



ISSN: 1817-6798 (Print)

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

available online at: www.jtuh.org/
JTUH
 مجلة جامعة تكريت للعلوم الإنسانية
 Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities
Ibraheem Khalaf Saleh Al-Jubouri**Istabraq Tariq Al Azzawi**

University of Tikrit College of Education for Humanities

* Corresponding author: E-mail :

Ibrahim.Kh@tu.edu.iq

07701751369

Keywords:
 Labov's Model,
 Instructional model,
 Narrative,
 Coherence,
 Cohesion,
ARTICLE INFO**Article history:**

Received	30 Jan 2024
Received in revised form	10 Feb 2024
Accepted	11 Feb 2024
Final Proofreading	15 Apr 2024
Available online	15 Apr 2024

E-mail t-jtuh@tu.edu.iq
 ©THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER
 THE CC BY LICENSE

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>


Labov's Model as an Instructional Model for Teaching EFL University Students' Textual Aspects of Writing

A B S T R A C T

This study looks at how well students continue to write and connect their thoughts throughout the narrative text. It aims at identifying the effect of using Labov's model as an instructional model for teaching narrative writing on EFL university students' textual aspects of writing that include cohesion, coherence, as well as meaning i.e. ideational and textual. Moreover, it seeks to find out which aspect of writing: cohesion, coherence and meaning has been affected more than the other and it prepared to find out the effect of the instructional model on EFL university students' textual aspects of writing at the recognition and production levels, and if it affects on gender as well. The sample chosen for this study includes selecting two samples (32 controlling group and 32 experimental group), getting full information about their names, years of failure or delay if available, ages by months, gender, parents' achievement, the marks of the previous year at the same subject, doing up a pretest to equalize both samples, preparing a lesson plan according to Labov's narrative model and adopting it in teaching the experimental group. The results show that Labov's model has an effective impact in improving students' writing generally, as well as on development of the textual aspects of writing in recognition and production.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.31.4.2024.23>

نموذج لآبوف كنموذج تعليمي في تدريس الجوانب النصية للكتابة لمتعلمي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية

ابراهيم خلف صالح الجبوري/ جامعة تكريت/ كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

أستبرق طارق العزاوي/ جامعة تكريت/ كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

الخلاصة:

إن الغرض من هذا البحث هو فحص قدرة الطلبة في الحفاظ على كتاباتهم وإقامة روابط ذات معنى داخل النص السري . ولذلك فإننا نأمل من هذه الدراسة التعرف على إجراءات التدريس المتبعة في تدريس الكتابة السردية ، والتعرف على أثر استخدام نموذج لابوف نموذجاً تعليمياً لتدريس الكتابة السردية في الجانب النصي من الكتابة لدى طلبة الجامعة من دارسي اللغة الإنجليزية كونها لغة أجنبية ؛ ومعرفة تأثير النموذج التعليمي في تماسك هؤلاء الطلبة ، وكذلك معرفة تأثير النموذج التعليمي على تماسكهم ، فضلاً عن معرفة تأثير النموذج التعليمي في المعنى النصي والفكري لهم ، ومعرفة تأثير النموذج التعليمي على المعنى النصي والفكري لديهم ، زد على ذلك معرفة أي جانب من جوانب الكتابة: التماسك والترابط والمعنى قد تأثر أكثر من غيرهما ، ولذلك فإن معرفة تأثير النموذج التعليمي على الجانب النصي للكتابة لدى الطلبة على مستوى الإدراك والإنتاج له أثر كبير ، ومعرفة مدى تأثير هذه الدراسة من خلال اختبار الفرضيات الآتية : من ناحية أنه لا يوجد فرق ذو دلالة إحصائية في درجات الاختبار البعدي للمجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة حين يتعلق الأمر بالكتابة السردية التي تدرس باستخدام نموذج لابوف التعليمي؛ ومن ناحية أخرى حين يتعلق الأمر بالتماسك ، فلا يوجد فرق بين المجموعتين . ومن ناحية ثالثة حين يتعلق الأمر بالمعنى النصي والفكري ، فلا فرق بين المجموعتين حين يتعلق الأمر بتدريس الكتابة السردية بالطريقة التقليدية بناءً على نتائج الاختبار البعدي .ويمكن استنتاج عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في أداء المجموعات التجريبية في جوانب الكتابة الآتية : التماسك، والترابط، والمعنى . لذلك لا يوجد اختلاف في مستويات الإدراك والإنتاج في الجوانب النصية للكتابة لدى المجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة ، ولا يوجد اختلاف في درجات طلبة المجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة في الجوانب النصية للكتابة باختلاف الجنس. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة اتبعت الإجراءات الآتية: (1)اختيار عينة من الأشخاص (32 للمجموعة الضابطة و 32 للتجريبية) وجمع التفاصيل الشخصية الكاملة (الاسم، تاريخ الميلاد، سنوات الرسوب أو التأجيل، الجنس، العمر مقسمة حسب الشهر)، بالإضافة إلى معلومات عنهم كالمستوى التعليمي للأبوين ودرجات الطلبة في نفس المادة العام الماضي. (2) إنشاء اختبار قبلي للتأكد من أن العينتين قابلتان للمقارنة (3). تطوير منهج دراسي يعتمد على منهج لابوف السري (4) تدريس المجموعة التجريبية على وفق أنموذج لابوف(1972) توضح النتائج أن منهج لابوف يؤثر بشكل كبير في نمو كتابة الطلبة في كل من الإدراك والإنتاج ، ولا سيما ما يتعلق بالجوانب النصية لعلهم.

كلمات مفتاحيه :نموذج لابوف ,نموذج تعليمي ,سري ,التماسك ,الترابط ,المعنى

Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem and its Significance

Writing proficiency can provide a formidable obstacle for numerous students, regardless of the language. Nunan (1999) states that the most difficult part of acquiring a language, especially for those learning a second language, is the capacity to generate a cohesive, fluent, and comprehensive written production. Narrative writing is a fundamental way in which human beings organize discourse and convey meanings. It can be conveyed through various forms of communication such as spoken or written language (Barthes, 1977). Labov's model of narrative from 1972 is to study the narrative structures of the stories. He developed a highly popular model for analyzing narrative structures, which was originally used to study the narrative structures of orally told stories (Patterson, 2013; Labov, 1972). It consists of six main parts of narrative: abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution, and coda. It remained influential for decades as the structural model for oral then written narrative.

1.2 Aims of the Study

The current study aims at:

1. Finding out the effect of using Labov's Model as an instructional model for teaching narrative writing on EFL university students' textual aspects of writing, through:
 - a. Finding out the effect of the used instructional model on EFL university students' level in cohesion.
 - b. Finding out the effect of the used instructional model on EFL university students' level in coherence.

- c. Finding out the effect of the used instructional model on EFL university students' level in meaning: textual and ideational meaning.
- d. Finding out which aspect of writing: cohesion, coherence and meaning has been affected more than the other.
2. Finding out the effect of the used instructional model on EFL university students' textual aspect of writing at the recognition and production levels.
3. Finding out the effect of the used instructional model on EFL university students' textual aspects of writing according to gender.

1.3 Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses have been formulated in order to achieve the aims of the study:

1. There are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group which is taught by using Labov's model as an instructional model and the control group which is taught by using the conventional method in textual aspects of writing at the post test.
 - a. There are no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups' level in cohesion at the post test
 - b. There are no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups' level in coherence at the post test
 - c. There are no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups' level in meaning: textual and ideational at the post test
 - d. There are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental groups' in the aspects of writing: cohesion, coherence and meaning at the post test.

2. There are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups' textual aspects of writing at the recognition and production levels in the post test
3. There are no statistically significant differences between the mean score of the experimental and control groups' textual aspect of writing according to gender in the post-test.

1.4 Limits of the Study

The sample with whom the work is conducted is the second-year students (morning studies) at Tikrit University, College of Education, Department of English; at the first course in the academic year 2022-2023. The current study is limited to textual aspects of writing that include coherence ,cohesion, and meaning.

1.5 Plan of the Study

The following steps are followed in order to achieve the aims of the study:

1. Providing a theoretical background about the variables of the study.
2. Selecting a sample from the EFL second year students and divided them into two equal groups : experimental and control.
3. Equalizing the two groups in different variables: parents' academic attainment, and students' age , their achievement in previous year examination and pre-test.
4. Preparing a lesson plan, adopting Labov's model (1972)
5. The experimental group has been taught by using Labov's model; While using the conventional method with the control group.
6. Constructing an achievement posttest.
7. Subjecting the two groups to the posttest.
8. Analysing the selected data statistically by using suitable statistical means and giving conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

Chapter Two

Theoretical Background

2.1 Labov's Narrative Model

Labov's model of narrative analysis from 1972 is to study the narrative structures of the stories of r/tifu.. He has developed a highly popular model for analysing narrative structures, which is originally used to study the narrative structures of orally told stories and it consists of six main parts of narrative: abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution, and coda. (Labov, 1972 and Patterson, 2013).

Cortazzi (2014) mentions that Labov's model of narrative analysis is a sociolinguistic approach that examines formal structural properties of narratives in relation to their social functions. Labov and his co-workers (Labov and Waletzky, 1967) originally develop particular interview questions in sociolinguistic research in order to overcome the formal constraints of face-to-face interviews. Some questions seemed to obtain more casual, natural speech because speakers became more personally involved with what they are saying.

2.2 Labov's Parts of the Model

Labov's model consists of the following six sequential elements:

- Abstract: an introductory part of the narrative that summarizes the event.
- Orientation: information about the time, place of the events, and the participants.
- Complicating action: sequential clauses that lead up to their climax.
- Resolution: how the protagonist manages to resolve the crisis.
- Coda: a final clause to show that the narrative has ended.

- Evaluation: expression of attitudes or opinions to make the point of the narrative. Studies have continued to examine narratives based on this model, Wang, 2017) despite its limitations (Patterson, 2008).

Schegloff (1997) mentions that criticisms include the model's dependence on monological narratives elicited in interviews, thus neglecting the co-construction between storyteller and audience. In this case, however, this fits well with the context of writing for testing purposes because it is characterized by a lack of co-construction between the person who writes, namely the student, and the person who reads Incorporating Sociolinguistic Narrative Model into EFL Writing for Testing Purposes and grades, usually the teacher. Given this, Labov and Waletzky's model is in fact suitable for being applied to EFL writing in an examination-driven context.

Labov's (2006) opinion is that narratives make use of temporal junctures where the order of the events matches the order of the narrative clauses. Hence, narratives add coherence to themselves by following a particular structure and also to our thoughts. Labov after working on many narratives taken from people of different locals and background found that there are certain features that are common to all narratives.

Table (1) Steps of Labov's Model

Stage	Lexico-grammatical features
Abstract Signals the story and the reason for telling it.	(No abstract stage in this text)
Orientation Orients the listener to the story by giving details of time, location, characters, etc.	- Expressions of time, place, - who, what, where, when: in Mosman, one weekend, outside his place. - Past tense verbs (was, had) - Use of nouns and pronouns for

	participants (I, Stan, he, our)
Complication It introduces the problem	- Events sequenced in time - Past tense action verbs (bit, banged, took off) - Expressions of place (on the fleshy part of his thumb) and manner (with the axe)
Evaluation It establishes the significance of the story and builds suspense	- Action suspended through evaluation of events and suspense- building - Repetition (it was just like blowtorch) - Intensifiers (excruciating, terribly) - Conformation check (what, the posing goes ...?)
Resolution Explains the resolution of the problem	- Events are time-sequenced - Past tense action verbs - Normality restored (He was terribly lucky)
Coda Comments over all story and brings it back to the present	- Evaluation of story through: vocabulary expressing speakers' attitude (absolutely dreadful) - Return to present (doesn't it give you the creeps?)

Taken from Schmitt (2013)

2.3 Narrative Writing

Labov (1972) defines narrative as “one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred”, which is very restrictive when compared to Fludernik’s definition (2009). Labov focuses on clausal structures and so-called narrative clauses, which are clauses that have temporal juncture, and they cannot be moved without changing the semantic interpretation of the text (Alleyne, 2015). Labov

(1972:13) also defines a minimal narrative, in which “the clauses are characteristically ordered in temporal sequence”. Because of these definitions, Labov argues that some clauses are not narratives, such as non-independent clauses, subordinate clauses or clauses that include **used to**, **would** or the general present. This does somewhat restrict the analysis of the stories that include many clauses that are not narrative according to this definition; however, to enable a full analysis of the data, this study focuses on Fludernik’s definition of narrative and approaches all the stories and clauses as narratives. Labov’s model has received a fair amount of critiques. It has been criticized for example because it does not consider the context of the narratives, and because Labov’s definition of narrative clauses causes some problems since not all texts fit into his definition, making the model inflexible (Patterson, 2013; Alleyne, 2015).

2.4 Writing and its Textual Aspects

2.4.1. Coherence

A text is formed not only with the structured string of words, but also with the contextual occurrence of sentences. Coherence, generally, is the contextual appearance of the utterances in the text. More specifically, it is the contextual fitness of the text that contributes in understanding the meaning or message. According to Taboada (2004: 158), “Coherence is the hanging together of the text with relation to its context of situation or culture”. It is the result of the interpretation of the meaning of the text, and it depends on the relation between the audience and the text (Tanskanen, 2006). Therefore, the coherence of a text can be perceived only if the receiver’s background knowledge is sufficient enough to interpret the linkage of messages in the discourse. According to Yule (2008:126),

“Coherence is everything fitting together well, and it is not something that exists in words or structures, but something that exists in people”.

2.4.2. Cohesion

The role of cohesion is very important in writing. It links together the elements that are structurally unrelated through the dependence of one on the other for its interpretation. Moreover, it distinguishes texts from non-texts and enables readers or listeners to establish relevance between what was said, is being said, and will be said, through the appropriate use of the necessary lexical and grammatical cohesive devices. It occurs when the semantic interpretation of some linguistic in the discourse depends on another. It is the “foundation upon which the edifice of coherence is built” and is an essential feature of a text if it is judged to be coherent.

Taboada (2004: 202) defines cohesion as “the internal hanging together of the text”. To Yule (2008: 107) “Cohesion is the tie and connection that exist within the text’. It is the part of the system of a language; a type of intra-sentence relation of an item with either the preceding or following item/s in the text. In communication process, cohesion gives insights into how the writer structures what s/he wants to convey. Halliday and Hasan (1976) view that cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary in the text. There are two types of cohesion: grammatical cohesion, and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion is the cohesive tie that is expressed through the grammatical system of a language such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction.

2.4.3.1 Cohesive Ties

Cohesive ties are generic words or phrases used to link different parts (e.g., ideas, sentences or sections) of a piece of writing. Halliday and Hasan (1976) state

that the cohesive ties are: references, conjunctions, substitutions, ellipses, and lexical ties. As narrative is a complete whole with many basic elements, cohesive ties help this whole to be more compact and organized. Through cohesive ties, the different parts of the narrative are made more connected. In fact, cohesive ties are the elements that create semantic clarity of a text.

2.4.3.2. Reference

There are many pronouns, e.g., personal, reflective, interrogative, and demonstrative that are used for referencing. These references can either take the form of anaphoric referencing or cataphoric referencing. In the narratives, the personal reference with personal pronoun “ I ” comes in the category of anaphoric references because “I” refers back to the narrator of the story. Halliday and Hasan (1976) mentions that reference deals with semantic relationships and it can be accomplished by:

- Exophoric reference, which signals that reference, must be made to the context of a situation.

(1) It needs a lot of work.

- Endophoric reference which signals that reference must be made to the text of the discourse itself, is either anaphoric (referring to the preceding text):

(2) The party is great. It's similar to last year's.

or cataphoric (referring to the text that follows):

(3) I want to tell you this: If you study hard, you will succeed.

They suggest the following subcategories of reference:

2.4.3.3 Ellipsis

Ellipsis is usually words or parts of a sentence that are omitted and the meaning is made clear from the context. In the narratives, there are few examples where elliptical use of language is done. Ellipsis is substitution by zero, i.e. ellipsis refers to leaving an empty slot that may potentially be filled by the referent, and, like substitution, it refers anaphorically to a noun, verb, clause or part of a clause (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Salkie 1995, Thompson 2004).

Thompson (2004) states that ellipsis typically occurs in adjacent clauses where the word period is omitted. The difference between substitution, reference and ellipsis may sometimes seem unclear and the terms can easily be confused. It can perhaps be seen more clearly by looking more closely at some cases. In the case of reference, the referent cannot easily be replaced by what it is referring to without altering it, whereas the examples with substitution and ellipsis the substituted/omitted item may be reinserted without alterations (Halliday and Hassan 1976). Ellipsis can be classified into three types:

A. Nominal Ellipsis which involves the omission of the head of a noun phrase, with some modifiers sometimes:

(4) Were the test questions easy? Some yes.

B. Verbal Ellipsis which involves the omission of a lexical verb from verb phrase:

(5) Have you been swimming? Yes, I have.

Or the omission of everything except the lexical verb.

(6) Has she been studying? No, playing.

C. Clausal Ellipsis which involves the omission of the whole clause:

(7) Will you call me? No.

Ellipsis is regarded to be “a mark of good style”(Wonderly, 1968 and James, 1983). In spite of this virtue, writers sometimes avoid using ellipsis that creates some ambiguity concerning reader, i.e. to make the message more explicit.

2.4.3.4. Substitution

Substitution is the category in which one thing is substituted by another. Such words are substituted by other words. It is said, “I myself was grieving on my (this disease).” In this example, “love” is substituted by “this disease”.

Following are the main three types of substitution:

A. Nominal Substitution which contains the use of (‘one’, ‘ones’ and ‘the same’) to be a substitution for a noun head or nominal complement.

(8) Which book is it? The one on the corner.

B. Verbal Substitution which involves the replacement of a verb or verb phrase by (do, does, did).

(9) I love my son. I really do.

C. Clausal Substitution which involves the use of limited words as clause substitutes. (So) is used for a positive clause and (not) for a negative clause.

(10) Do you like it? Absolutely not.

In brief, substitution gives unity to a text, by making the structure of the text interwoven. Chapman (1983: 2) points out that substitution “helps to integrate the

propositions in the two sentences and thus contributes to the overall cohesion of the passage”.

2.4.3.5 Conjunction

Conjunctions can work as coordination or subordination depending on their different uses. That is why they are used for linking. In the selected narratives, many examples show this linkage. The first example in both the narratives is “and”. This is a coordinating conjunction because it takes part in coordinating different parts of a sentence. Conjunction involves combining textual elements into a “potentially coherent complex semantic unit” (Thompson 2004: 189) and includes conjunction proper as well as continuity, i.e. prepositions and conjunctive adjuncts (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004). It connects pieces of text together and marks logico-semantic relationships between spans of text or within clause complexes to link paragraphs or clauses. It signals different kinds of relations, connections, or expansions of text: additive, extending and enhancing (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004). It is used to mark how pieces of a text are related, for example by sequencing the text in terms of time or cause and effect.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

3.0 Introductory Note :

This chapter sheds light on the procedures that have been followed fulfill the aims and verify the hypotheses of the current study.. More specifically, the current chapter involves:

3.1. Research Design

Research design is defined as the arrangement of conditions for the collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy and procedure (Akhtar, 2016). The research design sets the procedure for the required data, the methods to be applied to collect and analyze this data, and how all of this is going to answer the research question (Boru, 2018). On the other hand, Research design is the plan, structure, strategy and investigation concaved so as to obtain ensured to search questions and control variance (Thakur, 2021). The design of this research is quantitative research. As the current study aims to know the effect of Labov’s model of three variables based on statistical analysis.

The purpose of the experimental design is to emphasize control over conditions that would affect on the independent variables upon the dependent variables. In order to find out the effect of applying Labov’s model on the students’ achievement in English textual aspects of writing, the “Experimental-Control Group pre-post Test” design (Lewin, 1979: 52) is utilized, as shown in table (2).

Table (2) The Research Design

Group	Pretest	Independent variable	Posttest
Experimental	Pretest	Labov’s Model	Posttest
Control group	Pretest	_____	Posttest

The design consists of experimental and control groups. Both have been submitted to the pretest. The independent variable is administrated only to the experimental group and the Posttest is administrated to the two groups. The scores

of both groups, on the dependent variable are compared to see if there are any significant differences between them (Good,1973).

3.2 Population and Sampling

Population and sample are considered as one of the basic steps in the procedure of the study.

3.2.1 Population

Richards (1992) states that population refers to any set of subject, items, individuals, etc., which shows a particular qualities and a sample can be taken from. On the other hand , Gay (1996) states that it is a group of individuals that the researcher would like the results of a particular group to be generalized on.. The population of the present study is the EFL University students from the second-year college students (males and females) , Department of English ,College of Education for Humanities.

Table (3) The Population of the Study

University	College	No. of Males	No. of Females	No. of Population
Tikrit	College of Education for Humanities	70	73	143

3.2.2 Sample

Richards et al,(1992) mention that a sample refers to any group of individuals which is selected to represent a population . According to Ary, etal., (2010), a sample is a number of individuals, objects or events selected for a study from a population, usually in such a way that they represent the large group from which they are selected.

The sample of the present study consists of 64 second-stage students (males and females) who represent both controlling and experimental groups. Each group is 32 students who are randomly selected after excluding some of the students who should not be part of the sample because they either have years of failure, or they are older than the other members of the sample or they are at the evening studies and they are hosted with the morning studies and that may affect on the sample as far as age and the way of teaching are concerned in the Department of English at the College of Education for Humanities at the Academic Year 2022-2023, as shown in table (4).

Table (4) The Sample of the Study

University	College	No. of Males at both Groups	No. of Females at both Groups	Number of Samples at both groups	No. of Population
Tikrit	College of Education for Humanities	29	35	64	143

3.3 Applying the Experiment

The constructed plan has been applied on the second- year students of English Department at college of education at Tikrit University. It lasted for 8 weeks. Each lesson takes two hours and concentrates on explaining one step of Labov's narrative model and how it can be understood to achieve students' mastery of English textual aspects of writing. The components of each lesson include giving a brief idea about the topic that will be explained, using the

blackboard, asking students to participate, giving them a topic to write about, making group work to begin the writing skill . The given topics are interrelated with each other to construct and make progress in English narrative skills and aspects. The covered topics represent the students' abilities to achieve coherent and meaningful texts.

The two groups are taught by the researcher himself in order to control the teachers' variable that may affect the instructional process. The instruction started on the 10th of November 2022 and lasted for 8 weeks, and ended on the 29th of January 2023. Each of the eight lectures is taught with two hours . All lectures are given inside the classroom. After that, the post-test is administered.

Table (5) The Time Schedule of the Experiment

Date	Material	Time Limit
Tuesday 10 th November, 2022	Unit Two	2 hours
Tuesday 17 th November	Unit Two	2 hours
Tuesday 24 th November	Unit Two	2 hours
Sunday 1 st December	Unit Two	2 hours
Tuesday 8 th December	Unit Two	2 hours
Tuesday 15 th December	Unit Two	2 hours
Tuesday 22 nd December	Unit Two	2 hours
Tuesday 29 th December	Unit Two	2 hours

Chapter Four

Analysis of Data and Discussion of Results

4.1 Analysis of Data

4.1.1 Results Related to First Hypothesis

To find out if there is any significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and that of the control group in the posttest, all mean scores are obtained and compared. Statistics show that the mean scores of the experimental group is 65.12 and that of the control group is 59.53, with standard deviations of 6.80 and 7.06, respectively. By using the t-test formula for two independent, the calculated t-value is found to be 3.227, while the tabulated t-value is found to be 2.000 at the degree of freedom 62 and level of significance 0.05. This indicates that there is a significant difference between the achievement of the two groups and in favor of the experimental group.

Thus, the first hypothesis which states that “there is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group which is taught using Labov’s model as an instructional model for teaching narrative writing and the control group which is taught using the conventional method in textual aspects of writing at the posttest” is rejected, as shown in table (6).

Table (6)
Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups
in the Narrative Writing Test

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Sig.
EG.	32	65.12	6.80	Calculated	Tabulated	62	Sig.
CG.	32	59.53	7.06	3.227	2.000		

One-Way (ANOVA) Analysis of variance is used to determine whether or not there are any statistically significant differences among the mean scores of the textual aspects of writing. As shown in the following table:

Table (7)
One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Between the Three Textual Aspects
of Writing

Variables	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
Between Groups	431.896	2	215.948	19.424	3.10	0.05
Within Groups	1033.938	93	11.118			
Total	1465.833	95				

The calculated F-value 19.424 is higher than the tabulated F-value 3.10 at the (0.05) level of significance and DF = 2, 93. This indicates that there are significant differences among students mean scores in textual aspects of writing.

Table (8)
Comparisons of Means According to (Scheffe^a)

Groups	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Coherence	32	19.0313		
Ideational Meaning	32		21.8750	
Cohesion	32			24.2188
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000
Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.				
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 32				

The comparison of means shows the mean scores of the three aspects of writing. Thus, the first hypothesis, which states that "There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the textual aspects of writing cohesion and coherence at the Posttest," According to these results, the mean score of cohesion is 24.2188, whereas coherence is 19.0313, this indicates that there is a significant difference between the aspects of textual writing in the Posttest and in favour of cohesion aspect. So, this hypothesis is rejected, as shown in table (8).

Thus, the second hypothesis, which states that "There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the textual aspects of writing coherence and ideational meaning at the Posttest", the comparison shows that mean score of coherence is 62.0400, while the ideational meaning is 44.2000. This indicates that there is a significant difference between the two aspects of textual writing in the Posttest and in the favour of the ideational meaning aspect. So, this hypothesis is rejected, as shown in table (8).

However, the third hypothesis, which states that "There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the textual aspects of writing cohesion and ideational meaning at the Posttest," the statistics shows that mean score of cohesion is 76.7200, while ideational meaning is 62.0400. This indicates

that there is a significant difference between the two aspects of textual writing in the Posttest, and in the favour of cohesion. So, this hypothesis is rejected, as shown in table (8).

4.1.2 Results Related to Second Hypothesis

The mean scores of the students' performance at the recognition level and that at the production level in the conversation test are calculated and compared to find out whether there is any significant difference between them. The obtained results show that students' mean scores at the recognition level are found to be 31.60 and that at the production level is 33.51, with standard deviation 3.15 and 4.26, respectively. The t-test formula for two paired samples is used and results show that the calculated t-value is 3.417 and the tabulated t- value is 2.037 at the degree of freedom 31 and level of significance 0.05. This means that there is a significant difference between students' performance of textual aspects at the recognition level and that at the production level and for the benefit of the production level, as shown in table (9).

Table (9)
Students' Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, and T-Value of the Students' Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Production	32	33.51	4.26	Calculated	Tabulated	31	0.05
Recognition	32	31.60	3.15	3.417	1.972		

4.1.3 Results Related to Third Hypothesis

It is found that the mean score of the difference between the mean scores of the males' achievement and that of the females in the posttest, the mean scores of males is 64.84 with a standard deviation of 7.02. Whereas the mean scores of females are 65.53 with a standard deviation 6.728. By using t-test for two independent samples. The calculated t-value is 0.280, which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value which is 2.042 at 0.05 level of significance when the degree of freedom is 30. The obtained results indicate that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the males and that of the females in the textual aspects posttest. Thus, this hypothesis is accepted, as shown in table (10).

Table (10)
The T-test Value of Paired Samples, the Experimental Group
Achievement According to Gender

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Females	13	65.53	6.728	Calculated	Tabulated	30	0.05
Males	19	64.84	7.02	0.280	2.042		

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

The present study has come up with some conclusions, as follows:

1-Labov's model has an effective impact on the development of the textual aspects of writing ,i.e. coherence , cohesion and meaning by the experimental group has become more accurate in linking sentences within the text both semantically and syntactically.

2. The use of this modern technique, has an impact on the improvement of students' recognition and production as it helps to understand and analyze the text.

3-Labov's model refers to analysing a narrative text or structure and vice versa, moving smoothly from step to another, giving each stage or a text its own features, learning exactly where a complication and solving such a complication lies and finally having an evaluation for the story and getting it back to present in a process that is called coda., hypothesis generation and testing. Each step and technique followed with this model has a positive impact on the student's learning process.

4. Involving the students in Labov's model encourages them to reach the full potential of their needs and result in good achievement.

5. Labov's narrative model helps students pay attention to things they do not know and correct their errors related not only to grammar, but also to choosing the correct words and having a coherent text that is represented by using the correct content ,vocabulary, mechanics, format or organization as well as using a correct transition signals and cohesive devices.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the above conclusions, it is recommended that:

1. Teachers should rely on modern strategies and techniques in teaching English, especially Labov's narrative structure model .
2. There should be some training courses to improve teachers' skills in using eclectic studies that help developing students' capacities .
3. Technical requirements should be used to help implement techniques and strategies.
4. A booklet should be prepared by the educational institutions in cooperation with universities that includes modern techniques , steps and instructions for their application.

5. The planning of the English language curricula should be considered by the Ministry of Education, as it focuses on including a variety of activities that are compatible with narratives and stories available to students, and is not limited to information and mental knowledge only.
6. The directorates of education and the drafters of the curricula must review theses and dissertations, take what is contained in them and apply it to the curricula and not neglect them in order to come up with generations of thinkers and creators.

References

- Akhtar, I. (2016). **Research Design**. In book: Research in Social Science: Interdisciplinary Perspectives.
- Alleyne, B. (2015). “**Analysing narrative.**” In C. Rojek, G. Shields, L. Larson, & A. Scriven (Eds.), *Narrative networks: Storied approaches in a digital age*, (pp. 55–98). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Barthes, R. (1977). **Rhetoric of the Image**. In **Image Music Text (Essays Selected and Translated by Heath, S., pp. 32-51)**. London: Fontana Press
- Boru, T. (2018). **Research design and Methodology**. University of South Africa, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Chapman, D. (1983). **Career Satisfaction of Teachers**. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 7, 40-50.
- Cortazzi, M. (2014). “**Sociological and Sociolinguistic Models of Narrative.**” In *Narrative Analysis* (pp. 33-67). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). **Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research** (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Fludernik, M. (2009). **An Introduction to Narratology**. Routledge.
- Gay, L. R. (1996). **Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application**. New Jersey: Merrill.
- Good, C. R. (1973). **Dictionary of Education**. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw –
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). **Cohesion in English**. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and C. Matthiessen. (2004). **An Introduction to Functional Grammar**. 3rd. Ed. London: Arnold.
- Labov, W. (1972). **Language in the inner city**. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lewin, M. (1979). **Understanding Psychological Research**. New York: John
- Nunan, D. (1999). **Second Language Teaching and Learning**. USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Patterson, W. (2008). **Narratives of Events; Labovian Narrative Analysis and Its Limitations**. In: *Doing Narrative Research*, 2nd Edition, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Patterson, W. (2013). “**Narratives of Events: Labovian Narrative Analysis and Its Limitations.**” In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing Narrative Research*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9780857024992>

- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). **Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics**. London: Longman.
- Salkie, R. (1995). **Text and Discourse Analysis**. London and New York: Routledge
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). **Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis** (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2013). **An Introduction to Applied Linguistics**. 2nd edition, Routledge.
- Taboada, M. T. (2004). **Building Coherence and Cohesion: Task-oriented dialogue in English and Spanish**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Thakur, H. K. (2021). **Research Methodology in Social Sciences** .Research Gate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353430802>.
- Thompson, G. (2004). **Introducing Functional Grammar**. 2nd Ed. London: Arnold.
- Yule, G. (2008). **The study of language**. (3rd ed.). New Delhi: CUP.