND MATERIALS	INTERACTION PATTERNS
15 minutes	<p>Pre-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher presents a series of images (activities done in teacher's last vacations) and invites the students to describe them. - Teacher shares a reading text about a past experience (based on the images he has shown). - Then, teacher will explain briefly how to write a basic paragraph: Process: 	<p>To introduce the topic.</p> <p>To give an example.</p>	Canva presentation (Annex #1)	Teacher – whole class.

	<p>1. Topic sentence.</p> <p>2. The first main idea followed by its examples.</p> <p>3. The second main idea followed by its examples.</p> <p>4. Summary.</p> <p>- Teacher asks, 'What was your best experience?' and requests students to write 5 sentences on the PADLET® platform to describe that experience.</p>	<p>To encourage students to share their experiences and ideas.</p>	<p>Padlet (Annex #2)</p>	
<p>25 minutes</p>	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher presents a list of linking words students may use (Linking words for adding, sequencing, illustrating, cause and effect, comparing, contrasting, emphasising and summarizing information).</p> <p>- The teacher asks students to organize their ideas written in PADLET and asks them to write a paragraph on a piece of paper describing the experience (80-</p>	<p>To encourage students to reflect on their experiences and practice their writing skills.</p>	<p>Sheet of paper.</p>	

	120 words), they will follow the process presented above and connect it correctly.			
20 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher gets students in pairs and asks them to exchange their writings, review their classmates' writings and give feedback using the rubric given by the teacher. - Teacher asks students to correct the first draft with their classmates' suggestions (in the shared folder). - Students upload their corrected writings in PERPLEXITY, in order to identify mistakes. Then, students will upload evidences (screenshots) of the results in the google document inside the shared folder. 	<p>To identify writing mistakes.</p> <p>To help students identify and correct errors in their writing.</p> <p>To use of automated writing evaluation tools.</p>	<p>Rubric (Annex #3)</p> <p>Perplexity (Annex #4)</p>	<p>Pairs.</p> <p>Teacher – whole class.</p>

	The teacher will assign grades and give feedback to students' writing based on the evidence.			
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEXES:

Annex #1: Canva presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFwNM5rxxc/bYkf5D1sefJEQEAs_jc2ow/edit?utm_content=DAFwNM5rxxc&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sharebutton

Annex #2: Padlet Platform

<https://padlet.com/abnerperez0102/what-was-your-best-experience-trnr48df07ve1jls>

Annex #3: Perplexity IA

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #4: Rubric

Written by:.....

Reviewed by:.....

SINGLE PARAGRAPH RUBRIC					
	1	2	3	4	POINTS
Topic Sentence (main idea)	- Topic sentence unclear. - Incorrectly placed. - Not re-worded in closing sentence.	- Topic sentence unclear. - Incorrectly placed. - Re-worded in closing sentence.	- Topic sentence incorrectly placed. - Re-worded in closing sentence.	- Clear topic. - Correctly placed. - Re-worded in closing sentence.	
Supporting Sentence (details)	- No supporting details that relate to main idea.	- One supporting details that relate to main idea.	One supporting detail that relate to main idea.	Two or more supporting details that relate to main idea.	
Organization	- Details are not in logical or expected order.	- Some details are not in logical or expected order. - Reader is distracted.	- Details are in logical order. - Order makes writing less interesting.	- Details are in logical order. - Order keeps the reader interested.	

Mechanics and grammar	- <u>Six or more</u> punctuation, capitalization and spelling errors.	- <u>Three to five</u> punctuation, capitalization and spelling errors.	- <u>One or two</u> punctuation, capitalization and spelling errors.	- <u>No errors</u> in punctuation, capitalization and spelling.	
Legibility	- Writing is not readable.	- Writing is not readable in places.	- Marginally readable.	- Readable hand writing.	
TOTAL					/20

Annex #5: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/Eg7XI5FgqapOpCZkHlbyVDUBXzt_oUbgnlLrBCLadHI5PQ?e=CFf3nY

Teachers' name: Steeven Pérez

Date: 20th Nov, 2023

LESSON PLAN #3				
Topic:		Talking about movies.		
Students:		30 students of Second semester of PINE.		
Time:		60 minutes.		
Main aim:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To elaborate a film review. 		
Subsidiary aims:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop critical thinking skills by analyzing and evaluating a movie. To encourage students to share their opinions and preferences about movies. 		
Assumptions:		Students can use the appropriate tenses for the writing activities.		
Anticipated problems:		Students may have difficulties understanding the readings.		
Possible solutions:		Ask students about words they do not understand and show them their meaning.		
TIMING	PROCEDURE	STAGE AIM	AIDS AND MATERIALS	INTERACTION PATTERNS
20 minutes	<p>Pre-writing task</p> <p>- Students play 'Guess the movie' on Wordwall platform (Students read a short movie description and choose which movie it corresponds to).</p> <p>-Teacher shares a reading text of a movie review. Then, he suggests the following process for writing a movie review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Start with the film's title. 2. The type of film. When it was released. 	<p>To introduce the topic.</p> <p>To give an example.</p>	<p>Wordwall (Annex #1)</p> <p>Canva presentation (Annex #2)</p>	Teacher – whole class.

	<p>3. Explain the film's story but don't explain the ending!</p> <p>4. Your opinion of the film.</p> <p>5. Should people go and watch the film? Why?</p> <p>- Teacher leads a brainstorming based on the 5 steps previously covered.</p>	To encourage students to share about their preferences.		
25 minutes	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher requests students to select a movie and write a review following the 5 suggested steps (120-150 words).</p>	To practice writing skills.	Worksheet (Annex #3)	Teacher – whole class.
15 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher asks students to correct mistakes of their writings in the word document into the shared folder, based on their classmates' feedback.</p> <p>Then, Teacher requests students to upload their writings on PERPLEXITY platform and upload the</p>	<p>To identify and correct mistakes.</p> <p>To help students identify and correct errors in their writing.</p>	<p>Rubric (Annex #4)</p> <p>Perplexity (Annex #5)</p>	Teacher – whole class.

	<p>results in the shared folder.</p> <p>- Teacher will assign grades and feedback of students writing based on the evidence.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEXES:


Annex #1: Wordwall

<https://wordwall.net/resource/57950277>

Annex #2: Canva presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFwUbvXeP8/rC6cgFkOzqVFfVIqCSMMUg/view?utm_content=DAFwUbvXeP8&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link&utm_source=publishsharelink

Annex #3: Worksheet



LearnEnglish Teens

Writing skills practice: Film review – writing practice

Write a review of your favorite movie Name:.....

Date:

① _____

②

③

④

⑤

☆☆☆☆☆ Fantastic! ☆☆ Bad

☆☆☆☆ Really good! ☆ Terrible!

☆☆☆ OK

www.britishcouncil.org/learnenglishteens

© The British Council, 2012 The United Kingdom's international organisation for educational opportunities and cultural relations. We are registered in England as a charity.

Annex #4: Rubric

Written by:.....

Reviewed by:.....

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Organization Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	Information is very organized with a well-constructed opinion and supporting detail.	Information is organized with a well-constructed opinion.	Information is organized, but paragraphs are not well-constructed.	The information appears to be disorganized.
Character/Setting/Plot Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	The review focuses on the following areas: character(s), setting, and plot.	The review focuses 2 of 3: character, setting, plot.	The review includes only one of the following: character, setting, and plot.	The review does not include a description of character, setting, or plot.
Opinion/Supporting Details Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	My review has a strong opinion that is supported by 2-3 details (good or bad).	My review has a strong opinion, but it is not strongly supported by details.	My review does not have any supporting details, but it does have an opinion.	My review does not have a strong opinion or supporting details. My opinion may not be clear.
Spelling Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	All of the words from the no excuse list are spelled correctly.	A few words (2-3) on the no excuse list are spelled incorrectly.	Many words (4-6), including the no excuse words, are spelled incorrectly.	More than 7 words are spelled incorrectly.
Mechanics Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Almost no grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors	A few grammatical spelling, or punctuation errors.	Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.

Annex #5: Perplexity IA

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #6: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/Eu6lSn11NjVArRlso0jaa24B02hAFEE0yNm14FoTQS3Mbw?e=GZWbG0

	<p>hotel review of a guest).</p> <p>-The teacher suggests adding the following information when writing a hotel review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Name of the Hotel. •Where is it located? •What services are offered? •What makes it special? •Personal opinion. <p>- Teacher requests students to think about a hotel they have stayed in and write down a list with its information based on the 5 points presented above (in their notebooks).</p>	critically about accommodation.		
25 minutes	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher asks students to organize their ideas and write a hotel review in a word document (into the shared folder) as the example presented before (100-200 words).</p> <p>Teacher suggests a list of linking</p>	To develop critical thinking skills.	Word document	Teacher – whole class.

	words to use: (for adding, sequencing, illustrating, cause and effect, comparing, contrasting, emphasizing and summarizing information).			
15 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher asks students to revise their draft and correct spelling, capitalization and grammar. - Then, Teacher asks students to upload their writings on PERPLEXITY platform and upload the results in the word document into the shared folder. - Teacher will assign grades and feedback of students writing based on the evidence. 	<p>To identify and correct mistakes.</p> <p>To help students identify errors in their writing.</p>	Perplexity (Annex #4)	Teacher – whole class.

ANNEXES:

Annex #1: You Tube video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wyqfYJX231g>

Annex #2: Canva presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFwU5-bxEM/uTMx8lrGSCiJfegZrS5f2Q/view?utm_content=DAFwU5-bxEM&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link&utm_source=publishsharelink

Annex #3: Rubric

	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language
5	All content is relevant to the task. Target reader is fully informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is generally well organized and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices	Uses a range of everyday vocabulary appropriately, with occasional inappropriate use of less common lexis. Uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control. Errors do not impede communication.
4	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5</i>			
3	Minor irrelevances and/or omissions may be present. Target reader is on the whole informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task in generally appropriate ways to communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is connected and coherent, using basic linking words and a limited number of cohesive devices.	Uses everyday vocabulary generally appropriately, while occasionally overusing certain lexis. Uses simple grammatical forms with a good degree of control. While errors are noticeable, meaning can still be determined.
2	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.</i>			
1	Irrelevances and misinterpretation of task may be present. Target reader is minimally informed.	Produces text that communicates simple ideas in simple ways.	Text is connected using basic, high frequency linking words.	Uses basic vocabulary reasonably appropriately. Uses simple grammatical forms with some degree of control. Errors may impede meaning at times.
0	Content is totally irrelevant. Target reader is not informed.	<i>Performance below Band 1.</i>		

Annex #4: Perplexity

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #5: Shared folder

<https://utaedu->

[my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/EsLb6KOFigRJsFe08DUEfrkBW_i0P4j8sJ4J84Op7RpXsvw?e=sBTTgv](https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/EsLb6KOFigRJsFe08DUEfrkBW_i0P4j8sJ4J84Op7RpXsvw?e=sBTTgv)

Teachers' name: Steeven Pérez

Date: 23th Nov, 2023

LESSON PLAN #5				
Topic:		Describing things		
Students:		40 students of Second semester of PINE.		
Time:		60 minutes.		
Main aim:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To elaborate a letter describing a product. 		
Subsidiary aims:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve writing skills. To develop critical thinking skills by analyzing products. 		
Assumptions:		Students can use the appropriate tenses for the writing activities.		
Anticipated problems:		Students may have difficulties understanding the readings.		
Possible solutions:		Ask students about words they do not understand and show them their meaning.		
TIMING	PROCEDURE	STAGE AIM	AIDS AND MATERIALS	INTERACTION PATTERNS
20 minutes	<p>Pre-writing task</p> <p>- Students will play a game in Wordwall (They will look at pictures of different objects and describe them).</p> <p>-Teacher shares a reading text (a letter from a store employee providing information about a product to a customer).</p> <p>-The teacher suggests following the next steps when writing a letter (Teacher explains what to write in each step):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address 	<p>To introduce the topic.</p> <p>To give an example.</p>	<p>Wordwall (Annex #1)</p> <p>Canva Presentation (Annex #2)</p>	Teacher – whole class.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date • Opening • Body text • Closing • Signature <p>- Teacher requests students to think of a common product from a store and write 10 characteristics of the product in Padlet platform.</p>	To encourage students to describe things.	Padlet (Annex #3)	
25 minutes	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher requests students to write a letter responding to a customer about a product (the product they described in the previous activity). 100-200 words. Students will follow the suggested steps when writing a letter.</p>	To develop critical thinking skills.	Letter template (Annex #4)	Teacher – whole class.
15 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <p>The teacher asks students to revise their first draft and correct spelling, capitalization and grammar.</p> <p>Teacher requests students to upload their writings on PERPLEXITY</p>	To help students identify errors in	Perplexity (Annex #6)	Teacher – whole class.

Annex #5: Rubric

Written by: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Assessment Rubrics: Letter-writing (Friendly letters)

Category	4	3	2	1
Ideas	All ideas were expressed in a clear and organized way. It was easy to figure out what the letter was about.	Most ideas were expressed in a pretty clear manner, but the organization could have been better.	Ideas were somewhat organized, but were not very clear. It took more than one reading to figure out what the letter was about.	The letter seemed to be a collection of unrelated sentences. It was very difficult to figure out what the letter was about.
Creativity	The letter contains many creative details and/or description that fully express the feelings of the writer to the reader. The writer has really used his imagination	The letter contains some creative details and/or descriptions that tell the feelings of the writer and the relationship between the writer and the reader. The writer has used his imagination.	The letter contains a few creative details and/or descriptions, but they distract from the story. The author has tried to use his imagination, but not very successfully.	There is little or no evidence of creativity in the letter. The writer does not seem to understand the relationships between the two characters and does not seem to have used much imagination.
Format	Complies with all the requirements for a friendly letter.	Complies with most of the requirements for a friendly letter.	Complies with several of the requirements for a friendly letter.	Complies with few of the requirements for a friendly letter.
Sentences and Paragraphs	Sentences and paragraphs are complete, well-constructed and of varied structure.	Most sentences are complete and well-constructed. Paragraphing is generally done well.	Some sentences are complete and well-constructed. Paragraphing needs some work.	Many sentence fragments or run-on sentences and paragraphing needs lots of work.
Grammar & spelling	Writer makes few or no errors in grammar or spelling.	Writer makes some errors in grammar and/or spelling but the errors do not impede understanding.	Writer makes quite a lot of errors in grammar and/or spelling	Writer makes very frequent errors in grammar and/or spelling.

Annex #6: Perplexity

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #7: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/Ev-gVLOU3x1KoQVpP9dqn0EBb7W9QyZp_Z-ce9z6fmmOOQ?e=D9SVbo

	<p>writing this type of review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name of the dish 2. Ingredients 3. Description 4. Recommendations 5. Conclusion <p>- Then teacher presents a list of adjectives with meaning used to describe food.</p>	To learn vocabulary		
25 minutes	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher requests students to select a traditional food of Ecuador and write a review following the 5 suggested steps (100-150 words) and using the vocabulary words presented.</p>	To practice writing skills.	Sheet of paper	Teacher – whole class.
15 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher asks students to revise and correct spelling, capitalization and grammar in their drafts.</p> <p>Then, Teacher requests students to upload their writings on PERPLEXITY platform and upload the results in the word document into the shared folder.</p> <p>- Teacher will assign grades and feedback of students writing based on the evidence.</p>	<p>To identify and correct mistakes.</p> <p>To help students identify and correct errors in their writing.</p>	Perplexity (Annex #5)	Teacher – whole class.

ANNEXES:

Annex #1: YouTube video

<https://youtu.be/3OXBqIGJzkg?si=LdW-Sf59HSvjv7gz>

Annex #2: Canva Presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFxoKKGXYk/J8SvncTWTlZNmIppHMbMxA/edit?utm_content=DAFxoKKGXYk&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sharebutton

Annex #3: Rubric

Student Name: _____

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Organization Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	Information is very organized with a well-constructed opinion and supporting detail.	Information is organized with a well-constructed opinion.	Information is organized, but paragraphs are not well-constructed.	The information appears to be disorganized.
Descriptive Language/Sensory Images Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	The review includes descriptive language that uses sensory images (smell, taste, see, feel, hear).	The review includes some descriptive language and sensory images.	The review includes 1 of 2 of the following: descriptive language and sensory images.	The review does not include descriptive language and sensory images.
Opinion/Supporting Details Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	My review has a strong opinion that is supported by 2-3 details (good or bad).	My review has a strong opinion, but it is not strongly supported by details.	My review does not have any supporting details, but it does have an opinion.	My review does not have a strong opinion or supporting details. My opinion may not be clear.
Spelling Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	All of the words from the no excuse list are spelled correctly.	A few words (2-3) on the no excuse list are spelled incorrectly.	Many words (4-6), including the no excuse words, are spelled incorrectly.	More than 7 words are spelled incorrectly.
Mechanics Student rating _____ Teacher rating _____	No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Almost no grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.

Annex #4: Perplexity

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #5: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/EnuXxMHUjVZMpZe-Rk2foLwBR2gRiFJu6Xd0enNfX6MJyQ?e=P9pSL1

Teachers' name: Steeven Pérez

Date: 30th Nov, 2023

LESSON PLAN #7				
Topic:		Enjoying the Arts		
Students:		40 students of Second semester of PINE.		
Time:		60 minutes.		
Main aim:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To elaborate a description of a piece of art. 		
Subsidiary aims:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop students' ability to describe things. To enhance students' ability to write a description. To promote a correct use of automated writing evaluation tools. 		
Assumptions:		Students can use the appropriate tenses for the writing activities.		
Anticipated problems:		Students may have difficulties understanding the readings.		
Possible solutions:		Ask students about words they do not understand and show them their meaning.		
TIMING	PROCEDURE	STAGE AIM	AIDS AND MATERIALS	INTERACTION PATTERNS
15 minutes	<p>Pre-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher engages students in a vocabulary in wordwall (students see different objects of art and chose the correct word that defines them). - Teacher shares a reading text of the painting 'The starry night' by Vincent van Gogh - Then, the teacher will present a list of useful phrases when writing an art description. - Teacher requests students to think in a famous piece of art (painting, 	<p>To introduce the topic.</p> <p>To give an example.</p> <p>To encourage students to share their ideas.</p>	<p>Wordwall (Annex #1)</p> <p>Canva presentation (Annex #2)</p>	Teacher – whole class.

	sculpture or musical composition) and type its name in the word document in the shared folder			
25 minutes	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher requests students to describe that piece of art (100-150 words), they will add the information required:</p> <p>1. Title and Artist: Begin by stating the title of the artwork and the name of the artist.</p> <p>2. Date: Specify the date when the artwork was created, if available.</p> <p>3. Medium: Describe the materials and techniques used to create the artwork, such as oil on canvas, sculpture in marble, or digital photography.</p> <p>4. Texture and Materials: Comment on the texture of the surface and the materials used.</p> <p>5. Historical and Contextual</p>	To encourage students to reflect on art.	Sheet of paper.	

	<p>Information: Provide relevant historical and contextual information about the artwork.</p> <p>6. Personal Reactions: Offer your personal reactions to the artwork, such as your feelings or thoughts.</p>			
20 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The teacher asks students to revise their drafts and correct spelling, capitalization and grammar. - Then, Students will upload their corrected writings in PERPLEXITY, to identify mistakes. Students will upload evidences (screenshots) of the results in the word document inside the shared folder. <p>The teacher will assign grades and feedback of students writing based on the evidence.</p>	<p>To identify writing mistakes.</p> <p>To use automated writing evaluation tools.</p>	<p>Perplexity (Annex #4)</p>	<p>Teacher – whole class.</p>

ANNEXES:

Annex #1: Wordwall

<https://wordwall.net/es/resource/23675824>

Annex #2: Canva Presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFxo_9hWzY/7bvqtrVVpk01Rg9DU9y5NQ/edit?utm_content=DAFxo_9hWzY&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sharebutton

Annex #3: Rubric

5	<p>All content is relevant to the task.</p> <p>Target reader is fully informed.</p>	<p>Uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward ideas.</p>	<p>Text is generally well organized and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices</p>	<p>Uses a range of everyday vocabulary appropriately, with occasional inappropriate use of less common lexis.</p> <p>Uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control. Errors do not impede communication.</p>
4	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5</i>			
3	<p>Minor irrelevances and/or omissions may be present.</p> <p>Target reader is on the whole informed.</p>	<p>Uses the conventions of the communicative task in generally appropriate ways to communicate straightforward ideas.</p>	<p>Text is connected and coherent, using basic linking words and a limited number of cohesive devices.</p>	<p>Uses everyday vocabulary generally appropriately, while occasionally overusing certain lexis.</p> <p>Uses simple grammatical forms with a good degree of control.</p> <p>While errors are noticeable, meaning can still be determined.</p>
2	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.</i>			
1	<p>Irrelevances and misinterpretation of task may be present.</p> <p>Target reader is minimally informed.</p>	<p>Produces text that communicates simple ideas in simple ways.</p>	<p>Text is connected using basic, high frequency linking words.</p>	<p>Uses basic vocabulary reasonably appropriately.</p> <p>Uses simple grammatical forms with some degree of control.</p>

				Errors may impede meaning at times.
0	Content is totally irrelevant. Target reader is not informed.	<i>Performance below Band 1.</i>		

Annex #4: Perplexity

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #5: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/Eum8_tFLFwBJjvOPJ5fC25EBxrwe2yLIYpCfEPBEcgItNQ?e=PQxdh2

Teachers' name: Steeven Pérez

Date: 01st Dec, 2023

LESSON PLAN #8				
Topic:		Technology		
Students:		40 students of Second semester of PINE.		
Time:		60 minutes.		
Main aim:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop an article of the use of technology. 		
Subsidiary aims:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop students' ability to organize their ideas and connect them coherently. To enhance students' ability to write an article. To promote a correct use of automated writing evaluation tools. 		
Assumptions:		Students can use the appropriate tenses for the writing activities.		
Anticipated problems:		Students may have difficulties understanding the readings.		
Possible solutions:		Ask students about words they do not understand and show them their meaning.		
TIMING	PROCEDURE	STAGE AIM	AIDS AND MATERIALS	INTERACTION PATTERNS
15 minutes	<p>Pre-writing task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher presents a video of the use of technology in daily life nowadays. -Then, teacher asks 'What do you think about the use of technology nowadays?' (Brainstorm students' ideas in the board). Teacher shares a reading text, an article about 'the internet'. - Teacher suggest the following structure to write an article: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction presents the topic in a general way, 	<p>To introduce the topic.</p> <p>To give an example.</p>	<p>YouTube video (Annex #1)</p> <p>Canva presentation (Annex #1)</p>	Teacher – whole class.

	<p>but making clear what the article is about.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second paragraph talks about why I like the Internet and one of the things that I like about it. • The third paragraph makes a recommendation of a website, explaining why I like it so much. • The conclusion is a summary of sorts and asks the reader for some feedback on their own preferences- <p>- Teacher shows a list of technology-related topics and requests to write the ideas in padlet.</p>	<p>To encourage students to share their ideas.</p>	<p>Padlet (Annex #2)</p>	
<p>25 minutes</p>	<p>While-writing task</p> <p>- The teacher asks students to organize their ideas written in PADLET and write an article of the use of technology (100-200 words), they will follow the structure shown above and connect it correctly using the following linking words.</p>	<p>To encourage students to reflect on their opinions and practice their writing skills.</p>	<p>Sheet of paper.</p>	

	<p>- Teacher presents a list of linking words students may use (Linking words for adding, sequencing, illustrating, cause and effect, comparing, contrasting, emphasizing and summarizing information).</p>			
20 minutes	<p>Post-writing task</p> <p>- Teacher asks students to revise their first drafting and correct spelling, capitalization and grammar.</p> <p>- Then, students transcribe their corrected writings in PERPLEXITY, in order to identify mistakes. They will upload evidences (screenshots) of the results in the word document inside the shared folder.</p> <p>The teacher will assign grades and feedback of students writing based on the evidence.</p>	<p>To identify writing mistakes.</p> <p>To help students identify and correct errors in their writing. To use of automated writing evaluation tools.</p>	Perplexity (Annex #4)	Teacher – whole class.

ANNEXES:

Annex #1: YouTube video

<https://youtu.be/CMS728YNHmo?si=IXv3NxdOwcCxVTca>

Annex #2: Canva presentation

https://www.canva.com/design/DAFxpOx6Pjc/viPiFJEwrkdP-Bt0kfsL_Q/edit?utm_content=DAFxpOx6Pjc&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sharebutton

Annex #3: Padlet

<https://padlet.com/abnerperez0102/what-are-the-advantages-and-disadvantages-of-using-technolog-3alq9ou8xkf6dwje>

Annex #4: Rubric

	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organization	Language
5	All content is relevant to the task. Target reader is fully informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader’s attention and communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is generally well organized and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices	Uses a range of everyday vocabulary appropriately, with occasional inappropriate use of less common lexis. Uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control. Errors do not impede communication.
4	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5</i>			
3	Minor irrelevances and/or omissions may be present. Target reader is on the whole informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task in generally appropriate ways to communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is connected and coherent, using basic linking words and a limited number of cohesive devices.	Uses everyday vocabulary generally appropriately, while occasionally overusing certain lexis. Uses simple grammatical forms with a good degree of control. While errors are noticeable, meaning can still be determined.

2	<i>Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.</i>			
1	Irrelevances and misinterpretation of task may be present. Target reader is minimally informed.	Produces text that communicates simple ideas in simple ways.	Text is connected using basic, high frequency linking words.	Uses basic vocabulary reasonably appropriately. Uses simple grammatical forms with some degree of control. Errors may impede meaning at times.
0	Content is totally irrelevant. Target reader is not informed.	<i>Performance below Band 1.</i>		

Annex #5: Perplexity

<https://www.perplexity.ai/>

Annex #6: Shared folder

https://utaedu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/xcalero_uta_edu_ec/Ekea9ZOA2u5LmQkiNXdp23sB3tobd6xudiSk7E0D-lShrQ?e=mpDHpK

EVIDENCES AND GRADES:

[WRITINGS AND EVIDENCE](#)

Annex 7: Turnitin report



Digital Receipt

This receipt acknowledges that Turnitin received your paper. Below you will find the receipt information regarding your submission.

The first page of your submissions is displayed below.

Submission author: Abner Pérez
Assignment title: Quick Submit
Submission title: THESIS_ABNER PEREZ
File name: THESIS_P_rez_Steeven_TURNITIN.pdf
File size: 1.02M
Page count: 78
Word count: 20,353
Character count: 112,959
Submission date: 01-Jan-2024 09:48PM (UTC-0500)
Submission ID: 2266055782

UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA DE AMBATO FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS
HUMANAS Y DE LA EDUCACIÓN
CARRERA DE PEDAGOGÍA DE LOS IDIOMAS NACIONALES Y
EXTRANJEROS RESUMEN

ABSTRACT

THEM: "TEXT-BASED TEACHING AND WRITING SKILLS
DEVELOPMENT"

AUTHOR: Abner Steeven Pérez Huamán

TUTOR: Leda Ximena Calero Mg.

The current study aimed to identify the effectiveness of Text-based teaching in writing skills development in second semester students of Pedagogy of National and Foreign Languages at the Technical University of Ambato. The methodology used in this study was pre-experimental with a quantitative approach. A total of 40 university students (33 females and 7 males) participated in this research, who were assessed through a pre and post test which was a Cambridge B1 preliminary test, writing section, to collect information about their writing skills in relation to 4 criteria (content, communicative achievement, language, and organization). The duration of the treatment was 4 weeks, following a series of 8 interventions following The Text-Based Teaching, in which a variety of physical and technological resources were used, always based on a reading text as the basis for each lesson, and an automated writing evaluation tool (Complexity) was used to support the review and provision of feedback on the written outcome of each

THESIS_ABNER PEREZ

ORIGINALITY REPORT

9%	9%	6%	4%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	macrothink.org Internet Source	2%
2	Submitted to Ho Chi Minh City Open University Student Paper	1%
3	ir.uitm.edu.my Internet Source	1%
4	www.gssrr.org Internet Source	1%
5	www.researchgate.net Internet Source	1%
6	digilibadmin.unismuh.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
7	jle.hse.ru Internet Source	<1%
8	jurnal.fkip-uwgm.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
9	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	<1%

Annex 8: Key categories

