

**YAZILI ANLATIMDA VIDEO'NUN ÖN
ÇALIŞMA OLARAK KULLANILMASI**

**USING VIDEO AS A PRE-WRITING
ACTIVITY IN WRITING**

Figen ÖNCÜ

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Eskişehir 1999

USING VIDEO AS A PRE-WRITING ACTIVITY IN WRITING

**YAZILI ANLATIMDA VIDEO'NUN ÖN ÇALIŞMA OLARAK
KULLANILMASI**

Figen ÖNCÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Danışman: Yrd.Doç.Dr. F.Hülya ÖZCAN

Eskişehir

Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Kasım 1999

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÖZÜYAZILI ANLATIMDA VIDEO'NUN ÖN ÇALIŞMA OLARAK
KULLANILMASI

Figen ÖNCÜ

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kasım 1999

Danışman: Yrd.Doç.Dr. F. Hülya ÖZCAN

Bu çalışmada, video filmlerinin yazılı anlatımda ön çalışma olarak kullanılmasının İngilizce kompozisyon yazma becerisinin gelişimine olan etkisi araştırılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, veriler 1998-1999 öğretim yılı bahar döneminde Osmangazi Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Bölümü Hazırlık Okuluna devam eden orta düzeydeki 20 öğrenciden alınmıştır. Bu öğrenciler deney grubu ve kontrol grubu olarak ikiye ayrılmıştır. Deney grubuna yazılı anlatımda ön çalışma olarak video filmler gösterilmiş, kontrol grubuna ise ön çalışmada video filmler gösterilmemiştir. Bu çalışmada, öğrencilerin ilgilerini çekebilecek 'Music of Tomorrow', 'Digital Game World', 'There But For The Grace' isimli üç video filmi seçilmiştir.

Gruplara ön test verildikten sonra üç hafta süren uygulamaya geçilmiştir. Uygulamanın sonunda her iki gruba son test verilmiş ve bu testlerin sonuçlarının istatistiksel analizi yapılmıştır. Çalışmaya katılan öğrencilerin İngilizce kompozisyon yazma becerisinde ilerleme kaydedip kaydetmediklerinin tespit edilebilmesi için hem grupların kendi içlerinde hem de gruplar arasında karşılaştırmalar yapılmıştır. Deney ve kontrol gruplarından elde edilen ön ve son test sonuçlarına göre deney grubunun bu uygulamadan faydalandığı ve bu grubun son test sonuçlarının kontrol grubunun sonuçlarına oranla istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılık gösterecek derecede arttığı tespit edilmiştir.

THESIS OF MASTER OF ARTS ABSTRACT**USING VIDEO AS A PRE-WRITING ACTIVITY IN WRITING**

Figen ÖNCÜ

English Language Education Department

Anadolu University Social Sciences Institute, November 1999

Advisor: Assistant.Prof. F. Hülya ÖZCAN

In this study, the effects of using video films as a pre-writing activity in writing argumentative compositions were investigated. The data were collected from 20 intermediate level students attending Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department Preparatory School. These students were divided into two groups, an experimental group and a control group. The control group was not exposed to video films and the experimental group was exposed to pre-writing activity by using video films in the classroom. Three video films are: 'Music of Tomorrow', 'Digital Game World', 'There But For The Grace' were chosen according to the interests of the students. After the pre-tests were given, the treatment, which continued for three weeks, started. At the end of the treatment, the post-tests were given and the statistical analysis of the results of these tests were done. The improvement of the subjects in terms of composition writing were compared within the groups and between the groups by analysing the statistical data and the results of the pre and post tests.

According to the statistical data obtained from the pre and post test result of the experimental and the control group, it was observed that the experimental group gained more improvement in writing argumentative composition compared to the control group.

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

Figen ÖNCÜ'nün "Yazılı Anlatımda Video'nun Ön Çalışma Olarak Kullanılması" başlıklı tezi 14.1.2000 tarihinde, aşağıdaki jüri tarafından Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliği'nin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim dalında, Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

İmza

Üye (Danışman) : Yrd.Doç.Dr. F.Hülya ÖZCAN
Üye : Prof.Dr. Şefik YAŞAR
Üye : Doç.Dr. İlknur KEÇİK

Prof.Dr. Enver ÖZKALP
Anadolu Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler
Enstitü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Assistant Professor F. Hülya ÖZCAN for giving me her valuable guidance and support throughout this study.

I am especially grateful to Prof.Dr. Embiya AĞAOĞLU for the statistical interpretation of this study.

I would like to thank Prof.Dr. Zekeriya ALTAÇ for giving me invaluable ideas related to this research.

I am also very grateful to Miss. Nazan SAYIN and Mr. Hakan AVCI for their help on various aspects of the study.

I am also very grateful to the students who volunteered to take part in the study.

I must express my special thanks to my family for their patience and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTIONS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| ÖZ | ii |
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI | iv |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | v |
| ÖZGEÇMİŞ | vi |
| LIST OF TABLES | x |

CHAPTER

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. The Writing Skills | 1 |
| 1.2. Teaching Techniques in Writing Classes | 2 |
| 1.2.1. Controlled Writing | 2 |
| 1.2.2. Directed Writing | 3 |
| 1.2.3. Guided Writing | 3 |
| 1.2.4. Free Writing | 4 |
| 1.3. Visuals and Aural Materials in Writing Classes | 4 |
| 1.3.1. Video as Visual Material | 6 |
| 1.4. Problem | 7 |
| 1.5. The Purpose of the Study | 7 |
| 1.6. Limitations | 8 |
| 1.7. Definitions of the Terms | 8 |
| 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 10 |
| 2.1. Video as Teaching Aid | 10 |
| 2.1.1. Varieties of Video Materials Used in ELT | 12 |
| 2.1.2. Role of Video in ELT Classroom | 13 |
| 2.1.3. Advantages of Visual Setting | 15 |
| 2.2. Literature Review on Pre-Writing Activities | 19 |
| 2.2.1. Brainstorming | 20 |
| 2.2.2. Discussion | 20 |
| 2.2.3. Mapping | 20 |
| 2.2.4. List Making | 20 |
| 2.2.5. Reading | 20 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.2.6. Pictures | 21 |
| 2.2.7. Video as a Pre-Writing Activity | 21 |
| 3. METHODOLOGY | 22 |
| 3.1. Subjects | 22 |
| 3.2. Instruments | 23 |
| 3.3. Data Collection | 24 |
| 3.4. Data Analysis | 25 |
| 3.4.1. The ESL Composition Profile | 25 |
| 3.4.2. Analytical Procedures | 26 |
| 4. RESULTS | 27 |
| 4.1. Pre-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group | 27 |
| 4.2. Post-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group | 28 |
| 4.3. Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control Group | 28 |
| 4.4. Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group | 29 |
| 4.5. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Content | 30 |
| 4.6. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Organization | 32 |
| 4.7. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Vocabulary | 33 |
| 4.8. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Language Use | 35 |
| 4.9. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Mechanics | 36 |
| 4.10. Discussion | 38 |
| 5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH. | 40 |
| 5.1. Overview and Conclusion | 40 |
| 5.2. Suggestions for Further Studies | 42 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 55 |

| | |
|---|----|
| APPENDICES | 43 |
| Appendix A ESL Composition Profile | 43 |
| Appendix B The Results of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Students in the Control Group | 45 |
| Appendix C The Results of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Students in the Experimental Group | 46 |
| Appendix D The Results of the Pre-test Total Scores of the Control Group | 47 |
| Appendix E The Results of the Pre-test Total Scores of the Experimental Group | 48 |
| Appendix F The Results of the Control Group in Post Test | 49 |
| Appendix G The Results of the Experimental Group in Post Test | 50 |
| Appendix G1 The Results of the T-test for Both Groups in Organization and in Vocabulary in Post Test | 51 |
| Appendix G2 The Results of the T-test for Both Groups in Language Use and in Mechanics in Post Test | 52 |
| Appendix H Written Topics | 53 |
| Appendix I Video Films | 54 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|--------------|---|----|
| TABLE 2.1. | Roles Which Video Material Fulfils | 15 |
| TABLE 4.1. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group in Pre-test and T-test Results | 27 |
| TABLE 4.2. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group in Post-test | 28 |
| TABLE 4.3. | The Mean Scores of the Control Group in Pre-test and in Post-test | 29 |
| TABLE 4.4. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group in Pre-test and in Post-test | 30 |
| TABLE 4.5.1. | Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Content | 31 |
| TABLE 4.5.2. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Content in Post-test | 31 |
| TABLE 4.6.1. | Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Organization..... | 32 |
| TABLE 4.6.2. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Organization in Post-test | 33 |
| TABLE 4.7.1. | Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Vocabulary | 34 |
| TABLE 4.7.2. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Vocabulary | 34 |
| TABLE 4.8.1. | Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Language Use | 35 |
| TABLE 4.8.2. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Language Use | 36 |
| TABLE 4.9.1. | Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Mechanics | 37 |
| TABLE 4.9.2. | The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Mechanics | 37 |

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Writing Skills

Writing a composition requires mastery of not only grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgemental elements. Therefore, teaching how to write is complex and sometimes difficult to teach (Heaton, 1991: 135).

As Leki (1990) says, most of the time when students write in a foreign language the main purposes of the writing activity for teachers are to catch grammar, spelling and punctuation errors of the students, or to give students practice on recent grammar points. However, many researchers working in this field believe that the purpose of writing should be to help the students to communicate their thoughts, and feelings in compositions not to practice grammar. In order to help the students to communicate their thoughts and feelings in compositions, and to group the many and varied skills in writing, Heaton (1991: 135) offers the following five general components or main areas.

- “- language use: the ability to write correct and appropriate sentences;
- mechanical skills: the ability to use correctly those conventions peculiar to the written language - e.g. punctuation, spelling;
- treatment of content: the ability to think creatively and develop thoughts, excluding all irrelevant information;
- stylistic skills: the ability to manipulate sentences and paragraphs, and use language effectively;
- judgement skills: the ability to write in an appropriate manner for a particular purpose with a particular audience in mind, together with an ability to select, organise and order relevant information.”

The purpose of writing is also to help the students to establish a particular register; for example, is the student writing to inform, entertain, or explain? (Heaton, 1991: 135) The use of appropriate register in writing implies an awareness not only of a writing goal but also of a particular audience. There are various kinds of register such as slang, jargon, legal language, Standard English, business English, etc. The ability to write for a particular audience using the most appropriate kind of language is essential for both native-speaking and foreign student alike. Failure to use the correct register frequently results in incongruities and embarrassment. Thus, the use of correct registers becomes an

important skill at advanced levels of writing. While native speakers learn to make distinctions of register intuitively, students of foreign languages usually experience problems in mastering this complex area of language (Heaton, 1991: 135).

In foreign language teaching, writing is the last skill (Demirel, 1993: 127). Demirel (1993: 127) also adds, writing is important as speaking so that teachers should give the same importance for teaching writing. Demirel (1993: 127) states, while students are speaking teachers show tolerance for their grammar, spelling mistakes. However, the teachers show no tolerance for the students' grammar, spelling mistakes in writing. Teachers are also confused why their students still make lots of mistakes in writing. For example, students use the wrong tenses or fail to join sentences (Byrne, 1991: 52). There is not only one possible reason. One of them maybe is the task that is not simple as it seems. The teachers' problem is how to do the task that the students see the purpose of writing and make measurable progress through the performance of realistic and relevant tasks. One of the problems in writing is what to write about. At the early stages of writing, students usually feel that they have nothing to say. In real-life situations, how often do people begin to write when they have nothing to write: no purpose and no audience in mind? Thus, meaningful situations or a description of a real-life situation, should be given in compositions. Composition titles should guide the students.

As writing is considered as a productive skill, by the help of certain techniques, students are taught how to write. At the basic level, students study writing skills at phrase, sentence, and paragraph levels. At the intermediate stage, the students study writing skills by using different techniques such as multiple choice, true/false or transformation, in addition in the advanced stages; controlled writing, directed writing, guided writing, and free writing give students a chance to enlarge their ideas.

1.2. Teaching Techniques in Writing Classes

1.2.1. Controlled Writing

Controlled writing is the opposite of free writing, where students generate, organise, and express their own ideas in their own sentences. In controlled writing, students are provided with a great deal of the content and the form (Raimes, 1983: 95).

According to Raimes (1983), controlled writing is a useful tool at all levels of composition teaching, not just in the early stages; it can be included at any level of language proficiency.

Students focus on specific features of the written language, in most controlled composition type of tests. So that, students can reinforce grammar, vocabulary, and syntax, in context. In most of the controlled writing students' work should be grammatically correct, and students have no chance to make mistakes.

1.2.2. Directed Writing

Directed writing activities require the teachers' control of the students' task, and are performed through group and pair work.

Directed composition is in which students originate the sentences but in which they are given suggestions regarding content and organization of what is written. In directed compositions the content and sequence of events are provided by a series of pictures or cartoons, or by film strips or short movies. A story or oral narrative told by the teacher is retold in written form. The students complete a narrative relating to a particular event or a person's life in which they may be given the freedom to select from a number of alternative renderings of the narrative.

Directed composition writing involves note taking from a lecture or a talk followed by a subsequent written report (Gorman, 1989).

- a) Scrambled sentences: Rewrite the given text by changing some sentences or words.
- b) Changing words: Rewriting the given text's structure, or changing the grammar or tense. For example, changing the first pronoun 'I' to 'She', for upper levels changing the active sentences into passive voice.
- c) Using a model: According to the model text, students write a similar composition or a dialogue by using key words.
- d) Ordering sentences: Making a paragraph by using reorder sentences or making correct sentences by using words.
- e) Question-answer: By answering some questions, students can write a paragraph.
- f) Completing sentences: By completing sentences or dialogues.

1.2.3. Guided Writing

Guided writing is a technique that provides assistance to the students, with a model to follow a plan or outline on which to expand. While doing guided writing tests students are given a partly written version with indications of how to complete it, or pictures that show a new subject to write about in the same way as something that has been read (Pincas, 1982). In guided writing, students work independently, and they can prepare themselves for free writing.

- a) Dictation: Students can write the text that they listened.
- b) Dicto-Composition: Students listened to the all text and rewrite the text.
- c) Note Taking: While students are listening the text, they are taking notes. After taking notes, they write the texts again by using their notes.
- d) Summarising: After reading or listening the text, students summarized the text.

- e) Writing the Meaning/Theme of the Text: Very shortly students write the main idea of the text.
- f) Making Outline: Making an outline from a text according to the theme, main idea, and the thesis statement of the text.

1.2.4. Free Writing

In free writing, teachers asked their students to write freely on any topic without worrying about grammar and spelling. The emphasis in this writing is that intermediate-level students should put content and fluency first and not worry about form. Once ideas are down on the page, grammatical accuracy, organization, and the rest will gradually follow (Raimes, 1983:7). In this kind of writing, 'audience' and 'content' are important (Raimes, 1983:7).

1.3. Visuals and Aural Materials in Writing Classes

Visual materials offer an attractive and stimulating framework for writing. Visual materials can motivate students and the students can remember for a long time. The results of the research, which took place in Texas University in United States of America, showed that people could remember 10% of what they read. People could remember 50% of what they watch and hear, however, if those people hear or listen, they could remember 20% (Demirel, 1993: 87).

As is seen from the research findings, language teachers should use visual and aural materials as much as possible. In language classrooms, teachers use these visual and aural materials:

A. Visual Materials:

1. Books:

- a. Course book,
- b. Teachers' book,
- c. Work book.

2. Boards:

- a. Blackboard,
- b. Bulletin Board,
- c. Magnetic Board,
- d. Information Board.

3. Pictures:

- a. Plain Pictures,
- b. Line Pictures,
- c. Flash Cards,

- d. Figures,
- e. Wall Papers,
- f. Posters,
- g. Signs.

4. Real Models and Materials

5. Projector and Graphics

B. Aural Materials:

- 1. Radio
- 2. Tape recorder

C. Visual and Aural Materials:

- 1. Cameras and Movies
- 2. Cable TV
- 3. Video
- 4. Computers (Demirel, 1993: 96).

Raimes (1983) suggests, writing teachers can find a valuable resource in pictures: drawings, photographs, posters, graphs, charts, maps. Raimes (1983) also adds, pictures provide a shared experience for students in the class. If the teacher uses a picture, students will need the appropriate vocabulary, idiom, and sentence structure to discuss what they see (after close observation of the material). Pictures are important, so that they provide the use of a common vocabulary and common language forms (Raimes, 1983). Raimes (1983:27) states, a picture is a valuable resource and it provides:

- '1. a shared experience in the classroom;
- 2. a need for common language forms to use in the classroom;
- 3. a variety of tasks;
- 4. a focus of interest for students.'

In writing classes teachers can use one picture or pictures in sequence for guided and free writing exercises. A picture sequence, such as comic strip, provides the subject matter for writing narrative and for speculating about the story beyond the pictures in the strip. A set of parallel pictures provides material that offers guidance on vocabulary, sentence structure, and organization yet lets the students write about new subject matter (Raimes, 1983:36). Raimes (1983) suggests, effective communicative tasks can be derived from diagrams, tables, graphs, and charts. Students deal with given information presented visually, and they work on conveying the same information in writing.

If the language teachers want a better teaching/learning, they should use as much as possible visual and aural materials together. Why the teachers should prefer video? Video supports both visual and aural input for the students. Video is the best material for showing real-life situation (Demirel, 1993: 98). Video can be used in schools. Video can be used for classroom teaching and also for individual learning (Demirel, 1993: 97).

There are also some researches for using video in teaching English as a foreign language. For example, in Ankara University, an experimental research applied to 129 postgraduate students in their English Lesson for listening comprehension. The results showed that using video while teaching was more effective than traditional teaching (Demirel, 1993: 97). In 1978, Ohio State University used video for teaching French as a foreign language to 103 student. They used some video films such as, short films, dialogues, or lectures. The speakers were all professionals in these video films. The results showed that students who watched the video films were more successful in their speaking performance than the others were. Another research was applied to 6 year-old-children. Researchers used video and video games for searching the effects of visuals on children's comprehension skills. The results showed that children could identify the words' written form and spellings after the 2-week treatment.

1.3.1. Video as Visual Material

Since the 1970's video has been used in ESL/EFL classrooms. In most of the European countries, teachers began to use video as a visual material in schools (McGovern, 1980: 126). Firstly, researchers searched how teachers could use video as a visual material in teaching language. The results showed that teacher should use video for linguistic, practical, and pedagogical reasons. In real-life situation, student or learner can see the speaker (native speaker). This can help the student or learner to understand the speaker. Visual aids are very important in communication. Radio and cassettes can only support aural input. Pictures, real images can only support visual input to the student. However, video can support both aural and visual input for the students. Television can be used as an audio-visual aid but finding the right program at the appropriate time can be difficult. Video can be used whenever teacher wants. It can be easily applied into the syllabus. Every teacher can use it. Teacher can practice on video before the lesson for checking the video film deciding some questions. While watching the video film, teacher can stop the cassette and rewind the cassette for watching the video section again. Teacher can also freeze a particular scene on TV so that the students can see events, a place, or a person clearly or discuss them if necessary. However, teacher can not stop a scene on TV while watching a TV program. Video can be more independent material than TV. As mentioned before, video can be used at any time, anywhere, and easily by everyone (McGovern, 1980: 126). Video as an audio-visual aid can also motivate the students in a language class. Besides this, video gives a chance to variety, interest, and entertainment. Since the 1970's, both ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers have been using films and videocassettes in their classrooms. Since then, the number of films and videocassettes has increased day-by-day. Language teachers can easily find videocassettes according to their students' level, age, gender and interest.

1.4. Problem

As Raimes (1983) says, traditional procedure for composition writing, in which students are given a single topic to write on, is not very much content based. Moreover, students may not have gained enough experience and enough background information to write on the given topic. Therefore, it is very difficult for students to start the first sentence because they do not know what to write and how to write and they are not stimulated enough to write about the given topic. Students lack of motivation in composition writing, this makes teacher search for some major stimulus. Therefore, it is believed that, using video in composition writing may help students to overcome the problem what to write and how to write better compositions. When provided by both the visual and aural input, there will be sufficient background information relevant to the topic in concern. Because by using video films as a pre-writing activity, students may have the chance to form ideas and to discuss their ideas, which consequently may help students to make an easy start to their compositions and write better compositions in terms of content.

Thus, in this study the contribution of video films in writing introduced as a practical technique to motivate students in composition writing. In addition to this point of view, when composition titles are based on video films, students perform the compositions better. Also composition writing which are done through video films make students learn something while writing compositions. Composition writing through video films, makes students express themselves using the situation given and the new vocabulary provided. In other words, compositions done through video films ensure that the students can use the information presented. While writing compositions through video films, writing skills are stimulated and students are encouraged to speculate about facts and clues given, and to come up with their own ideas and conclusions.

1.5. The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find out whether the writing process of intermediate level EFL students could be supported through video materials. After watching video films as a pre-writing activity, it is hoped that the students will have the knowledge of “what to write” and “how to write” about the topic. Students can have some problems when the teacher use traditional or common pre-writing activities such as, pictures or cassettes. Therefore, using video films in writing classes may help students to write better argumentative compositions. As video films can provide both visual and aural input, students may have enough background information related to the topic.

In this study, the following questions will be answered:

1. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in post test?
2. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in Content, Organisation, Vocabulary, Language Use, Mechanics in post test?

1.6. Limitations

In this study:

1. Only three video films were used.
2. The level of the students was limited to the intermediate level and the students were prep-school students at the Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department.

1.7. Definitions of the Terms

ESL: English as a second language.

EFL: English as a foreign language.

Input: Oral, written, or visual stimuli from the formal or informal learning setting (Türker, 1993: 43).

Content: Understanding of the subject, discussing main point with sufficient details, using information clearly (Heaton, 1991: 135).

Language Use: Using well-formed and complete sentences with appropriate complements, effective complex constructions of sentences, agreement between sentences (Heaton, 1991: 135).

Vocabulary: Facility with words and ideas to convey intended information, attitudes and feelings (Heaton, 1991: 135).

Mechanics: Correct spelling, correct use of punctuation marks and capital letters and paragraphing (Heaton, 1991: 135).

Organization: Developing and concluding paragraphs, controlling ideas clearly (Heaton, 1991: 135).

Communicative Learning: As stated by Richards and Rodgers (1986: 69), communicative learning is the process which starts from a theory of language as communication. Learning theory of the approach is described by theories of language learning processes that are compatible with the communicative approach. Krashen, who is not directly deal with Communicative Language Teaching, have developed theories cited

as compatible with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). Richards and Rodgers (1986:72) states, Krashen's theories as follows:

'Krashen sees acquisition as the basic process involved in developing language proficiency and distinguishes this process from learning. Acquisition refers to the unconscious development of the target language system as a result of using the language for real communication. Learning is the conscious representation of grammatical knowledge that has resulted from instruction, and it cannot lead to acquisition.'

Krashen and other theorists stress that language learning comes through using language communicatively, rather than through practicing language skills (Richard and Rodgers, 1986). Johnson and Littlewood consider another learning theory that the acquisition of communicative competence in a language is example of skill development (Richard and Rodgers, 1986).

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Video as Teaching Aid

Many attempts have been made to describe video as one of the new aids used in EFL classrooms (Brumfit, 1983). What most scholars generally agree on is that video is a useful and increasingly affordable teaching aid for the EFL teachers, and a means of introducing some welcome variety into the EFL classroom.

Since the 1970's video has been used in EFL classrooms. Tomalin (1990: 3) defines video: "Video is the sound and the vision recorded onto video tape and played through a video recorder onto a TV screen". In addition to what Tomalin says, Allan (1991: 49) defines video as "a wonderful aid that helps us provide a richer and more varied language environment within which learning can take place". The combination of variety, interest, and entertainment we can derive from video makes it an aid which develops motivation in learners.

Over the last two decades, the use of films and video-tapes, in both ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts, has become an increasingly more important component of second language instruction. Tomalin (1990: 7) says, "Video is not a method, but it is an aid to the teacher in the same way as the audio tape, the magnet board and flash cards are. Teachers may plan lessons around a video or plan lessons using video as one of the aids".

Since the 1970's, both ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers have been using films and video-tapes in their classrooms. Since then, the number of films and video-tapes has increased day-by-day. Teachers easily find video-tapes and films according to their teaching purpose. As Stoller notes:

"... films and videos became more readily available for teaching purposes, growing numbers of teachers promoted their use, bringing authenticity, reality, variety and flexibility into the second-language classroom..." (1990: 10).

If the words like "freeze-frame", "reverse", "speed viewing" and "fast-forward" sound unfamiliar to a teacher, it is clear that video has not yet become a successful medium in his/her language classroom. "Video is an excellent aid in language teaching and worth being used regularly, as well as an extensive source of information. Besides being such an authentic medium, video is an effective and interesting medium" (Bauman, 1990: 8-13). Nowadays, video is an excellent aid in language teaching and it is considered as an

extensive source of information. Although video can easily get students' attention, some of the students can still be passive viewers. Passive viewers will be turned in to active viewers, if the teacher uses tasks that generate response and participation. One of the reasons for passive viewing is that students watch video as they watch TV. Students are accepted as experienced TV viewers, but most of their viewing is passive in a domestic context, and mainly for relaxation and entertainment. When a classroom teacher tells his or her students that he is going to show a film on video next Friday afternoon, most probably they say "How nice!" and think that the teacher is perhaps tired and "shirking his duties". On Friday afternoon he/she takes the students to the video room and realizes that all of them are ready to wait for the teacher to switch on the TV, but switch off their minds, stretch out on a comfortable chair, and let the "box" keep them entertained for the rest of the class time. But, when the teacher starts giving the handouts, and explains that he/she has a purpose in showing that film, they open their eyes wide, and start complaining about the teacher who is still active on Friday afternoon.

Since video demands our attention as it plays, by making use of this vary element in a class, passive viewers can be turned into active viewers by providing them with stimulating tasks that generate response and participation. Some of the teachers think that video can replace them. Video can not be in the place of the teacher, it can only support the teacher in his/her teaching. According to Bauman (1990), video, as an aid which is integrated into our lesson or syllabus, can provide the class with a unique and enjoyable learning experience. In addition to this, it presents learner-centred activities. Video does not replace the classroom teacher but supports him/her in his/her teaching.

In his book *Video*, Maley tells us that:

"Video is a supercharged medium of communication and a powerful vehicle of information. It is packed with messages, images, ambiguity, and so represents a rich terrain to be worked and reworked in the language learning classroom" (Maley, 1991: 11).

Explanation of video is made more explicit with the following quote by Lonergan:

"The term 'video' is often used to mean quite different things in language teaching. For some, it means no more than replaying television programmes on a video recorder, for viewing in class or private study. For others, it implies the use of a video camera in class to record and play back to learners their activities and achievements in a foreign language..."

(Lonergan, 1990: 1).

For Chris Kennedy (1983: 95), it is necessary that video should be taken into consideration as an aid, at certain times with certain students, to make the learning and teaching process more effective. In communicative teaching, students should use the language better in different situations. According to Jane Willis (1982) , today "blackboard lessons" or "textbook lessons" are giving way to the lessons in which video is accepted as a teaching aid. Video materials can be valuable resources in the same way as textbooks or audio tape recordings (Willis, 1982: 43).

Video, being an essential aid in EFL classrooms, can serve three basic functions, which are; when used in a language unit, video can be used as an introduction and sample of authentic language use, as an additional context to reinforce a language point, and as a summary for a language unit.

2.1.1. Varieties of Video Materials Used in ELT

In language teaching, video materials can come from a wide variety of sources. Lonergan (1990: 7) categorises the sources of video films broadly as follows:

- “1. video recordings of language teaching broadcasts and films,
2. video recordings of domestic television broadcasts, such as comedy programmes and news programmes,
3. video recordings of specialist films and television programmes, such as documentaries produced by industry, or educational programmes,
4. video language-teaching materials made for the classroom, rather than for public transmission as broadcasts,
5. self-made video films involving the teachers and learners”.

(Lonergan, 1990: 7)

For Lonergan (1990: 7), referring to Item 1 above, “... films made for language teaching have the obvious merit of being planned and produced for a language-learning audience”. From this definition it is understood that the language may be graded, and the presentation of new vocabulary items and structures can be controlled. In item 2, Lonergan (1990: 7) mentions that video recordings of domestic television broadcasts have not been produced for language-teaching purposes, but they can be used to bring the same benefits to language learning as with the use of other authentic materials, such as newspaper articles, magazine pictures or popular records. They are real and meaningful, and provide good guidance to the learner. In item 3, video recording of specialist films and television programmes can be defined as materials produced by various companies to inform the general public and specialists about their work. This type of materials is especially suitable for language learners for specific purposes at advanced level.

Apart from Lonergan (1990) two other classifications of video software used in EFL classrooms are made by McGovern (1980: 57-65) and Macknight (1983: 11). Both McGovern and Macknight apparently stress the importance of correct selection of video sequences which will not turn the lesson into a period for watching television rather than for language learning.

Lonergan (1990) is not the only one who categorises video materials, Tomalin (1990) also categorises video materials into two categories:

- “1. Direct teaching video: to teach the class directly, there is only one language item to follow, and the teacher leads the students through it. Such as: model sentences and necessary instructions are given (e.g. BBC’s Follow Me series).

2. Resource video: to provide illustrations of the new language at a particular level (e.g. The British Council MacMillan's Video English series)".

Tomalin (1990) says that the teachers should use both American and British TV programmes, such as English lessons on TV, films, series, and documentaries. Tomalin (1990) also points out the importance of using American and British TV programmes, such as English lessons on TV, films, series, and documentaries, and stresses the limitations and advantages of these materials as follows: one of two great limitations of using TV programmes is their being broadcasted within class hours. The second is that the student can only watch it once, and has no chance to do an intensive study unless he records it on video, but using this type of material can be considered an advantage because it gives the students the opportunity to see and hear the language used currently in the culture

From his analysis of the study on "Video equipment acquisitions" (MacKnight, 1983), it was found that the most widely used software is off-air materials (91%), because off-air material has the advantage of being free, and offers a range of high quality. It is a professionally presented material and readily accessible.

In summary, as cited by Margaret Allan (1991: 93) "technology in video is still developing, and recording equipment is becoming lighter and easier to use, but all we have to know is to learn how to produce the correct material in relation to the institution's own needs and resources".

2.1.2. Role of Video in ELT Classroom

Video is very commonly used for introducing and getting the students' interest in a topic, for giving information on cultural background. The suitability of video as a medium, to bring a living language to learners, is undoubted. An air of reality can be brought into the classroom by the dynamic combination of sound and vision. The wealth of visual information available can convey the atmosphere of another culture and show paralinguistic aspects of communication (Lonergan, 1990: 69).

In an attempt to explore and classify the uses of video-taped recordings to fulfil specified language objectives, Jane Willis (1982: 45) draws up a tentative framework which allows us to establish more clearly the potential roles of video in an ELT classroom. The six tentative categories of the use of video are as follows:

1. Model and Cue

To present new language items in short, well contextualized situations, illustrating meaning and use, to give listening practice and change for selective controlled oral practice, possibly in conjunction with audio tape.

2. Target

To show 'target' situations that students can re-enact using their own words e.g. simple role play, to introduce a wider variety of settings and interactions, related to those used previously but less predictable, extending listening skills, giving students practice in recognizing different realisations of similar functions.

3. Transfer and Reinforcement

To illustrate target language in use in a far wider variety of relevant situations, using longer episodes, to stimulate simulation to provide material suitable for simple transcoding, under guidance: note taking with matrix to introduce features of continuous text, e.g. signalling devices, discourse markers.

4. Illustrator of Message and Discourse Structure

To expose students to larger chunks of language that they may not initially understand, but which illustrate typical text structures and allow practice in comprehension skills and strategies.

5. Source of Information

To provide material of which the content is relevant to students' needs and interests, for the purpose of information retrieval (activities in real life), to provide and resource material for related oral/written tasks e.g. simulations presenting a minilecture, writing a report.

6. Stimulus

To provide material to act as a stimulus for freer classroom activities (problem solving, game etc) not necessarily based on the intended message of the programme (Willis, 1982: 45).

MacKnight (1982: 7) suggests that the roles of video naturally vary according to the type of student group, and the course objectives. He adds the following table showing the main roles that video material fulfills.

Table 2.1. Roles Which Video Material Fulfils

| Role | % of occurrence |
|---|-----------------|
| Introduction to topic/stimulus of interest | 89 |
| Information on cultural background | 75 |
| General language spin off | 61 |
| Consolidation of known language | 48 |
| Contextualization of new language | 45 |
| Identification and practice of language items | 45 |
| Development of professional competence | 36 |
| Basis for project work | 27 |
| Self analysis of professional task | 20 |
| Development of social competence | 16 |
| Self-analysis of social task | 16 |

(MacKnight, 1983: 7).

From this table examined by MacKnight (1983), video is most widely used to introduce and stimulate interest in a topic, to give information on cultural background, and for general language spin-off. The roles which are given in this table are generally defined as the development of listening skills, but video is a very useful aid to develop other language skills as well.

To conclude, it is very easy to say that video recordings have an important part to play in listening work because it helps students hear the language being taught in a real-life situation. As stated by Ur (1984: 66) "video programmes can provide some enjoyable listening because there is plenty of visual reinforcement to spoken text, and this visual support is associated in the students' minds with pleasurable recreation".

As Lonergan (1990: 69) says, "The teacher will not have a better background knowledge of the content matter than the students. Video offers a ready-made situation for genuine communication: the learners can tell the teacher something he or she does not know".

2.1.3. Advantages of Visual Setting

Most teachers are accustomed to using an audio tape to present examples of language in use. Since audio tape lets us bring different voices and different accents into the classroom, and as a result of this, a skillful use of sound effects suggests a setting (Allan, 1991).

However, all the considerations suggested above can be met better with video. When students want to listen to spoken language extensively, video should be preferred, as video brings real-life situations into the classroom and as speech is combined with visual effect, video facilitates comprehension, thus it leads to better communication.

Anderson and Lynch (1988: 46) have illustrated the reason for difficulties in understanding spoken language from a tape-recorder or radio as “unpredictable content of what is said, complex topics, the language expressed in quite involved linguistic form, a number of different speakers with different voices and their accents, a varying level of background noise and lack of visual support for interpreting what is being said or who is speaking”.

In his article Shepherd brings out the methodical and technical benefits of using video for language learners:

“By using as text a continuous narrative discourse with action occurring ‘naturally’ in a series of recognisable, already familiar settings, the language learner sees and hears the various characters using the language in varied contexts. As the physical setting (in whatever episode) is visible, video clips eliminate the need for contrived discourse. Video provides support and builds up confidence in the learner, particularly for various comprehension activities” (Shepherd, 1990: 18).

Shepherd also adds the idea that “various paralinguistic behaviours in video highlight the culturally specific communication modes”. At the end of the watching activity, students can then be asked to take the roles of characters, and act their roles. This activity helps to bridge the gap between language ability and communicative competence needed for language learning.

According to Cunningsworth (1984), video material holds a good deal of potential for the language teachers, as it allows presentation and practise of language in a contextualized manner Cunningsworth adds (1984: 52) that:

“an obvious advantage of video, over tape-recorder for language presentation, is the chance that is given to students to have both visual and aural input and make use of all the contextual clues provided by the gestures and facial expressions of the speaker, and by the situation in which he is speaking”.

Cunningsworth also adds (1984: 54):

“teachers are often guilty of underestimating the difficulty faced by learners when they are asked to listen to a disembodied voice coming out of a tape-recorder. Using videotape, certainly, makes the students’ task not only easier but, also more realistic”.

As mentioned previously, the most out standing feature of video is the ability of the environment where the language is used or visual element. Video combines sound and vision; therefore, the students have both aural and visual clues to meaning.

Besides its methodical benefits, the technical benefits of video need to be mentioned. Basically the use of video is the same with the use of audiocassette recordings. A person who has used latter before can easily use video. As is known, video includes fast-forwarding for omitting sequences and “homing in” on a specific episode or

exchange. The pause button is for sudden stopping, in other words, “freezing” in midsentence for students to predict or attempt to continue, an utterance. Rewind is for repetition to hear a phrase again or see an action again. In addition, we can use slow motion to highlight some special visual image, such as a place, an appearance, clothes, a gesture, or an expression. Shepherd (1990: 18) puts emphasis on the fact that using video is really important, because it gives different opportunities both to teachers and students. For example, if a particular sequence of a video has a very clear audio recording of an interesting dialogue, which lends itself well to the listening mode, the visual screen image can simply be turned off. The soundtrack can be used to guess about the setting, age, profession and appearance of the participants, the aim of the dialogue, or to focus on a specific language structure or function.

Sometimes students are asked to watch video without sound. This type of activity, called ‘silent viewing’, separates the aural and the visual clues and allows the students to guess the language used in the film. Students who watch video without sound can build up a sense of the situation based on environment, dress, expression, gesture and, of course, actions. It also helps students concentrate on the nonverbal elements of face-to-face interaction with in the target language speaking population.

Allan (1991: 40) points out that “visual information helps us interpret the audio signals we receive by reinforcing them with additional clues. Watching video without soundtrack gives the students time to think about the information before they tackle the listening task”.

In situations where the visual element is completely eliminated, as in telephone conversations and radio broadcasts, the aural input needs to be explicit to clarify the setting. An obvious example is that on the telephone, before giving the message, the speaker should introduced herself as in the example: “Hello, this is Jane speaking” (Willis, 1982: 31).

Again, as with the previous example, giving street directions on the phone is much harder, since there is no shared deictic environment. It must be taken into consideration that people often make gestures while speaking on the phone, although they cannot be seen. To use body language even on the telephone is inevitable.

Jane Willis (1982: 31) stresses the importance of visual setting. According to her “In a radioplay, a script writer would make sure that when a parcel or birthday present is unwrapped, the recipient expresses admiration (or otherwise) in such a way as to identify the contents clearly to the listener”.

Any kind of visual support, in the form of pictures, graphs, diagrams, maps, is vitally important in a listening course based on audio tapes. Since visual aids can help learners by supplying cultural information and by enabling them to predict the language more accurately, the use of video, instead of tape-recorder, should be preferred.

James Kinder (1979) believe that learning materials that add a moving, visual element, to sound, make language more alive and meaningful, and help bring the real world into the classroom. Dale (1986: 43) wonders whether visual elements are essential or desirable; she states that “some visual support is helpful for many students to remind them of ideas and language they may know but have temporarily forgotten”. Visual support can make many tasks easy for the students in writing as well as other skills. Students can benefit from visual supports as a remainder of ideas and language when they are dealing with different tasks especially in productive skills, speaking and writing. Writing, which is considered to be one of the most difficult skills by the students, may become a bit easier to deal with by the help of such reminders.

Allan (1991: 65) points out her own opinion on the same subject and states that “Video presents realistic slices of life”. When students want to study spoken English, they spend much of their time in the classroom working on examples which are focused on the use of dialogues or a narrative, to practise the language of the unit. The teacher usually uses the examples in the textbook, often with audio tapes. Using audio tapes gives the students a great realism, of different voices and sound effects. However, when video is used, students realize that the examples are more comprehensive after watching, because they show the ways people communicate visually as well as verbally (Allan, 1991).

Allan (1991: 49) also points out that “the visual support provided by video helps learners when they listen to a foreign language because students can see, as well as hear, what is going on”. And video’s moving pictures also help learners concentrate on the topic because videos provide a focus of attention while students listen. Allan adds that both these forms of support, listening and watching, suggest that video is a good medium for extended listening to the foreign language, “the more exposure learners have to the language, the better they are likely to learn it”.

As emphasized by Percival and Ellington (1984: 64), “video presentations can be used in education and training as an effective lecture substitute, and they are particularly useful if the content has high visual impact”. Percival and Ellington also add that “video programmes can provide an impression of life outside the classroom and show lifestyles in other countries, scientific processes at the microscopic level, complicated industrial processes, theatrical productions, and so on”.

As stated video is found effective in spoken listening lessons. Considering the support it provides it will be affective in writing too. Therefore, bringing the real life in the classroom may help the students to enrich their language by learning new words, phrases and sentence structures, and teachers desire to observe it in their production in writing. Therefore, students can understand the given topic easily and video films may motivate them about their topics in writing lessons. Watching the language in real life

situation, students may hear new words, phrases and sentence structures and they can use them in their written work. Therefore, students may give examples from real life from the target language community. The examples they give, may be more realistic as they watch the communities' life styles in the video films.

To conclude, the use of video in EFL classrooms is more effective than the use of audiocassette recordings. When learners watch video programmes in the target language, they exercise their listening skills as they do when they listen to audiocassette recordings. With video, they have all the additional clues that the visual setting gives them while they watch and listen. Thus, video helps us provide a richer and more varied language environment within which learn can take place. Since, in some situations, the classroom is the only place where learners can hear the foreign language spoken, video becomes a means of giving them a "language bath" in the classroom.

2.2. Literature Review on Pre-Writing Activities

Most writers don't start with a good focal point. They have to look for one. They have to sort through their experiences, observations, and ideas for something worth writing about. This preliminary collecting and sifting of possibilities, often called pre-writing, is an essential step in the writing process (Britton, 1975).

According to Britton (1975), a writer's past experiences and frames of references serve to colour facts which have been gathered. Writers then analyze, synthesize, interpret facts in relation to their point of view.

Pre-writing is all the thoughts, sights, sounds, tastes, feelings, opinions and attitudes a person has ever experienced. Elbow (1981) says, "teachers job is to call these memories out of storage and find ways of expressing them clearly and comfortably. Pre-writing is a period for exploration and discovery prior to the actual composition of a piece (Murray, 1984). At the pre-writing stage, students/the writers are ready to write.

Murray (1984) defines pre-writing as follows:

"Pre-writing includes any experience, activity, or exercise that motivates a person to write, generate ideas for writing, or helps a writer to focus attention on a particular topic. Pre-writing includes talking, thinking, writing anything that helps the writer get ready to write".

This stage is often over-looked, and students are merely expected to write without being assisted in doing so.

For beginning writers, pre-writing may be planned learning experiences that the teacher provides later, as they become more experienced, writers may need less extensively planned pre-writing experiences. Pre-writing helps all writers to discover what they have to say (Murray, 1984). Raimes (1983: 10) also states, "Many teachers in ESL classes now give their students the opportunity to explore a topic fully in such pre-writing activities as discussion, reading, debate, brainstorming, and list making".

2.2.1. Brainstorming

Used widely in business, industry, and engineering. Brainstorming involves loosening out ideas, often with several other people, in order to find new or fresh ways to approach a topic (Macconic, 1970). Raimes (1983: 69) explains brainstorming as follows:

“The teacher does not have to monitor grammar or pronunciation, except when the speaker cannot be understood, though the teacher will obviously be the resource person whom students turn to as they search for the right word or the right structure to express their ideas. Whatever the writing assignment is based on -a reading, picture, map, textbook topic, personal experience, or an examination essay question- it can be preceded by student talk, specifically by a brainstorming activity, with student producing relevant vocabulary, making comments, asking questions, and making associations as freely as they can in a short time”.

After brainstorming activity, students can write down without worrying about grammar, spelling, organization, or the quality of the ideas (Raimes, 1983).

2.2.2. Discussion

Discussion lets students to talk about a topic and lets them to focus on specific aspects of a topic is to provide guidelines for group or whole-class discussion (Raimes, 1983: 71). The ideas, students come up with within the established guidelines are, however, entirely their own.

2.2.3. Mapping

Mapping is a way of generating ideas using a visual scheme, or map. Mapping is an especially useful way of developing various subtopics in an essay (Elbow, 1981).

2.2.4. List Making

Raimes (1983) says, ‘Lists are a much neglected part of writing in a second/foreign language, even though a lot of the writing that people do is list making’. People write lists to help them remember what to do. People usually write shopping lists, lists of people to invite to a party, and lists of things to do tomorrow (Raimes, 1983). Lists are the basis for many conceptual activities; people alphabetize, group, and classify (Raimes, 1983).

List making is kind of classification and it may help students to be aware of the classification systems of the target language (Raimes, 1983).

2.2.5. Reading

Any reading, a short story, a newspaper column, an advertisement, a letter, a magazine article, a poem, the students do relates to writing in that what they read was once written. When the students read professional writing, they interact with the finished product (Raimes, 1983).

2.2.6. Pictures

ESL/EFL writing teachers can find a valuable resource in pictures: drawings, photographs, posters, slides, cartoons, magazine advertisements, diagrams, graphs, tables, charts, and maps. Pictures provide a shared experience for students in the class, a common base that leads to a variety of language activities (Raimes, 1983). With a picture, all students, after close observation of the material, will immediately need the appropriate vocabulary, idiom, and sentence structure to discuss what they see. Pictures also provide a stimulating focus for students' attention (Raimes, 1983).

2.2.7. Video as a Pre-Writing Activity

In ESL/EFL literature, video is not given as a pre-writing activity in writing. Video is used in speaking and listening classes as a substitute teaching material (Tomalin, 1990:29). In speaking and listening classes as a post-activity, teachers used writing (Tomalin, 1990:44). However, in writing classes video is not used as a pre-writing activity. As is searched in ESL/EFL literature, video is suggested in writing.

Previous research findings in the field prove that audio-visual input has an important role in increasing the writing proficiency of the students. Students are known to produce better writing samples when audio-visual input is given. For instance, Tomalin (1990) talks about an approach for teaching writing which is mainly based on the audio-visual input. Tomalin strongly believes that basing students' writings on audio-visual clues will increase their proficiency and interest in their compositions. Tomalin offers some lesson plans for listening and speaking classes. In these lesson plans, Tomalin suggests composition writing as a post-activity. He also adds that students can write their compositions easily as they watched video films and they studied on video films by some listening or speaking exercises such as 'true or false' or 'fill in the blanks'. Moffet and Wagner (1976) also say that asking a child to write about his feelings or sensations shows him that the 'stuff' he may write about is around him. Baskoff (1981) points out that using paragraphs which are based on topics related to what students are going to write, gives students an opportunity to write better compositions.

3. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, subjects, the instruments used, data collection procedures and the procedures followed during the treatment sessions are described.

3.1. Subjects

This study was carried out at Osmangazi University Foreign Languages Department.

There were 20 subjects and these 20 subjects were randomly assigned to two groups in the study as 10 students to Group I and 10 students to Group II. Since the ideal language classroom consists of 10 or 15 students, the number of the subjects (10) to be used for each group was accepted as satisfactory. The subjects had been exposed to 30 hours of English per week in their program in the preparatory year. Therefore, the subjects had the potential competence of English necessary for the purpose of this study. The criterion for choosing these subjects was their being educated in a school in which video is used as a teaching device and their being the members of the intermediate level of English course at the school.

The students in the preparatory school are always grouped according to their level of English. At the beginning of the academic year, a proficiency test is given, then a placement test is given to determine the students' level of English. When this study was administered, in 1998-1999, the students were put into three groups: Group I upper-intermediate classes A and B; Group II intermediate classes C, D, E.; and Group III pre-intermediate classes F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O. The number of students in each class was between 20-25 and their ages were between 17 and 21. Group I had the students who got the highest mark in the placement test. Group II had the students who got lower grades than Group I but higher than Group III. And finally, the students who got the lowest mark in the placement test were put into the Group III classes.

Two classes in Group III were chosen. Their levels were almost the same and there were 45 students in these classes. Before the actual study, these 45 students were given two tests. First, Michigan Placement Test scores were used to determine the language level of these students. Secondly, a topic was given and the students were asked to write a composition, and their compositions were excepted as pre-tests. Both the Michigan Placement Test and the compositions were evaluated by experienced teachers and native

speakers who had been teaching writing for several years. In scoring, the published key of Michigan Placement Test and ESL Composition Profile (Hughey, et.al, 1983) were used. These tests assisted the researcher to determine the proper study subjects. After gathering all the data from the Michigan Placement Test and ESL Composition Profile, 20 students were chosen randomly among the students who scored between 30 and 40 as subjects of the study.

All of these students were taking the same integrated English course. After the pre-study composition, one of the groups which was the experimental group was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the other group which was the control group was not exposed to video films for six weeks.

The study was carried out in the second term of the academic year 1998-1999. The experimental group and the control group had been studying video three hours a week and for a semester of 16 weeks.

3.2. Instruments

In this study, in order to have students write better compositions and to provide them with background information, video films were used. Since video films were not designed especially for English language teaching classrooms, three video films on different topics, as listed below, were chosen for the purpose of our study. These three video films were chosen by considering up to date events and students' interests. Most of all, they kept the students motivation very high by presenting real life situations.

VIDEO FILM I:

Title : Music of Tomorrow

Time : 20 minutes

Content : It is about using computers in composing songs and shooting video films. Peter Gabriel, rock star, uses computers for his songs and video films.

VIDEO FILM II:

Title : Digital Game World

Time : 15 minutes

Content : It is about computer games. How to prepare these computer games visual and sound effects.

VIDEO FILM III:

Title : There but for the Grace

Time : 25 minutes

Content : It is about homeless people in United States of America. Why they chose to live in streets. How can we help them and people's behaviour to these people.

The use of the above mentioned video films, aimed at helping students to produce three argumentative compositions as indicated below:

WRITTEN TOPIC I:

“Are we endangering ourselves to being addicted to the internet? Does the internet causes us to be anti-social?”

This topic was given to the students as a pre-study composition subject (pre-test).

WRITTEN TOPIC II:

“Should the computer be used to learn creativity? Should games and other things be considered personal property? Or should they be shared freely?”

WRITTEN TOPIC III:

“Are visual games deceptive? What do visual games teach?”

WRITTEN TOPIC IV:

“One day you are a member of society, and the next day you are worthless. No one cares about you.” Have you ever felt worthless? How can we prevent people from feeling worthless? What must be done? Why? How? When?

This topic was given to students as a post-study composition subject (post-test).

To evaluate the students’ examination papers (see Appendix A), the ESL Composition Profile, suggested by Hughey et al. (1983), was used with some modifications. The Profile contains five component scales: Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Language Use, and Mechanics (detailed information is covered in Appendix A). Each focuses on an essential aspect of writing and is evaluated according to its approximate importance for written communication. While the papers were evaluated special attention was given to ‘Content’ and ‘Language Use’ components in the ESL Composition Profile. In content, the students are expected to write relevant sentences to the topic and develop thesis statement. In Language Use, students are expected to make less errors in grammar such as tense and word order. The total weight for each component was divided into numerical ranges that aim towards mastery levels; i.e. Excellent to Very Good. Good to Average, Fair to Poor and Very Poor.

3.3. Data Collection

As we know, in composition writing students come across with some problems. Generally, composition titles which give students no guidance can be specified as one of those problems occurring in writing tests.

If video is used, the visual and non-verbal features of discourse make the topic easier to cope with. When subjects are given any kind of guidance, especially through video films, they may feel themselves ready to perform the tasks they are assigned.

In the first writing hour of the study, the pre-study composition was given to both the control and experimental groups. In this pre-test, the students in both groups were asked to write at least three paragraphs on the following topic:

“Are we endangering ourselves to being addicted to the internet? Does the internet cause us to be anti-social?”

Afterwards; during data collection, the following procedure was followed: In both the experimental and the control group, general question and answer was used to activate students' background information with the topics, in the experimental group, 15 minutes took for watching video films. After watching the video films, 15 minutes took for question and answers about the films. In the control group, 30 minutes was used for general chat on the topic to activate students' background information. In this group, no video film was used.

By means of this stage, the subjects were prepared for the second stage; the composition writing. Whatever the writing topic was, subjects performed the writing during the rest part of the class time. They spent 40 or 50 minutes to write a composition.

During the writing stage, the teacher was ready to help the subjects with their particular difficulties, such as asking the meaning of a new word which was not learnt before. The teacher functioned as a guide who walked around to help, especially for those who would refuse to watch the video or write about the sequence. The teacher encouraged them to get involved in the activities. Since this study was not considered as a “traditional writing class” in which students are given papers, then asked to write a composition on the given topic within 40 minutes, the subjects were allowed to ask questions to the teacher in order to perform the writing better. Furthermore, they were given access to reference materials such as dictionaries for them to make use of, and also free to ask questions to the teacher when they needed help.

3.4. Data Analysis

The compositions of the students in the control group and the experimental group for pre-study composition and the compositions were analyzed and evaluated according to the ESL Composition Profile Suggested by Hughey et.al (1983: 140).

3.4.1. The ESL Composition Profile

Analytic evaluation is generally guided by a type of analytic evaluation scoring guide in order to guarantee that scorers are evaluating the same aspects of the composition. This also increases the reliability of the scoring. There are various types of analytic evaluation guides. The scale used in this study gives the opportunity of scoring the compositions from five different aspects: content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics. Jacobs et al. (1981) state that:

“this is an important difference, since readers sometimes tend to value only one aspect of a composition when using a purely impressionistic approach, yet it is only through a writer's

successful production, integration and synchronization of all these component parts of a composition an effective whole is created. The profile asks readers to peer at the composition through as many windows as possible in arriving at their judgments of quality” (p.31).

Since the profile consists of subcomponents, the scorer has to focus on all of the aspects given in the profile while scoring. Also, each component of this profile is weighed according to its approximate importance for written communication, the distribution is: 30 points for content, 20 points for organization, 20 points for vocabulary, 25 points for language use and 5 points for mechanics, in addition, each component is divided into four mastery levels; excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor and very poor, and all of these levels have specific criteria for each component. Criteria which are defined by descriptors give detailed information about the characteristics of a composition at each mastery level and this enables the scorers to score the compositions more reliably and effectively.

3.4.2. Analytical Procedures

Each paper was analyzed and evaluated according to the component scales in the ESL Composition Profile. For less subjectivity in measuring, for having an objective measurement and for the reliable results all the compositions were read and marked by three teachers. One of the teachers was a native speaker of English and two of them were non-native teachers. The teachers have been teaching writing in EFL classes for a long time.

By using ESL Composition Profile each composition was measured in five different components. Content was scored out of 30, Organization out of 20, Vocabulary out of 20, Language Use out of 25, and Mechanics out of 5. The sum of the scores of the five components gave the total score for each composition.

For the average score, the three separate scores for both the five components and total scores given by the three different teachers were added and divided by 3. The results gave the average scores for each paper. An average score for each paper in pre-study composition, and in post test for each component and total scores are shown in the Appendices B and C.

In order to analyze the data and derive conclusions, statistical techniques were applied. To determine the difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films, a two-tailed student's t-test for independent samples was applied and the results of two groups were compared at the 0.05 level of significance. To determine the difference within the groups, a two-tailed t-test for correlated samples was applied and the results were compared at the 0.05 level of significance.

4. RESULTS

In this chapter, the data collected in this study were analyzed in order to answer the Research Questions which ask:

1. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in post test?
2. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in Content, Organisation, Vocabulary, Language Use, Mechanics in post test?

4.1. Pre-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group

The pre-test scores of the experimental and the control group were compared before the treatment session (see Appendix B for the summary of the pre-test scores of the control group and Appendix C for the experimental group).

The mean score of pre-test (pre-study composition) was 54.3 for the control group and 54.6 for the experimental group. The experimental group scored slightly higher than the control group. The difference in group means is 0.3. Since there is a difference between the two groups, t-test for independent samples was applied to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. The Mean Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group in Pre-test and T-test Results

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 54.3 | | | |
| | | | 0.3 | 0.182 | 0.857 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 54.6 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Although the mean score was 0.3 higher for the experimental group compared to that of the control group, the results of t-test for independent samples indicate that this difference was not significant; ($t= 0.182, p= 0.857$) at the 0.05 level of significance. The pre-test scores of both groups did not show significant difference. That is, the two groups have the same writing proficiency when the study started.

4.2. Post-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group

The post-test scores of the experimental and the control group were compared after the study was completed in both groups (see Appendix D for the summary of the post-test scores of the control group and Appendix E for the experimental group). The mean post-test score was 57.6 for the control group and 67.8 for the experimental group (Mean difference= 10.2). The difference between the two groups was examined by t-test for independent samples in order to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. The Mean Scores of the Experimental and the Control Group in Post-test

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 57.6 | | | |
| | | | 10.2 | 8.620 | 0.000 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 67.8 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Although both groups improved after the treatment, subjects in the experimental group scored higher than subjects in the control group in post-test. The results of t-test for independent samples show that the difference was significant ($t= 8.620, p= 0.000$) at the 0.05 level of significance. That is, although they started at the same writing proficiency level, experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video improved in writing.

4.3. Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control Group

The mean score for pre-test in the control group was 54.3 and the mean score for post-test was 57.6 (see Appendix B for the summary of the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group). The difference between the pre-test and the post-test of the control

group was 3.3. To determine whether there was a significant improvement between the pre and post-tests within the control group, t-test for dependent samples was applied (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3. The Mean Scores of the Control Group in Pre-test and in Post-test

| Control group | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|---------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Pre-test | 10 | 54.3 | | | |
| | | | 3.3 | 3.497 | 0.006 |
| Post-test | 10 | 57.6 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

For the control group, mean difference between the pre and post-test was 3.3. The results of the t-test for dependent samples indicate that this difference was significant ($t=3.497$, $p=0.006$) at the 0.05 level of significance. So, during the study the control group also improved as a natural result of the courses they were attending to but this improvement was not as big as the experimental group's.

4.4. Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group

The mean score for pre-test in the experimental group was 54.6 and the mean score for the post-test was 67.8 (see Appendix C for the summary of pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group). The mean difference between the pre and post-test of the experimental group was 13.2. To determine whether there was a significant improvement between the pre and post-tests within the experimental group, t-test for dependent samples was used (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group in Pre-test and in Post-test

| Experimental group | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|--------|-------|
| Pre-test | 10 | 54.6 | | | |
| | | | 13.2 | 16.220 | 0.000 |
| Post-test | 10 | 67.8 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

The results of the t-test for dependent samples indicate that this difference was statistically significant ($t= 16.220$, $p= 0.000$) at the 0.05 level of significance. The experimental group students showed higher performance in the post-test than they did in the pre-test compared to the control group.

4.5. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Content

The post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group were compared after the study was completed in both group in content (see Table 4.5.1. for the summary of the post-test scores for the control group and the experimental group in content).

Table 4.5.1. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Content

| | t:10.386 | d.f.:18 | p<0.05 |
|------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subjects | Experimental Group | Control Group | |
| 1 | 23 | 18 | |
| 2 | 24 | 17 | |
| 3 | 24 | 20 | |
| 4 | 24 | 20 | |
| 5 | 23 | 18 | |
| 6 | 23 | 19 | |
| 7 | 25 | 19 | |
| 8 | 23 | 20 | |
| 9 | 26 | 19 | |
| 10 | 23 | 17 | |
| Mean value | 23.8 | 18.7 | |

The mean post-test scores in content was 18.7 for the control group and 23.8 for the experimental group (Mean difference= 5.1). The difference between the two groups was examined by t-test for independent samples in order to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.5.2.).

Table 4.5.2. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Content in Post-test

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|--------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 18.7 | | | |
| | | | 5.1 | 10.386 | 0.000 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 23.8 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Although both groups improved after the treatment, subjects in the experimental group scored 5.1 higher than subjects in the control group in post-test in content. The results of t-test for independent samples show that the difference was statistically significant ($t=10.386$, $p=0.000$) at the 0.05 level of significance.

4.6. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Organization

The post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group in organization were compared after the study was completed in both groups (see Table 4.6.1. for the summary of the post-test scores for the control group and the experimental group in organization).

Table 4.6.1. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Organization

| | t:4.230 | d.f.:18 | p<0.05 |
|------------|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| Subjects | Experimental Group | Control Group | |
| 1 | 12 | 12 | |
| 2 | 13 | 11 | |
| 3 | 14 | 12 | |
| 4 | 13 | 13 | |
| 5 | 13 | 11 | |
| 6 | 14 | 13 | |
| 7 | 13 | 11 | |
| 8 | 13 | 12 | |
| 9 | 13 | 11 | |
| 10 | 13 | 12 | |
| Mean value | 13.1 | 11.8 | |

The mean post-test scores was 11.8 for the control group and 13.1 for the experimental group (Mean difference= 1.3). The difference between the two groups was examined by t-test for independent samples in order to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.6.2.).

Table 4.6.2. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Organization in Post-test

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 11.8 | | | |
| | | | 1.3 | 4.230 | 0.000 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 13.1 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Although both groups improved after the treatment, subjects in the experimental group scored 1.3 higher than subjects in the control group in post-test in organization. The results of t-test for independent samples show that the difference was significant ($t=4.230$, $p=0.000$) at the 0.05 level of significance.

4.7. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Vocabulary

The post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group in vocabulary were compared after the study was completed in both groups (see Table 4.7.1 for the summary of the post-test scores in vocabulary for the control and the experimental group).

Table 4.7.1. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Vocabulary

| | t:5.210 | d.f.:18 | p<0.05 |
|------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subjects | Experimental Group | Control Group | |
| 1 | 11 | 12 | |
| 2 | 16 | 11 | |
| 3 | 15 | 12 | |
| 4 | 17 | 13 | |
| 5 | 17 | 11 | |
| 6 | 14 | 12 | |
| 7 | 15 | 12 | |
| 8 | 15 | 11 | |
| 9 | 15 | 10 | |
| 10 | 13 | 11 | |
| Mean value | 14.8 | 11.5 | |

The mean post-test scores was 11.5 for the control group and 14.8 for the experimental group (Mean difference= 3.3). The difference between the two groups was examined by t-test for independent samples in order to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.7.2.).

Table 4.7.2. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Vocabulary

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 11.5 | | | |
| | | | 3.3 | 5.210 | 0.000 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 14.8 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Although both groups improved after the treatment, subjects in the experimental group scored 14.8 higher than subjects in the control group in post-test in vocabulary. The results of t-test for independent samples show that the difference was significant (t=5.210, p=0.000) at the 0.05 level of significance.

4.8. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Language Use

The post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group in language use were compared after the study was completed in both groups (see Table 4.8.1 for the summary of the post-test scores in language use for the control group and the experimental group).

Table 4.8.1. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Language Use

| | t:1.342 | d.f.:18 | p<0.05 |
|------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Subjects | Experimental Group | Control Group | |
| 1 | 14 | 14 | |
| 2 | 15 | 14 | |
| 3 | 14 | 14 | |
| 4 | 13 | 13 | |
| 5 | 13 | 13 | |
| 6 | 14 | 12 | |
| 7 | 14 | 13 | |
| 8 | 13 | 13 | |
| 9 | 12 | 12 | |
| 10 | 13 | 12 | |
| Mean value | 13.5 | 13 | |

The mean post-test score was 13 for the control group and 13.5 for the experimental group (Mean difference= 0.5). The difference between the two groups was examined by t-test for independent samples in order to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.8.2).

Table 4.8.2. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Language Use

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 13 | | | |
| | | | 0.5 | 1.341 | 0.196 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 13.5 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Although both groups improved after the treatment, subjects in the experimental group scored 13.5 higher than subjects in the control group in language use in post-test, the results of t-test for independent samples show that this difference was not significant ($t=1.341$, $p=0.196$) at the 0.05 level of significance. Neither groups showed a significant improvement in terms of language use during the study.

4.9. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Mechanics

The post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group in mechanics were compared after the study was completed in both groups (see Table 4.9.1. for the summary of the post-test scores in mechanics for the control group and the experimental group).

Table 4.9.1. Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Mechanics

| | t:0.000 | d.f.:18 | p>0.05 |
|------------|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| Subjects | Experimental Group | Control Group | |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | |
| 6 | 2 | 3 | |
| 7 | 3 | 2 | |
| 8 | 3 | 3 | |
| 9 | 2 | 3 | |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | |
| Mean value | 2.6 | 2.6 | |

The mean post-test scores was 2.6 for the control group and 2.6 for the experimental group (Mean difference= 0). The difference between the two groups was examined by t-test for independent samples in order to see if the difference was significant or not (see Table 4.9.2.).

Table 4.9.2. The Mean Scores of the Experimental Group and the Control Group in Mechanics

| | n | Mean | Mean Difference | t | p |
|--------------------|----|------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Control group | 10 | 2.6 | | | |
| | | | 0 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 2.6 | | | |

at 0.05 level of significance

Both subjects in the experimental group and the subjects in the control group scored the same mean score, which is 2.6, in mechanics in the post-test. The results of t-test for independent samples show that this difference was not significant ($t=0.000$, $p=1.000$) at the 0.05 level of significance.

See Appendix B which showed the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

See Appendix C which showed the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group in content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

4.10. Discussion

Since the aim of this study was to determine the effects of using video films as a pre-writing activity, a number of video films were used in the experimental group to achieve this purpose. Before the application students provide the pre-study composition in other words the pre-test. In pre-study composition (pre-test), the experimental group showed 54.6 mean score, the control group showed 54.3 mean score. That is, the experimental group and the control group had approximately the same scores in the total and in the scores of components before the actual study in the pre-study composition (pre-test), meaning that the experimental group and the control group subjects have almost same writing proficiency before the study. After the study, the results showed that the total scores of the subjects in the experimental group had an increase. The experimental group scored higher than the control group. The mean difference of both groups' became 10.2 between the experimental and the control group which was statistically significant. The subjects in the experimental group wrote better compositions when they had gone through a writing syllabus enhanced with video due to the fact that they were able to initiate their background information, as well as to learn how to start, and the necessary vocabulary to develop their arguments. The experimental group's subjects received additional clues while watching and listening to the video films: i.e people acting in the films, their gestures, mimics, and the body language increased the productivity in the writing tasks. As Willis states (1982: 30), "Network of interactions between the verbal and non-verbal components leads to full comprehension". Visual input helps the subjects identify the details clearly because the visual clues make the language more alive and meaningful. These visual clues help them recall the events and the language used in the story.

The pre-test and the post-test scores of the control group showed a slight significant difference when compared statistically (54.3 and 57.6 respectively). Both groups improved but the level of improvement was different. The improvement of the control group between the pre-test and the post-test was not as high as the experimental group's improvement.

Therefore, the experimental group's improvement in writing was due to the pre-writing activity through video while the improvement of the control groups who was not exposed to video films was the consequence of the English language education going on throughout the study.

The analysis of the components in the ESL Composition Profile, show that there are some differences in some components in post-test. The compositions of the subjects in the experimental group and the control group, showed significant differences between the pre-study composition (pre-test) and the post-test in content, organization, and vocabulary significantly. However, their improvement in language use and in mechanics is statistically non-significant.

The experimental group's subjects were able to develop more concise and planned thesis on which they based their writing production. Their compositions were more related, substantive, and knowledgeable because of being given the necessary initiative information. Therefore, teaching writing through video with the help of watching video films helped the students in content.

Besides, the experimental group's subjects wrote better and longer compositions in terms of organization compared to the control group. Because of pre-writing activity through video, video films gave the subjects the idea of good expression, cohesion, organization and logical sequencing. Subjects in the experimental group wrote more related, clear and continuous compositions in terms of supporting details and questioning compositions.

The improvement in terms of vocabulary implied that the experimental group by the help of video films, the experimental group's subjects used effective words, appropriate register, appropriate vocabulary to the topic.

The statistical results indicate there was no improvement in mechanics. The reason why the students in the experimental group did not improve in terms of mechanics was probably because features such as punctuation, spelling, capitalization and paragraphing were not emphasized neither before this study started nor during the pre-writing activity. Although the improvement in terms of Language Use was statistically significant it was only 0.5, which could be considered as a little improvement than content and vocabulary. This numerically less improvement could be because the features such as articles, pronouns, prepositions, tense agreement, word order were not emphasized neither before this study started nor during the pre-writing activity.

To conclude, this study showed that the subjects in the experimental group, who were exposed pre-writing activity through video, wrote better argumentative compositions than the subjects in the control group who were not exposed pre-writing activity through video films. Moreover, there was a significant difference in the components between the experimental group and the control group in post-test. As is seen from the findings, there was a significant difference in content, organization and vocabulary while there was no difference in language use and in mechanics.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1. Overview and Conclusion

This study stemmed from the need of using technology in EFL writing classes. So that students feel that any kind of input, such as audio-visual, or visual in writing classes makes the writing task more meaningful, realistic, and interesting. Providing aural, audio-visual and visual support also create interesting writing topics. As Byrne (1991: 27) has suggested students should be provided with guidance in writing activities. Since, students should also be aware of the reason behind writing their composition, the learning process and testing the items learned become more meaningful. For this reason, in this study, the contribution of audio-visual input in writing compositions through video was discussed.

At the beginning of the study it was assumed that, when the subjects in writing compositions, study the topic that they are asked to write on, through audio-visual channels, they feel themselves more ready to write. As was mentioned before, the aim of this study was to see whether watching video before writing helps students to write coherent and good argumentative compositions.

In this study, there were two groups, and 20 subjects. Subjects are from the Preparatory School of Osmangazi University. Subjects levels were intermediate. 10 of them were in the experimental group and 10 of them in the control group. During this study, the experimental group was exposed to pre-writing activity through video films. However, the control group was not exposed to pre-writing activity through video films. Two groups wrote four compositions during the study. The students in the experimental group wrote their compositions with the help of watching video films related with the topic, but the control group was required to write compositions about the given topic without having that help. The final composition was taken as post test. The scores of the post test of the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activity through watching video and the control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activity through watching video were evaluated by three writing teachers and the average score of these grades were taken as post test scores of the subjects.

At the beginning of the treatment, the subjects were given audio-visual-based compositions to see the contribution of audio-visual input in argumentative compositions. The first research question was:

1. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in post test?

The results showed that both groups improved to some extent. However, the improvement in the experimental group considerably higher compared to that of the control group in terms of composition writing. In other words, using video as a pre-writing activity helped the subjects to write coherent and good argumentative compositions. As Lonergan (1990) says, video is very useful for introducing and getting the students' interest in a topic, for giving information on cultural background. And also Allan (1991) states that, 'the visual support' provided by video helps learners. Percival and Ellington (1984) emphasizes the importance of using video at the presentation stage in education. So video could provide a great amount of help in preparing students for writing.

Then, the following question was asked:

2. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in Content, Organisation, Vocabulary, Language Use, Mechanics in post test?

The increase in using video films as a pre-writing activity was higher in the experimental group than in the control group in content, in organization, and in vocabulary. However, the increase in using video films as a pre-writing activity in the experimental group was same as in the control group in language use and in mechanics. It was revealed that when the subjects had not had audio-visual input, they had difficulty in writing their compositions. Since they did not watch the characters and their attitudes, facial expressions, clothes, etc., they had to focus on the topic and the key words that make the comprehension easier. Although the subjects received enough information through topic means to write compositions, they were not at all satisfied with the input. They pointed out that there were some missing parts in their mind, because they were not given a chance to see what was going on.

In addition to the above findings, it was observed that in audio-visual-based composition students were more active and a little bit more successful than other students, because the language which was considered incomprehensible became comprehensible by means of visual clues.

As a result, as was observed in the audio-visual input composition scores, the lack of understanding of the language in the video-film did not cause any problem because students only watched the scenes and guessed the language used in the sequence, by means of the given visual clues. Since they were not limited by the verbal clues, they were free to create their own scenarios, in accordance with the topic they were given to write. Thus, there was not any specific limitation in the language to be used in the writing composition.

The presented data clearly reveals the effectiveness of visual setting in compositions when sound is accompanied this new technique was found useful because subjects received additional clues while listening to the sound track; i.e. people acting in the film, their gestures, mimics and the body language increased the productivity in the writing tasks. "Network of interactions between the verbal and non-verbal components leads to full comprehension." (Willis, 1982: 30). Visual input helps the students identify the details clearly because the visual clues make the language more alive and meaningful. Moreover, these visual clues help them recall the events and the language used in the story.

Another important point which is worth mentioning here is that the subjects were observed to be very enthusiastic and highly motivated throughout the pre-viewing and writing activities. The students enjoyed the previewing and writing stages because they became aware of the fact that these activities prepare them much better in performing the writing tasks.

Consequently, despite the time limitation, it may easily be concluded that teachers can benefit from video in writing class. In designing writing class many other methods and techniques can be utilized. The technique which was used in this study is only one of them. On the whole, in order to arrive at more accurate and conclusive results, further research, covering the progress of a longer period of treatment with a wider variety of materials, testing different level of students needs to be conducted. It is hoped that the present research would give guidance to language teachers in designing, and conducting writing by means of video.

5.2. Suggestions for Further Studies

In this study, intermediate level of EFL students were used. Further studies can be conducted with elementary, upper intermediate and advanced level students to see if there will be differences in the results in terms of the effects of video as a pre-writing activity.

In further studies other type of compositions which were not included in this study can be dealt with.

This study can be applied to other writing classes.

In this study, it was found that in content, organization, vocabulary there was a significant difference, however, in language use and in mechanics the results did not show significant differences between the groups in terms of improvement. This may be because the subjects wrote their compositions in a short-time (50 minutes). Further study may cover a longer period of treatment.

Finally, further studies may be conducted to compare video use with other pre-writing activities such as brainstorming, mapping, list making, reading, pictures or a combination of one or two of these previously mentioned pre-writing activities could be experimented to see which way we could get better results.

APPENDIX A

| ESL COMPOSITION PROFILE | | | |
|--|-------|---|----------|
| STUDENT | DATE | TOPIC | |
| SCORE | LEVEL | CRITERIA | COMMENTS |
| C O N T E N T | 30-27 | EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic. | |
| | 26-22 | GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail | |
| | 21-17 | FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic | |
| | 16-13 | VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate | |
| O R G A N I Z A T I O N | 20-18 | EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated / supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive | |
| | 17-14 | GOOD TO AVERAGE: some what choppy • loosely organized but main idea stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing | |
| | 13-10 | FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development | |
| | 9-7 | VERY POOR: does not communicative • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate | |
| V O C A B U L A R Y | 20-18 | EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register | |
| | 17-14 | GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured | |
| | 13-10 | FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • meaning confused or obscured | |
| | 9-7 | VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|--|-----------------|
| L A N G U A G E U S E | 25-22 | EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions. | |
| | 21-18 | GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured | |
| | 17-11 | FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • meaning confused or obscured | |
| | 10-5 | VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate | |
| M E C H A N I C S | 5 | EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing | |
| | 4 | GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured | |
| | 3 | FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • meaning confused or obscured | |
| | 2 | VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate | |
| TOTAL | SCORE | READER | COMMENTS |

The Results of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Students in the Control Group

| Subject | Content | | Organization | | Vocabulary | | Language Use | | Mechanics | | Total | |
|---------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 58 | 58 |
| 2 | 20 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 54 | 55 |
| 3 | 20 | 20 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 60 | 61 |
| 4 | 20 | 20 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 60 | 62 |
| 5 | 20 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 53 | 56 |
| 6 | 19 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 55 | 59 |
| 7 | 16 | 19 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 49 | 57 |
| 8 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 50 | 59 |
| 9 | 19 | 19 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 52 | 55 |
| 10 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 52 | 54 |

The Results of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Students in the Experimental Group

| Subject | Content | | Organization | | Vocabulary | | Language Use | | Mechanics | | Total | |
|---------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | 17 | 23 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 49 | 63 |
| 2 | 16 | 24 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 55 | 71 |
| 3 | 20 | 24 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 59 | 69 |
| 4 | 18 | 24 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 17 | 11 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 52 | 70 |
| 5 | 18 | 23 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 12 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 59 | 69 |
| 6 | 19 | 23 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 55 | 67 |
| 7 | 18 | 25 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 51 | 70 |
| 8 | 18 | 23 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 58 | 67 |
| 9 | 21 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 55 | 68 |
| 10 | 19 | 23 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 53 | 64 |

APPENDIX D

Table 1. The results of the pre-study composition (pre-test) total scores of the students in the control group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities.

| Subject | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Language Use | Mechanics | Total |
|---------|---------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | 18 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 3 | 58 |
| 2 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 54 |
| 3 | 20 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 3 | 60 |
| 4 | 20 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 3 | 60 |
| 5 | 20 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 53 |
| 6 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 55 |
| 7 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 49 |
| 8 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 50 |
| 9 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 52 |
| 10 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 52 |

The results of t-test showing the difference between the control group and the experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | d.f | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|-------|-----|---------------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 54.3 | | | | | |
| | | | 3.917 | 1.323 | 18 | 0.183 < 2.101 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 54.6 | | | | | |

APPENDIX E

Table 2. The results of the pre-study composition (pre-test) total scores of the students in the experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities.

| Subject | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Language Use | Mechanics | Total |
|---------|---------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 49 |
| 2 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 55 |
| 3 | 20 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 2 | 59 |
| 4 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 52 |
| 5 | 18 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 2 | 59 |
| 6 | 19 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 55 |
| 7 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 51 |
| 8 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 3 | 58 |
| 9 | 21 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 55 |
| 10 | 19 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 53 |

The results of t-test showing the difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activity through video films and the control group who was not exposed to video films in post test.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | d.f | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|-------|-----|---------------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 57.6 | | | | | |
| | | | 3.406 | 1.323 | 18 | 8.621 > 2.101 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 67.8 | | | | | |

APPENDIX F

Table 3. The results of the control group who was not exposed to video films in post test.

| Subject | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Language Use | Mechanics | Total |
|---------|---------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 58 |
| 2 | 17 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 2 | 55 |
| 3 | 20 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 61 |
| 4 | 20 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 3 | 62 |
| 5 | 18 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 56 |
| 6 | 19 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 3 | 59 |
| 7 | 19 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 2 | 57 |
| 8 | 20 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 59 |
| 9 | 19 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 55 |
| 10 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 54 |

The results of the t-test showing the difference between the total scores of the students within the experimental group in the pre-study composition (pre-test) and in post test.

| | N | x | d | s.d | d.f | t | p | level of significance |
|----------------------------------|----|------|------|-------|-----|--------|---------|-----------------------|
| Pre-study composition (pre-test) | 10 | 54.6 | | | | | | |
| | | | 10.2 | 2.570 | 9 | 16.220 | > 2.262 | 0.05 |
| Post test | 10 | 67.0 | | | | | | |

APPENDIX G

Table 4. The results of the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through video films in post test.

| Subject | Content | Organization | Vocabulary | Language Use | Mechanics | Total |
|---------|---------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | 23 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 3 | 63 |
| 2 | 24 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 3 | 71 |
| 3 | 24 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 2 | 69 |
| 4 | 24 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 3 | 70 |
| 5 | 23 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 3 | 69 |
| 6 | 23 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 2 | 67 |
| 7 | 25 | 13 | 15 | 14 | 3 | 70 |
| 8 | 23 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 3 | 67 |
| 9 | 26 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 2 | 68 |
| 10 | 23 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 2 | 64 |

The results of t-test showing the differences between the control group who was not exposed to video films and the experimental group who was exposed to video films in Content in post test.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | d.f | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|-------|-----|--------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 18.7 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.159 | 1.260 | 18 | 10.386 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 23.8 | | | | | |

APPENDIX G1

The results of the t-test showing the differences between the control group who was not exposed to video films and the experimental group who was exposed to video films in Organization in post test.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | d.f | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|-------|-----|---------------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 11.8 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.788 | 1.931 | 18 | 4.230 > 2.101 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 13.1 | | | | | |

The results of the t-test showing the differences between the control group who was not exposed to video films and the experimental group who was exposed to video films in Vocabulary in post test.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | d.f | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|-------|-----|---------------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 11.5 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.849 | 0.553 | 18 | 5.210 > 2.101 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 14.8 | | | | | |

APPENDIX G2

The results of the t-test showing the differences between the control group who was not exposed to video films and the experimental group who was exposed to video films in Language Use in post test.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | df | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|-------|----|---------------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 13 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.816 | 1.083 | 18 | 1.342 < 2.101 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 13.5 | | | | | |

The results of the t-test showing the differences between the control group who was not exposed to video films and the experimental group who was exposed to video films in Mechanics in post test.

| | N | x | s.d | S.E | df | t | level of significance |
|--------------------|----|-----|-------|-------|----|---------------|-----------------------|
| Control group | 10 | 2.6 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.516 | 1.000 | 18 | 0.000 < 2.101 | 0.05 |
| Experimental group | 10 | 2.6 | | | | | |

APPENDIX H

WRITTEN TOPIC I:

“Are we endangering ourselves to being addicted to the internet? Does the internet causes us to be anti-social?”

This topic was given to the students as a pre-study composition subject (pre-test).

WRITTEN TOPIC II:

“Should the computer be used to learn creativity? Should games and other things be considered personal property? Or should they be shared freely?”

WRITTEN TOPIC III:

“Are visual games deceptive? What do visual games teach?”

WRITTEN TOPIC IV:

“One day you are a member of society, and the next day you are worthless. No one cares about you.” Have you ever felt worthless? How can we prevent people from feeling worthless? What must be done? Why? How? When?

This topic was given to students as a post-study composition subject (post-test).

APPENDIX I

VIDEO FILM I:

Title : Music of Tomorrow

Time : 10 minutes

Content : It is about using computers in composing songs and shooting video films. Peter Gabriel, rock star, uses computers for his songs and video films.

VIDEO FILM II:

Title : Digital Game World

Time : 15 minutes

Content : It is about computer games. How to prepare these computer games visual and sound effects.

VIDEO FILM III:

Title : There but for the Grace

Time : 15 minutes

Content : It is about homeless people in United States of America. Why they chose to live in streets. How can we help them and people's behaviour to these people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, G. and P. Wingard (ed.). **The Teaching of English as an International Language: A Practical Guide.** Great Britain: Biddles Ltd., 1990.
- Allan, M. **Teaching English with Video.** Singapore: Longman Ltd., 1991.
- Anderson, D.R. and J. Bryant. **Children's Understanding of Television: Research on Attention and Comprehension.** New York: Academic Press. 1988.
- Baker, E. **Contemporary English.** Great Britain: Pitman Press, 1972.
- Barra, A. "Writing: Reflection and Research May Increase Teacher Understanding". **English Teaching Forum.** Vol. 31 No. 3, 1993.
- Bauman, J.F. **Reading Instruction and the Beginning Teacher.** Minneapolis, Minn: Burgess Pub. Co. 1984.
- Bauman, R. **Folklore, Cultural Performances and Popular Entertainments.** Minneapolis, Minn: Burgess Pub. Co. 1990.
- Billiows, F. L. **The Techniques of Language Teaching** London: Longmans Green and Co. Ltd. 1961.
- Braddock, R. **Research in Written Composition.** Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.
- Britton, J. **The Development of Writing Abilities.** London: McMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
- Brown, J. W. et al. **AV Instructional Technology, Media and Methods.** New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Co. Inc. 1969.
- Brumfit, C. J (ed). **Video Applications in Language Teaching.** Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1983.

- Byrne, D. **Focus on the Classroom**. Hong Kong: Modern English Publications, 1988.
- _____. **Teaching Writing Skills**. Hong Kong: Longman Ltd., 1991.
- Chastein, K. **Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice**. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.
- Cunningsworth, P. **Curriculum Change in the Primary School Since 1945: Dissemination of the Progressive Ideal**. London: Falmer PR. ,1988.
- Dale, E. **Audio-Visual Methods In Teaching**. New York. The Dryden Press, Inc. 1986.
- Daniel, G. **Fitting Equations to Data: Computer Analysis of Multifactor Data**. Cuthbert Daniel, Fred S. Wood with the assistance of John W. Gorman. New York: J. Wiley. 1980.
- Degenhart, R. E. **The IEA Study of Written Composition**. Oxford, England: Oxford UP 1992.
- Demircan, Ö. **Yabancı Dil Öğretim Yöntemleri**. İstanbul: Can Ofset, 1990.
- Demirel, Ö. **Yabancı Dil Öğretimi: İlkeler, Yöntemler, Teknikler**. Ankara: USEM Yayınları, 1993.
- Dunkel, P.A. "Developing Listening Fluency in L2: Theoretical Principles and Pedagogical Considerations". **The Modern Language Journal**. 70, ii., 1986.
- Duygun, M. **Teaching English Through Video**. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, 1990.
- Geddes, M. **Intermediate Conversation**. Hempstead: Phoenix ELT. 1991.
- Geddes, M. and G. Strutride. **Video in the Language Classroom**. London: Heinemann Ltd. 1982.

- Gilbert, M. "Using Movies for Teaching Low-Level Students of English". **English Teaching Forum**. Vol. 31. No. 3, 1993.
- Glendinning, E. and H. Mantell. **Writing Ideas: An Intermediate Course in Writing Skills**. Great Britain: Longman Ltd., 1983.
- Gorman, T.P. "Teaching Reading at the Advanced Level". **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language**. Los Angeles: Newbury House Publishers, 1989.
- Gorman, W. **Body Image and the Image of the Brain**. St. Louis: W.H. Green, 1969.
- Hagen, S.A. and B. Ege-Zavala. **Workbook for ESL Writers**. USA: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Heaton, J.B. **Writing English Language Tests**. Hong Kong: Longman Ltd., 1988.
- Hemei, J. "Teaching with Video in an English Class". **English Teaching Forum**. Vol. 35. No. 2, 1997.
- Hill, D.A. **Visual Impact**. Great Britain: Longman Ltd., 1990.
- Hillocks, G. "What Works in Teaching Composition: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Treatment Studies". **American Journal of Education**. Nov. 133-165, 1984.
- Hughes, A. **Testing for Language Teachers**. Great Britain: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Hughey, J.B., D.R. Wormouth, V.F. Hartfiel and H.L. Jacobs. **Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Techniques**. USA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1983.
- Jolly, D. **Writing Tasks** Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Kennedy, C. **English for Specific Purposes**. London: Mac Millian, 1984.

- Kinder, J. S. **Audio-Visual Methods and Techniques**. New York: American Book Co. 1979.
- Knight, Mac. **The Writing Process: Composition Writing for University Students**. Lund: Student litteratur, 1983.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. **Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Littewood, W. **Communicative Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Lonergan, J. **Video in Language Teaching**. Great Britain: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Lonergan, J. **Double Trouble**. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1984.
- Lynch, T. **Study Listening: Understanding Lectures and Talks in English**. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- McCrimmon, J.M. **Writing with a Purpose**. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984.
- McKay, S. and L. Rosenthal. **Writing for a Specific Purpose**. USA: Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Morrow, K. and K. Johson. **Communicate**. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Norbrook, H 'Listening Comprehension' **Modern English Teacher**. London: Modern English Publications, 1984.
- Nunan, D. **Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom**. Great Britain: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Palmer, H. **The Principles of Language Study**. London: Oxford UP, 1964.
- Percival, F. R. Land and D. Edgar. **Computer Assisted and Open Access Education**. London: Kogan Page, 1995.

- Pincas, A. **Teaching English Writing**. United Kingdom: The MacMillian Press Ltd., 1982.
- Raimes, A. **Techniques in Teaching Writing**. Hong Kong: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers. **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis**. USA: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Rivers, M. and M. Tepsley. **A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English**. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1978.
- Robinson, P. "Projection into Dialogue as Composition Strategy". **ELT Journal**. Vol. 41 : 30-36, 1987.
- Serdaroğlu, S. **The Use of Video in EFL Classroom: Exploitation of Authentic Video Material**. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, 1988.
- Shepherd, W. G. **Public Policies Toward Business**. Homewood: R. D. Irwin Co. Ltd., 1990.
- Stern, H.H. **Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching**. Hong Kong: Oxford UP, 1990.
- Tatsuki, D. "Ideas on Using Videos". **THA Internet TESL Journal**, 1998.
- Tekin, C. (ed.) **Çağdaş Bir Eğitim ve İletişim Aracı Video Araştırma Kuram-Uygulama**. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, 1998.
- Tomalin, B. **Video, TV and Radio in the English Class**. Hong Kong: MacMillan Publishers Ltd., 1990.
- Tomalin, B. 'Listening Comprehension, the Extra Dimension' **Practical English Teaching**. London: Mary Galsgow Publications, 1985.
- Türker, Ç. **Video in Language Teaching**. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, 1993.

- Ülsever, Ş. (ed.) **Developing Aural and Oral Skills**. Eskişehir: Etam A.Ş. Web Ofset, 1993.
- Valdman, A. **Trends in Language Teaching**. New York: McGram Hill Inc., 1976.
- Venolia, J. **Rewrite Right! USA**: Ten Speed Press, 1987.
- Walsh, J.H. **Teaching English**. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1971.
- Wilkinson, A. **Patterns of Language**. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1973.
- Willis, J. **Teaching English Through English**. Hong Kong: Sing Cheang Printing Co. Ltd., 1982.
- Willis, J. **A Framework for Task-Based Learning** Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1996.
- Wright, A. **Visual Materials for the Language Teacher**. London: Longman Ltd., 1973.
- Wright, A. **Audio-Visual Materials In Language Teaching**. London: Longman Ltd., 1974.
- Yaşar, Ş. “Uzaktan Öğretim Sistemiyle Öğrenim Gören Öğrencilerin Yabancı Dil Programına İlişkin Tutumları= Attitudes of the Students Who Are in Distance Education Process Towards Foreign Language Teaching”, **Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**. 2, 2: 227-233., Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1989.
- Yaşar, Ş. **Yabancı Dilde Okuma Becerilerinin Geliştirilmesinde Küçük Gruplarla Öğretim Yönteminin Etkililiği**. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1993.
- Zuber-Sherritt, O. **Video in Higher Education** London: Kogan Page Ltd. , 1984.

