CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the data collected and the summary of the results. The data comprised three sets of the overall scores based on content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics (Refer to Appendix D-G) and three sets of scores based on the usage of transitional expressions for the experimental group and the control group of both good and poor ability writers (Refer to Appendix H-I). However, focus would be on the organization of essays by the subjects. The residual effect of using the graphic organizer and transitional expressions in the pre-test and delayed post-test would also be included.

The first set of each score was obtained in the first week (pre-test) when the students were asked to write an expository essay which would involve comparisons and contrast with the title "Studying in local universities and abroad". The graphic organizer and transitional expressions were not introduced during the pre-test for both the experimental and control groups of good and poor ability writers. In the second week, the experimental group for good and poor ability writers were introduced to the graphic organizer and transitional expressions. The experimental group had a practice using the graphic organizer and transitional expressions on a different title ("The full-time

housewife and the career woman in a modern society"). The scores during the second week were not recorded.

The second set of each score was obtained in the third week (post-test) and the students were asked to write the same type of expository writing but with another title ("The single-sex school and co-educational school"). During the post-test, no instruction was given to use or not to use the graphic organizer and transitional expressions for both the experimental and control groups.

Finally, the third set of each score was obtained in the fifth week (delayed post-test), again with another title of the same type of comparison/contrast structure ("Working in the private and the public sector) and in this set too, no instruction was given whether to use or not to use the graphic organizer and transitional expressions for both groups.

The performance on the overall scores of the writing skill was evaluated by using the ESL Composition Profile by Jacobs, Wosmuth, Hartfiel and hughey (1981) based on the five elements. To obtain answers for the research questions in this study, the data was analyzed statistically means of T-tests for the comparison of means. The SPSS was used to perform the T-test.

The analyses were carried out with the view to examine the effects of teaching text structure instruction on the composition of expository prose by ESL learners. Following is a presentation of the findings for the three research questions.

4.1 Analysis

4.1.1 Research question 1

Does a graphic organizer help students in composing their essays writing?

Table 4.1 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the good and poor ability writers during the pre-test, the post-test and the delayed post-test using a graphic organizer. The table shows the mean scores of the good ability writers to be lower in the post-test and delayed post-test than during the pre-test. However, the mean scores of the poor ability writers were higher in the delayed post-test.

Table 4.1

Means and Standard Deviations of Good and Poor Ability Writers During Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test

Version	Good	Poor
Pre-test	X = 50.67 SD = 17.34 N = 30	X = 21.91 SD = 13.26 N = 33
Post-test	X = 44.35 SD = 14.50 N = 30	X = 30.00 SD = 15.38 N = 33
Delayed Post-test	X = 42.10 SD = 13.84 N = 30	X = 40.82 SD = 16.67 N = 33

Table 4.2

Results of T-test for Good Ability Writers using a Graphic Organizer

Pre-test	X = 50.67 SD = 17.34 N = 30	Mean Difference = 6.13
Post-test	X = 44.53 SD = 14.50 N = 30	Df = 29 2 Tail Prob. = 0.09 Mean Difference = 2.43
Delayed Post-test	X = 42.10 SD = 13.83 N = 30	Df = 29 2 Tail Prob. = 0.24

Table 4.2 shows that the good ability writers obtained a lower mean in the post-test (mean = 44.53) and delayed post-test (mean = 42.10) than during the pre-test (mean = 50.67). Tables 4.2 also shows that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the good ability writers (mean difference = 6.13, df = 29, $p > 0.05$). This graphic organizer does not have any effects on the composition of good ability writers.

Table 4.3

Results of T-test for Poor ability Writers using a Graphic Organizer.

Pre- test	X = 21.9 SD = 13.26 N = 33	Mean Difference = 8.09
Post-test	X = 30.0 SD = 15.38 N = 33	Df = 32 2 Tail Prob. = 0.04 Mean Difference = 10.81
Delayed Post-test	X = 40.82 SD = 16.67 N = 33	Df = 32 2 Tail Prob. = 0.00

Table 4.3 shows that the poor ability writers obtained a higher mean score in the post-test (mean = 30.0) and delayed post-test (mean = 40.82) than during the pre-test (mean = 21.9). It shows a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test (mean difference = 8.09, df = 32, $p < 0.05$). It also seems to indicate that the graphic organizer does have some effects on the composition of poor ability writers. Thus, the graphic organizer helped the poor ability writers in composing expository prose. However, the graphic organizer does not have any effects on the good ability writers.

Therefore, these findings support the first research question for poor ability writers but not for the good ability writers.

A closer analysis of the difference in score of the poor ability writers suggests that the majority obtained the increased marks not only for organization but also for content, vocabulary and language use as is evident from Table 4.4, Table 4.6 Table 4.8 and Table 4.82.

Table 4.4

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Poor Ability Writers On Content

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	9	9	22	8	13	16
2	2	12	14	10	10	13
3	2	1	16	14	17	17
4	15	14	22	8	10	14
5	1	12	12	11	10	14
6	10	12	14	17	2	8
7	10	14	17	11	13	15
8	10	10	21	5	10	11
9	5	9	17	2	2	8
10	10	15	20	10	9	12
11	5	17	18	5	9	12
12	5	6	8	8	9	9
13	2	2	1	1	2	4
14	3	3	3	2	12	12
15	4	5	17	3	8	10
16	5	8	10	2	5	9
17				4	4	8

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.4 presents the results of pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test of poor ability writers using a graphic organizer on content. It shows that there is an increase in marks for content when the graphic organizer is used for the experimental group. Compared to the essays from the control group, we also see similar increase in marks were scored on content. This is confirmed by using a T-test in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

Results of T-test for the Poor Ability Writers during Pre-Test and Delayed Post-Test on Content.

Version	Experimental Group		Control Group	
Pre-Test	X = 6.25 SD = 4.31 N = 16	Mean Difference = -8.25 Df = 15 2 Tail Prob. = 0.0	X = 7.11 SD = 4.64 N = 17	Mean Difference = -4.18 Df = 16 2 Tail Prob. = 0.001
Delayed Post-Test	X = 14.5 SD = 6.33 N = 16		X = 11.29 SD = 3.40 N = 17	

Table 4.5 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the poor ability writers during the pre-test and the delayed post-test using a graphic organizer on content. In the experimental group, the mean score in the delayed post-test (mean =

14.50) is higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 6.25). Thus, table 4.5 indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on content (mean difference = -8.25 , df = 15 . $p < 0.05$).

In the control group, the mean score of the delayed post-test (mean = 11.29) is also higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 7.11). Therefore, it also indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on content (mean difference = -4.18, df = 16, $p < 0.05$).

Table 4.6

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test Of Poor Ability Writers On Organization

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	6	4	11	5	8	12
2	1	8	9	6	7	11
3	1	0	10	9	12	12
4	10	10	14	5	7	10
5	1	7	10	5	8	8
6	9	12	9	11	1	5
7	5	11	10	8	7	11
8	7	9	14	3	7	9
9	5	8	13	1	2	6
10	5	12	15	5	6	11
11	2	13	13	5	6	8
12	3	4	4	5	4	5
13	2	1	1	0	1	2
14	1	2	1	1	13	8
15	2	3	14	2	6	6
16	3	4	6	1	3	8
17				2	3	4

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.6 presents the results of pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test of poor ability writers using a graphic organizer on organization. It shows that there is an increase in marks for organization when the graphic organizer is used for the experimental group. Compared to the essays from the control group, we also see similar increase in marks on organization. This is evidently confirmed by using a T-test in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Results of T-test for Poor Ability Writers during Pre-Test and Delayed Post-Test on Organization.

Version	Experimental Group		Control Group	
Pre-Test	X = 3.93 SD = 2.90 N = 16	Mean Difference = -8.25	X = 7.11 SD = 4.64 N = 17	Mean Difference = -3.70
Delayed Post-Test	X = 9.62 SD = 4.51 N = 16	Df = 15 2 Tail Prob. = 0.0	X = 11.29 SD = 3.40 N = 17	Df = 16 2 Tail Prob. = 0.00

Table 4.7 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the poor ability writers during the pre-test and the delayed post-test using a graphic organizer on organization. In the experimental group, the mean score in the delayed post-test (mean = 9.62) is higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 3.93) Thus, Table 4.7 indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on organization (mean difference = -5.69, df = 15, $p < 0.05$).

In the control group, the mean score of the delayed post-test (mean = 8.05) is also higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean =4.35). Therefore, it also indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on organization (mean difference = -3.70 , df = 16, $p < 0.05$).

Table 4.8

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Poor Ability Writers On Vocabulary

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	3	5	11	5	9	10
2	1	8	7	6	6	11
3	1	0	10	9	11	11
4	8	12	13	7	6	9
5	1	6	7	3	7	9
6	8	13	10	9	2	4
7	6	10	9	5	9	10
8	6	9	13	4	8	10
9	5	8	11	3	2	6
10	4	13	14	5	5	10
11	3	12	12	6	4	10
12	3	3	3	3	5	5
13	1	1	1	0	2	3
14	1	1	1	2	10	9
15	2	2	12	2	5	5
16	2	3	5	2	3	9
17				3	3	3

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.8 presents the results of pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test of poor ability writers using a graphic organizer on vocabulary. It shows that there is an increase in marks for vocabulary when the graphic organizer is used for the experimental group. Compared to the essays from the control group, it does not show similar increase in marks were scored on vocabulary. This is confirmed by using a T-test in Table 4.81.

Table 4.81

Results of T-test for Poor Ability Writers during Pre-Test and Delayed Post-Test on Vocabulary.

Version	Experimental Group		Control Group	
Pre-Test	X = 3.43 SD = 2.47 N = 16	Mean Difference = -5.25 Df = 15 2 Tail Prob. = 0.0	X = 4.35 SD = 2.50 N = 17	Mean Difference = -5.29 Df = 16 2 Tail Prob. = 0.17
Delayed Post-Test	X = 8.69 SD = 4.25 N = 16		X = 9.64 SD = 8.52 N = 17	

Table 4.81 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the poor ability writers during the pre-test and the delayed post-test using a graphic organizer on vocabulary. In the experimental group, the mean score in the delayed post-test (mean =

8.69) is higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 3.43) Thus, Table 4.81 indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on vocabulary, (mean difference = -5.25, df = 15, $p < 0.05$).

In the control group, the mean score of the delayed post-test (mean = 9.64) is also higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 4.35). However, it does not show a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on vocabulary (mean difference = -5.29, df = 16, $p > 0.05$).

Table 4.82

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Poor Ability Writers On Language Use.

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	3	4	13	4	7	13
2	1	6	6	5	6	11
3	1	0	11	10	11	13
4	8	13	15	6	6	11
5	1	8	8	5	7	7
6	8	12	10	12	1	5
7	6	9	9	6	9	9
8	5	9	14	4	8	10
9	5	8	13	2	2	4
10	5	11	12	3	4	10
11	2	12	12	6	4	11
12	2	2	3	3	4	4
13	1	1	1	1	1	2
14	1	1	1	2	11	9
15	2	2	10	2	4	5
16	2	4	4	1	2	8
17				3	3	5

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.82 presents the results of pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test of poor ability writers using a graphic organizer on language use. It shows that there is an increase in marks for language use when the graphic organizer is used for the experimental group. Compared to the essays from the control group, we also see similar increase in marks on language use. This is confirmed by using a T-test in Table 4.83.

Table 4.83

Results of T-test Poor Ability Writers during Pre-Test and Delayed Post-Test on Language Use

Version	Experimental Group		Control Group	
Pre-Test	X = 3.31 SD = 2.50 N = 16	Mean Difference = -5.56 Df = 15 2 Tail Prob. = 0.0	X = 4.41 SD = 3.00 N = 17	Mean Difference = -3.64 Df = 16 2 Tail Prob. = 0.001
Delayed Post-Test	X = 8.88 SD = 4.59 N = 16		X = 8.06 SD = 3.38 N = 17	

Table 4.83 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the poor ability writers during the pre-test and the delayed post-test using a graphic organizer on language use. In the experimental group, the mean score in the delayed post-test (mean

= 8.88) is higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 3.31). Thus, Table 4.83 indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on language use (mean difference = -5.56, df = 15, $p < 0.05$).

In the control group, the mean score of the delayed post-test (mean = 8.06) is also higher than the mean score in the pre-test (mean = 4.41). Table 4.83 also indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test on language use (mean difference = -3.64, df = 16, $p < 0.05$).

Nevertheless, this study does not show an increase in mechanics by using a graphic organizer. It can be shown in Table 4.84.

Table 4.84

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Poor Ability Writers On Mechanics

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	2	2	3	2	2	3
2	1	2	2	2	2	3
3	3	3	3	2	2	2
4	1	2	3	2	2	2
5	2	3	3	3	1	2
6	2	3	3	3	1	2
7	2	3	3	2	2	3
8	2	3	4	2	2	2
9	2	2	3	1	1	2
10	2	3	3	2	2	3
11	2	3	3	2	2	2
12	2	2	2	2	2	2
13	1	1	1	1	1	2
14	1	1	1	1	3	2
15	1	2	3	1	2	2
16	1	1	2	1	2	2
17				1	2	2

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

As for the good ability writers, the graphic organizer did not help students in composing their essays writing because the results did not show an increase in marks on content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics as illustrated in Table 4.85 to Table 4.89 for the experimental group. Compared to the essays from the control group, it is also obvious that the results did not show an increase in marks on all the five elements, too.

Table 4.85

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Good Ability Writers On Content

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	22	22	20	16	11	12
2	13	12	14	16	12	15
3	17	26	19	12	12	8
4	10	13	5	24	12	11
5	13	12	12	18	12	15
6	9	10	4	18	12	15
7	22	20	12	26	16	12
8	14	16	12	24	19	11
9	23	18	12	3	3	3
10	13	18	15	12	10	7
11	13	10	10	8	10	9
12	13	7	14	20	18	20
13	11	6	10	18	12	14
14	13	12	15	24	14	14
15	9	6	7			
16	9	8	12			
17						

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.86

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Good Ability Writers On Organization

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	14	15	16	12	10	11
2	8	11	11	11	11	14
3	13	16	15	10	10	6
4	7	9	5	17	11	10
5	8	9	9	13	9	11
6	5	8	3	13	8	11
7	14	12	9	15	15	9
8	14	11	9	15	15	9
9	16	12	13	2	2	2
10	10	13	12	6	6	7
11	7	6	13	5	6	6
12	11	6	9	12	14	14
13	11	11	11	12	11	9
14	10	12	13	14	11	9
15	8	6	10			
16	11	8	9			
17						

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.87

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Good Ability Writers On Vocabulary

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	15	15	15	9	10	11
2	9	9	9	10	13	15
3	12	15	13	9	9	7
4	6	7	4	15	9	9
5	8	8	8	13	9	10
6	5	8	3	10	10	11
7	15	10	7	1	11	10
8	12	11	9	16	13	9
9	15	11	9	2	2	2
10	10	10	11	5	5	7
11	8	5	10	5	5	7
12	10	7	8	13	13	12
13	11	7	11	10	10	8
14	8	10	13	14	12	9
15	7	7	9			
16	9	8	7			
17						

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.88

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Good Ability Writers On Language Use

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	**GO2**	**GO3**	**GO1**	**GO2**	**GO3**
1	20	18	15	8	9	12
2	12	9	9	10	16	15
3	12	17	13	9	11	7
4	5	6	4	14	8	7
5	10	8	7	13	8	9
6	6	8	3	15	10	11
7	17	10	6	17	10	10
8	12	12	7	18	12	8
9	17	10	9	2	2	1
10	10	11	9	7	5	6
11	9	4	12	5	5	5
12	11	9	7	17	12	13
13	14	7	11	10	12	7
14	7	10	13	11	14	18
15	6	7	10			
16	9	8	8			
17						

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

Table 4.89

Results of Pre-Test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test of Good Ability Writers On Mechanics

	Experimental			Control		
	GO1	GO2	GO3	GO1	GO2	GO3
1	4	4	4	3	3	3
2	3	3	3	3	4	4
3	3	4	4	3	3	2
4	2	2	2	4	2	2
5	2	3	2	3	3	3
6	3	2	2	3	2	3
7	4	3	2	3	3	3
8	3	3	2	4	3	3
9	4	3	3	1	2	1
10	2	3	3	2	2	3
11	2	2	3	2	2	2
12	3	3	2	4	3	3
13	3	2	3	3	3	2
14	2	3	3	3	4	2
15	2	2	2			
16	2	2	2			
17						

GO1 = Pre-Test GO2 = Post-Test GO3 = Delayed Post-Test

The examples of marks on all the five elements could be seen in Appendix J-P for two students, one from the poor ability writer and the other from the good ability writer.

4.1.2 Research question 2

Does transitional expressions help students in improving their essays writing?

Table 4.9 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the good and poor ability writers during the pre-test, the post-test and the delayed post-test in using transitional expressions. The table shows the mean scores of the good ability writers to be higher in the post-test and the delayed post-test than during the pre-test. It also shows the mean scores of the poor ability writers to be higher in the post-test and the delayed post-test than during the pre-test.

Table 4.9

Means and Standard Deviations of Good and Poor Ability Writers during Pre-test, Post-Test and Delayed Post-Test using Transitional Expressions

Version	Good	Poor
Pre-test	X = 0.30 SD = 0.47 N = 30	X = 0.00 SD = 0.00 N = 33
Post-test	X = 1.37 SD = 1.32 N = 30	X = 0.27 SD = 0.62 N = 33
Delayed Post-test	X = 1.30 SD = 1.26 N = 30	X = 0.45 SD = 0.71 N = 33

Table 4.91

Results of T-test for Good Ability Writers using Transitional Expressions

Pre-test	X = 0.30 SD = 0.47 N = 30	Mean Difference = 1.07
Post-test	X = 1.37 SD = 1.32 N =30	Df = 29 2 Tail Prob. = 0.00 Mean Difference = 0.07
Delayed Post-test	X = 1.30 SD = 1.26 N = 30	Df = 29 2 Tail Prob. = 0.807

Table 4.91 shows that the good ability writers obtained a higher mean score in the post-test (mean = 1.37) and delayed post-test (mean = 1.30) than the pre-test (mean = 0.30). There is a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test for the good students using transitional expressions (mean difference = 1.07, df = 29, $p < 0.05$). However, there is no significant difference between the post-test and the delayed post-test using transitional expressions (mean difference = 0.07, df = 29, $p > 0.05$). This seems to indicate that transitional expressions do have some effects on the composition of good ability writers when the post-test is given in improving their essays writing.

However, when the delayed post-test is given, there was no significant difference in the marks for transitional expressions used.

Table 4.92

Results of T-test for Poor Ability Writers using Transitional Expressions.

Pre-test	X = 0.00 SD = 0.00 N = 33	Mean difference = 0.27
Post-test	X = 0.27 SD = 0.62 N = 33	Df = 32 2 Tail Prob. = 0.018 Mean difference = 0.18
Delayed Post-test	X = 0.45 SD = 0.71 N = 33	Df = 32 2 Tail Prob. = 0.24

Table 4.92 shows that poor ability writers obtained a higher mean score in the post-test (mean = 0.27) and delayed post-test (mean = 0.45) than during the pre-test (mean = 0.00). There is a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test (mean difference = 0.27, df = 32, $p < 0.05$), However, there is no significant difference

between the post-test and the delayed post-test using transitional expressions (mean difference = 0.18, df = 32, $p > 0.05$).

Therefore, the teaching of transitional expressions has some effects on poor ability writers during the post-test in improving their essays writing. However, it does not have any effects during the delayed post-test of the poor ability writers. Thus, these findings support the second research question for the good and poor ability writers only between the pre-test and the post-test but did not support both groups between the post-test and the delayed post-test.

4.1.3 Research Question 3

Is there a residual effect of the teaching of the graphic organizer and transitional expressions on students?

Table 4.93

Means and Standard Deviations of Good and Poor Ability Writers during Pre-test and Delayed Post-test using Graphic Organizer.

Pre-test	X = 34.38 SD = 19.84 N = 32	Mean difference = 9.37
Delayed Post-test	X = 43.75 SD = 17.01 N = 32	Df = 31 2 Tail Prob. = 0.019

Table 4.93 presents the means scores and standard deviations of the good and poor ability writers of the experimental group using a graphic organizer. This table shows the experimental group for both good and poor ability writers has a higher mean score in the delayed post-test (mean = 43.75) than the pre-test (mean = 34.38). Thus, there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test for the good and poor ability writers in the experimental group (mean difference = 9.37, df = 31, $p < 0.05$) Therefore, it seems to indicate there is a positive residual effect on students.

Table 4.94

Means and Standard Deviations of Good and Poor Ability Writers during Pre-test and Delayed Post-test using Transitional Expressions.

Pre-test	X = 0.25 SD = 0.44 N = 32	Mean difference = 0.97
Delayed Post-test	X = 1.21 SD = 1.21 N = 32	Df = 31 2 Tail Prob. = 0.00

Table 4.94 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the good and poor ability writers of the experimental group using transitional expressions. This table shows that the experimental group of both good and poor ability writers has a higher mean score in the delayed post-test (mean = 1.21) than the pre-test (mean = 0.25) Therefore, it shows that there is significant difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test using transitional expressions (mean difference = 0.97, df = 31, $p < 0.05$). It also indicates that there is a positive residual effect on students. Thus, there is a positive residual effect of the teaching of the graphic organizer and transitional expressions on students.

4.2 Summary of Major Findings

This section presents a summary of the main findings of the study. First, when the graphic organizer was introduced to the good and poor ability writers it was found that the poor ability writers benefited more from the graphic organizer than the good ability writers in organizing their compositions. Second, the investigation of transitional expressions on the organization of the compositions in relation to the pre-test and the post-test. It was found that the transitional expressions helped both good and weak students to perform better in organization. Finally, when the difference between the pre-test and the delayed post-test were compared, it was found that there is a positive residual effect on both groups.