

Research paper


## The Role of Reformulation Tasks in EFL Learners' Sound Discrimination to Develop Writing Skills

Sara Moradi

Department of English, Mahshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mahshahr, Iran

### Citation

Moradi, S. (2023). The role of reformulation tasks in EFL learners' sound discrimination to develop their writing skills. *Journal of new advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 1150-1164.

 10.22034/jeltal.2023.5.1.6

### Received

2023-01-20

### Revised

2023-02-23

### Accepted

2023-03-28

### Keywords:

corrective feedback,  
clarification request,  
error correction,  
learners' cognition,  
recast,  
teachers' cognition

### Abstract

The ability to realize sound discrimination can be the basis of productive language skills like speaking and writing. This study examines the role of reformulation techniques including interpreting, oral summarizing, and retelling tasks in relation to the development of sound discrimination boosting learners' writing skills. English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The participants (N=93) were selected from students majoring in English translation at Abadan Azad University. They were then divided into three equal experimental groups that received three types of reformulation tasks. But the control group received traditional instructions for text-based exercises. The tasks were used as interpreting, oral summarizing, and retelling. Participants took a pre-test of their ability to distinguish sounds, assessing their ability to distinguish sounds. Finally, the groups took a one-paragraph essay. A rubric developed by Robinson and Howell (2008) was used to score essays. ANOVA was used to estimate the significant differences between the groups. Findings indicated retelling was more effective than the oral summary and interpreting techniques in sound discrimination and writing accuracy. Implications suggest that retelling tasks improve a learner's ability to distinguish sounds and develop writing skills.

\*Corresponding Author: Sara Moradi

Address: Department of English, Mahshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mahshahr, Iran

Tel: (+98) 90312447160 E-mail: [moradi@gmail.com](mailto:moradi@gmail.com)

## Introduction

Reformulation tasks are useful techniques for providing input in sound discrimination recall and retention among English language learners. In EFL contexts, there are learners who cannot receive appropriate interaction in productive skills like speaking and writing and may face difficulties to get their communicative goals. This shortcoming may be resolved if the learners have access to the appropriate input of models in writing or speaking and then reformulate those structures on their own and arrive at the linguistic knowledge needed for communication through using models, reference sources, and asking teachers (Allwright et al, 1988). Thus, “By using reformulation technique, learners also can compare their text with the new version of it and rewrite their text. So reformulation as an immediate input can help learners to solve their problems (Williams, 2012, p. 54).

Writing skill is very challenging for EFL learners, especially in a context in which learners lack enough input of sound discrimination to recognize speech and meanings of words and sentences (Graham & Perin, 2007; Li, Zhang & Parr, 2020). Ting (2003) notes writing English skills is a difficult activity for English language learners since they have to recognize sounds and then read the correct form. He notes this is because writing in English, compared to speaking in English, requires the production of the sounds in the learners’ mind and then use them in the actual mode of writing format (Hubner et al, 2010). Therefore, learners need to know the characteristics of English language writing skills. Harklau (2002) states acoustic discrimination as a communication ability is a key role in language comprehension and understanding that is taken place in the beginning steps of language learning processes at elementary and secondary levels. Classrooms are the places that help learners to distinguish acoustic phonetics and articulate appropriate sounds forming words in productive skills. Writing skill is used to communicate and convey meanings which means that it is a way to understand how learners are communicative and meaningful in their social interactions (Yang & Zhang, 2010). Learning acoustic phonetics is also a means of communication with learners who know this language (Chastain, 1998; Farsia & Barjesteh, 2016). To achieve this goal, students must write in a way that is acceptable to members of that community or dictate what they hear in the classes or take notes when teachers give lectures in classes. Consequently, sound description and recognition is a part of linguistic input affecting the output of linguistic elements of the learners. Celce-Murcia (2001) emphasizes the ability to express concepts in writing skills that needs the learners to be accurate and consistent and achieve English language mastery. Native speakers also never master this skill. Writing skills need a combination of other language skills including sound discrimination, speaking, reading, and language discourse knowledge that makes learning the writing skill very complex. It can be regarded as a social skill since it reflects the learners’ communication ideas that are to develop and learn communication in the context of EFL (Fallahzadeh & Shokrpour, 2008).

Yang and Zhang (2010) studied the effect of rewording and text modeling in a writing tasks (rewritten, comparison, modification) in a course studied at Peking University. Results indicated the learners put effort into realizing the appropriate language to give their means at the composition steps and noticed most of the differences in structures in the original and target

texts. Reformulation tasks helped them to rewrite at the interpreting stage and they appreciate the ability to arrive at the communication standards. Therefore, text and linguistic structures are models that are helpful for a variety of linguistic inputs among EFL learners as non-native speakers of English language.

Different tasks are used as writing activities in schools. Sometimes verbal material is used for elementary learners, and a series of pictures to develop transliteration or representational knowledge can be stored as information in memory to improve writing (Pavio, 1990; Salvberg, & Valas, 1995). But when learners finish learning, they still cannot write correctly. This gap in written research can be partially filled by task-oriented activities in the classes. The researcher may use different reformulation tasks (compare, copy, interpret, rewritten, etc.) to find out the role of these tasks on learners' language accuracy; and guide learners how to distinguish native sounds and be able to use them in writing helps familiarize learners with the rules of language accuracy (Baese-Berk, 2019).

Language learners need to acquire this skill for pedagogical goals and objectives. Being precise and grasping English rules of grammar to improve this skill. Interpreting the sentences and texts in the class can be very helpful to reformulate the structures while listening to the sentences and gain sound discrimination a way to improve writing ability. Interpreting tasks and transcription of the structures are useful tasks for improving sound discrimination. It is important to know how different reformulation tasks affect sound discrimination and learners' sound recognition as the goal of input enhancement (Kim, 2020).

This study provides Iranian EFL learners with an understanding of reformulation tasks of sound discriminations that boost academic writing and the use of English outside of the classroom in an educational setting to meet their communicative goals. Thus, the ability to recognize authentic sounds, review sections, and be exposed to accurate texts throughout the semester helps students feel confident and write like a native. Reformulations tasks are used to some extent among Iranian EFL learners in the form of comparing and contrasting, interpreting, copying, oral summary, rewritten, etc. among Iranian students on sound discrimination. But there is no research to compare these reformulation tasks and decide which one is more effective. Therefore, to delimit the scope of the paper, three common reformulation tasks have been used in the study including interpreting, oral summarizing, and retelling at Abadan Islamic Azad University. Although a number of studies have been conducted on individual tasks to improve writing skills. But these three tasks have not been conducted in the Iranian context. Thus, this study may give learners some promotion of writing ability in general and sound discrimination in particular. The main purpose of this study is to fill the research gap in the literature of the study and improve EFL learners' writing skills via sound discrimination knowledge.

### **Literature Review**

In order to complete language learning requirements, learners need research writing requirements and fellowship membership. In this case, students must acquire the ability to

write. Writing is the process of expressing thoughts and ideas. Students must practice this skill by completing various writing assignments in writing classes. These assignments may include essay writing, abstract writing, report writing, thesis writing, notes, and more. While these activities may be challenging, they may not always result in learning without the use of cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies. According to Kormos (2011), teachers can gather information about how various task characteristics interact with the linguistic features of foreign-language texts prior to task selection.

The process of writing skill and sound discrimination can be divided into four categories (Panofsky et Al., (2005). Firstly, students should engage in procedural tasks of sound recognition in activities such as sketching, composing, revising, and writing the final version of the essay. Secondly, arguing provides essential information to support the idea. Thirdly, students are required to organize, criticize, evaluate, contrast, and compare opinions and information; and fourthly, students engage in peer-to-peer editing. The reform formula is based on Levenston's (1987) definition, which states that learners are considered to be "native speakers" when the composition of the essay is taken into account. This variation can be expressed in terms of vocabulary, syntax, or style. Reformulation tasks could be feedback tools, commonly used in production and observation, in relation to L2 writing. In accordance with Levenston's definition, a linguist would have a learner reformulate sounds into writings or essays in their native language while preserving all of their ideas and making it as original as possible. The original manuscript would be corrected in this revision.

The use of reformulation tasks and techniques has the potential to address some of the drawbacks of traditional feedback strategies, which tend to focus on untargted forms of feedback (Hanaoka & Izumi, 2012). Rewriting is an effective method of providing information about writing abilities. In both writing and speaking, students often fail to meet their communication objectives due to a lack of L2 awareness. However, by writing, students have the chance to address their issues in various ways, such as through the use of models, and resources, and asking their teachers. Additionally, by using the rewrite technique, students can compare their text to its new version and rework their own text. Refining the formula as an instant input can help students to address their issues (Williams, 2012).

It is generally accepted that reformulation involves the use of words, phrases, or phrases that are copied verbatim from a source text. However, it is important to note that this is not necessarily the case, as it may be a process of learning or development when the learners focus on the source text or spoken form. According to researchers, there is a distinction between copying, retelling, and oral summarizing techniques. Retelling can be employed as a means of avoiding copying, as it consists of the use of paraphrased words that are only repeated in the original text and are related to the subject matter of the text. Alternatively, students may opt to employ skimming paraphrases in their writing after listening to the source data (Keck, 2010).

It is possible for L2 writers to modify their text by inserting new words, deleting existing words, or substituting them with syntactical terms. Abbasi and Akbari (2008) argues that a

majority of L2 students employ shallow interpretations to avoid the use of their own words. This may be a result of a lack of self-assurance. Similarly, Shi (2012) argues that critical retelling using keywords alone does not guarantee a correct interpretation. Finally, Yamanaka (2003) argues that deductive reasoning (including the use of inferences and analogies) is essential for successful interpretation.

Fathman et al., (1990) investigated the effect of error correction on students' writing accuracy after sound exposure. The responses were mainly grammatical feedback including pointing out grammatical errors, response content including brief general comments about the text, and a combination of grammatical errors. The results of the study showed that only the grammar and content response groups improved students' writing accuracy when the learners were exposed to output. In a similar study, Chandler et al., (2003) surveyed participants in a semester and the students had to write a 25-page self-published article and a book review. In this study, they divided the participants into two groups with the same teacher and teaching method. The main difference between the experimental and control groups was in processing and receiving oral responses. The students were required to review each task and correct any mistakes noted by their teacher before progressing to the subsequent exercises in the experimental group. The control group, however, was able to correct the underlined mistakes after writing the initial version of the five tasks at the conclusion of the study period. The results indicated that a control group that had not corrected errors between exercises did not demonstrate an increase in accuracy while the experimental group demonstrated a significant increase in accuracy. Yang and Zhang's (2010) study was conducted to explore the effects of presenting participants with both rewritten and paraphrased texts in a three-stage writing task. The participants were EFL students who used narrative text for the purposes of the study. The participants observed discrepancies between their rewritten and composed texts during the interpretation phase. The models were also used as a good representation of their writing, including the native version. As a result, researchers concluded that both rewriting and modeling should be employed to enhance students' writing skill.

According to Shi (2012), rephrasing texts or oral interpretation can help students become cognizant of their issues and learn an original form of how to articulate their ideas. However, the text model is not limited to the original and provide learners with a natural example at all levels such as vocabulary, sentence structure, and pronunciation. In this study, Shi (2012) examined the role of rewrite and interpret of oral operations as source text reconstructions in second-language text. Additionally, the study attempted to examine how students and teachers view texts as interpreted, summated, and translated as reconstructions. The results of the study focused on the participants' opinions on the roles of retelling activities employed by students and faculty across disciplines in terms of the amount of interpretation, summation, and translation. In this study, 48 students and 27 teachers enrolled in a North American university voluntarily. The results demonstrate that reformulation of oral activities play a positive role in the development of students writing accuracy. In the study, two common reformulation activities that are more commonly used by students undertaking sound discrimination tasks are summarizing and retelling.

In a study at a university in Australia, Moore (1997) looked at how much English language learners relied on a copy when writing abstracts. He found that Asian ESL students relied more on a copy when they did not cite the original text. He thinks this is because of cultural differences, rather than copying since ESL students think the original text is the source of information so they copy it. Native English speakers, however, rely more on summarizing the original text because it is their personal opinion of the original one. Johns (1990) looked at the abstracts of 80 undergraduate English students who had low English proficiency compared to students with high levels of English. The literature review looked at theoretical and experimental research on the effects of reformulation tasks. They looked at different reformulation activities on the development of language skills, subskills, and learning a second language.

In a nutshell, all the reformulation activities seemed to be effective, but no clear distinction was made between them. This study wanted to find out if there were any differences between these activities that made learners aware of sound discrimination affecting their writing skill in English. The main goal of the study was to see if interpreting, oral summarization, and retelling, as reformulation tasks, had a big impact on upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners' sound discrimination and writing skills.

## Methodology

### Participants

This study involved students from the Islamic Azad University of Abadan. The learners who had just finished a basic writing course at the writing course I was the research population. To make sure everyone was the same language proficiency, the researcher gave out a placement test to 130 learners. After they scored well on the placement test, 93 learners were chosen as primary participants who had scores that were within 1 standard deviation above the mean. They were male and female learners and all were Persian language speakers. The participants were randomly divided into three equal experimental groups of 31 participants. The groups were the interpretation group (IG), oral summary group (OSG), and retelling group (RG).

### Instrumentation

In this study, we used the Test of English Proficiency and the IELTS Pre- and Post-test in writing to measure student achievement. We also used the Robinson and Howell Adaptive Checklist (Robinson & Howell, 2008) to score the writing of students before and after treatment sessions (see the Appendix). The reliability of the entry test was determined by using Cronbach's Alpha formula ( $\alpha = .91$ ) to make sure the sample population was homogeneous. We used the pre and posttest, which is made up of a 250-word essay on 5 topics for learners to choose from to write their essays.

### Materials

The first texts we used were from a book called "Active Reading: Volume 1" by Anderson (2007) for oral reading or listening the material CDs. There are 12 chapters long and each unit has two passages. In each unit, there are reading sections that we used as our original model of



oral reading for sound discrimination exposure. Arnaudet and Barrett's (1990) "Paragraph Development" was used as a source for teaching writing skill.

### Data Collection Procedure

This study was done with 93 participants who had taken an English proficiency test. The participants were divided into IG, OSG, and RG groups. All groups got the same materials but had to do different tasks. IG and OSG groups read sections of Anderson's (2007) Active Reading: Book 2, and Arnaudet and Barrett's (1990) textbook on Paragraph Development. It was a semester-long study, with 12 sessions lasting 90 minutes. The first session was a pre-test, where students had to write a paragraph with three topics given by the researcher. The researcher would explain what each group had to do for the semester and what they should do in oral reading and listening to the units. In interpreting group, students had to do the same thing as the other participants for the reformulation task and they had to write about a different topic after listening to the passages. They could use any style they knew and edit the text afterward.

The text from the textbook was ready for them and they could use it as a test text. It was plain text type and pretty accurate. They had their text and the model text on a subject. They compared their writing to grammar and patterns, and then they wrote a new text or changed their already written one. In retelling group, students first got a sample text from the book chosen by the researcher that was the same in all groups. They read a few paragraphs and then wrote a new text by retelling those parts. In oral summary group, a student like the previous group, first got a text orally, then wrote a text using the summarizing technique.

To figure out if the groups following reformulation tasks had an impact on EFL learners' sound discrimination ability mapped onto their writing skill, all three groups got the same post-test. The topics were the same as before, and they had to write a 250-word essay about them. The score was calculated using a checklist with two scorers and two markers. The checklist said that if a student made an error that was less than the sentence structure, they would lose 0.25 points out of 20, and if the sentence structure was more than the sentence structure, they would lose 0.5 points. The scores of all three groups were compared to the scores from the pre-test to see which group had the most improvement in sound discrimination and writing skill. The data was then analyzed using One-way ANOVA to show the average difference between the groups. Finally, a post hoc Scheffe test was used to show that the variables had a significant impact on the exact groups' means in the posttest of upper-intermediate Iranian language learners.

### Results

The next step in the data analysis is to calculate the results from both pretest and posttest scores gained by the learners in three groups. In Table 1, you can see the descriptive statistics of the participant's performance and the normality test of skewness and Kurtosis.

**Table 1.**  
*Descriptive Statistics and Normality Test*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis		
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
IG pre	31	4.00	15.00	10.20	3.29	-.07	.42	-1.08	.83
OSG pre	31	4.00	19.00	10.23	4.11	.56	.42	-.66	.83
RG pre	31	1.00	14.00	8.43	3.29	.20	.42	-.29	.83
IG post	31	5.00	15.00	10.76	3.05	-.36	.42	-1.03	.83
OSG post	31	7.00	19.00	11.90	3.29	.33	.42	-.59	.83
RG post	31	7.00	19.00	14.80	3.28	-.39	.42	-.50	.83
Valid N (listwise)	31								

**Note:** IG (interpreting group), OSG (oral summarizing group), RG (retelling group), Pre (pretest), post (posttest)

As it displays in Table 1, the means and SDs are presented in the pretest and posttest. The treatment could affect the posttest as the mean scores in all groups increased. The normality of data can be seen since all the statistics are greater than the significant level of 0.05. Thus, One-way ANOVA or paired samples t-test can be used as parametric statistics to measure pretest and posttest scores of the three groups.

**Table 2.**  
*Paired Samples t-Test (in three groups)*

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed )
		Mean	Std. Devia tion	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	IG pre – IG post	-.54	2.63	.47	-1.51	.41	-1.16	30	.255
Pair 2	OS Gpre – OS Gpost	-1.61	2.96	.53	-2.69	-.52	-3.03	30	.005
Pair 3	RG pre – RG post	-6.16	5.02	.90	-8.00	-4.31	-6.83	30	.000

Table 2 indicates the groups of OSG and RG are significantly different in the posttest. In other words, both groups outperformed IG group in the posttest. In addition, results show that the mean and the standard deviation are better for all groups in the posttest. It shows that the participants in all groups got better results after the treatment sessions. To figure out if there



were any differences between the groups in the pretest and posttest, a One-way ANOVA was run on the written scores of all groups. You can see the results in Table 3.

**Table 3.**

*One-way ANOVA (of the pretest)*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	61.570	2	30.785	1.990	.143
Within Groups	1392.387	90	15.471		
Total	1453.957	92			

The first thing to know is that the critical F of 1.990 which is less than the observed F of with ( $df = 2/90$ ). This means that the difference between the three groups is not significant, as it is seen ( $p = .143 > 0.05$ ). Moreover, there was no difference between the groups. So, all the groups were the same at the beginning of the study. Next, we looked at the student performance scores in the post-test. We used the same descriptive and inferential statistics for the post-test scores as it is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4.**

*One-way ANOVA (of the posttest)*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	251.247	2	125.624	8.313	.000
Within Groups	1360.065	90	15.112		
Total	1611.312	92			

Table 4 shows that the critical F of 8.313 is greater than the observed F with ( $df = 2/90$ ), so the difference between the two groups is pretty great as ( $p = .001 < 0.05$ ). In this table, each group's means of the posttest was compared to each other. There is a significant difference between the three groups' means in the posttest, but the performance of the participants in each group was reflected in their scores in Table 5. To make sure the where the exact difference between the post-test results was meaningful, a post hoc Scheffé test was used. The results of this analysis can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5.**

*Post-hoc Scheffe Checks Multiple Variables*

(I) Groups	(J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
IG	OSG	-1.09	.542	-3.55	1.36
	RG	-3.90*	.001	-6.36	-1.44
OSG	IG	1.09	.542	-1.36	3.55
	RG	-2.80*	.021	-5.26	-.34
RG	IG	3.90*	.001	1.44	6.36
	OSG	2.80*	.021	.34	5.26

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 5 shows all the groups that got different scores for sound discrimination affecting the learners' writing skill. Multiple results of interpreting showed there was a big difference between IG and OSG with RG. In other words, there is a significant difference between RG and both IG and OSG. But there was not a big difference between IG and OSG. When you compared IG to other groups, you did not see any big differences. When you compared the OSG to the IG group, the replication group showed a moderate difference but between the RG and IG there is a big difference. Thus, the RG had better results than the other groups in the posttest.

### Discussion

Based on the findings, the answer to the research question is that RG and then OSG could be effective reformulation tasks that have an impact on how well EFL learners can distinguish sounds and then map them onto their writing skills. This study found that the retelling task was effective in improving the ability of EFL learners to differentiate sounds. Moreover, oral summary tasks have an effect on how well learners can distinguish sounds after the test at the second priority. This is because these tasks are supposed to be part of the reviewing and it affected how well learners could distinguish sounds.

The study showed that retelling tasks had an effect on how well EFL learners (upper-intermediate learners) were able to identify sounds, so it looks like duplication of tasks does affect how well an EFL student is able to identify sounds. The study showed that there was no difference between the three retelling tasks (interpretation, oral summary and retelling) in terms of how well they developed learners' sound discrimination and writing skills. But the effectiveness of the retelling tasks is different because they are more effective at learning sound discrimination and improving writing skills compared to the other tasks. Basically, only two of these three tasks (interpretation and oral summary) were close together and affected learners' development of sound discrimination similarly to some extent because the number of errors in the posttest was reduced based on the checklist.

Students' writing performance was measured based on a checklist that was used to score their writing before and after the treatment. The checklist included five categories of writing errors, including punctuation and spelling, as well as grammar, verb, and part of speech. It also included the error frequency for each group during the pre and post-test. Participants did different things when it came to their pre and post-test errors. The IG had more punctuation and spelling errors, but fewer grammatical ones during the post-test. The OSG had fewer mistakes in punctuation and spelling after the therapy sessions, but more verb and part-of-speech errors. The retelling group had less errors for everything except the verb. This group had better punctuation, better parts of speech, and fewer spelling and grammar errors.

This research looks at how interpreting, oral summarization, and retelling, as well as reformulation tasks affect the ability of upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners to distinguish sounds. It looks at how these learners' ability to distinguish sounds affects their ability to write better. The study showed that the treatment was beneficial for the RG and OSG. The Scheffe postdoc test shows that the RG is more effective than the other groups since the difference is

pretty big. The RG did better on the second test since the tasks did change the upper-intermediate level EFL learners' ability to differentiate sounds and then wrote what they hear in the class. In this study, the retelling tasks was really helpful in improving their ability to discriminate sounds. Most of the studies that looked at retelling tasks used a comparative strategy. For instance, Hanaoka (2007) used a different strategy to look at what learners naturally saw when they were asked to retell an image, learners recognized their language issues and found solutions to over 90% of them based on the text they read in the review phase. This is similar to what we found in our study. When we read the text again in the second phase, less than 50% of our problems were solved. Swain and Lapkin's (2002) paper showed that retelling boost writing skill and it can be a great way to get learners interested in what you are writing.

Other groups (IG and OSG) had an increase in spelling errors. Learning new texts and rules means they have to write more than they have ever hear before, so they have to use words they have never used before. This could be why there was an increase in pronunciation and verb errors. But using a dictionary or a teachers' handling can help with that. The only thing that went down after correcting the post test was grammar. In OSG group, participants made 42 errors on the first test and 37 on the second. The research question looked at the differences between the three groups using sound discrimination tasks to develop writing accuracy, and the results showed that all groups had fewer grammatical errors in the posttest, except the interpretation group.

In the other three treatments, grammar improved, but interpretation didn't. When students do interpreting tasks, they are allowed to switch up their word structure and use different synonyms. But sometimes, these structural changes make it hard for them to follow English grammar rules for phrases and sentences, so they make mistakes. This is why it is best for teachers to avoid using interpreting tasks to help students improve their written grammar. In this study, there were some errors in expression, like prepositions and adverbs, but there were also some errors in nouns and adjectives. When you look at these separately, some of the errors have gone down since the treatment period, but sometimes, there was an increase in expression errors in all treatment groups.

Basically, retelling tasks help with grammar, punctuation, and spelling. They help with grammar mistakes, spelling and usage. They are really good at reducing grammatical errors. You can also sort the same tasks to reduce the same kind of errors. Both RG and OSG help with the same kind of mistakes since they showed changes after the treatment and their changes were significant.

### Conclusion

EFL learners have to have four language skills, one of which is writing. To write a good text, they need to follow English rules and sound discrimination ability. Writing accuracy is key to making sure the text is consistent and acceptable. This study looked at the role of reformulation tasks in boosting EFL learners' sound discrimination mapped onto their writing skills. They used three different reformulation tasks and looked at three groups of participants. The post-

test results showed that two of the reform tasks (RG and OSG) helped improve sound discrimination and writing skill. Participants in the interpreting group and those in the replication group showed big changes in their post-test scores. The study used a checklist to check students' errors before and after the treatment sessions. Based on this research, here are some ideas for how English learners, teachers, and syllabus designers can help EFL learners enhance their writing language skills via hearing and sound discrimination activities.

Implications of the study suggest if there is not a focus on a particular writing method or task, it can be hard to get your students to write well, even after the learners have done ample exercises. Usually, students write a text using a translation, thinking in their own language and then translating that into goals. But using Farsi for writing texts makes a lot of challenges because the rules for writing in Farsi are different than other languages. It is not enough to just check students for mistakes in their writing since teachers need to help them improve their skills. So, teachers can use reformulation tasks to help their students improve their writing. This study showed that RG and OSG tasks can help students' writing accuracy, so teachers can use them in their classes. For example, they can give students samples of their essays and sounds simultaneously and compare them to the sample texts. In this case, students can find their problems and solve them if they follow the samples.

Each retelling task has a sample text that students can compare their written text to. This helps them identify areas of difficulty and let their teachers know about them. Retelling tasks give students exposure to native patterns, so they learn how native speakers write. Exposure to writing samples helps them build confidence. They have models and can check their mistakes, so they self-regulate. Other reformulation tasks can be utilized to boost other language skills other than writing in future studies. The main limitation of the study was to recruit a small size of the research sample in each group for this study; therefore, future research may recruit more than this to arrive at a reliable outcome.

## References

- Abbasi, A. R., & Akbari, N. (2008). Are we encouraging patch writing? Reconsidering the role of the pedagogical context in ESL student writers' transgressive intertextuality. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 267–284.
- Allwright, R. L., Woodley, M. P., & Allwright, J. M. (1988). Investigating reformulation as a practical strategy for the teaching of academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 236–256.
- Anderson, N. J. (2007). *Active skills for reading: Book 1*. MA. Boston: Thomson.
- Arnaudet, M. L., & Barrett, M. L. (1990). *Paragraph development* (2nd ed.). USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Baese-Berk, M. M. (2019). Interactions between speech perception and production during learning of novel phonemic categories. *Atten Percept Psychophys* 81, 981–1005 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01725-4>
- Celce – Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3<sup>rd</sup>. Ed). United States: Heinle and Heinle.

- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and non-transgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3, 171-194.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills: Theory and practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Fallahzadeh, M. H., & Shokrpour, N. (2008). A survey of the students and interns' EFL writing problems at Shiraz University of medical sciences. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 1, 183-198.
- Farsia, L., & Barjesteh, H. (2016). The effect of reformulation task types on the grammatical accuracy of EFL learners writing performance. *International Journal of Research in Linguistics, Language Teaching and Testing*, 1(2), 34-44.
- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 445-476.
- Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 459-479.
- Hanaoka, O., & Izumi, S. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 332-347.
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 329-350.
- Hubner, S., Nuckles, M., & Renkl, A. (2010). Writing learning journals: Instructional support to overcome learning-strategy deficits. *Learning and Instruction*, 20, 18-29.
- Johns, A., & Mayes, P. (1990). An analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 253-271.
- Keck, C. (2010). How do university students attempt to avoid plagiarism? A grammatical analysis of undergraduate paraphrasing strategies. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 2, 193-222.
- Kim, M. (2020). A qualitative analysis of EFL learners' discrimination of near-synonyms in a data-driven learning task. *English Teaching*, 75(3), 25-47.
- Kormos, J. (2011). Task complexity and linguistic and discourse features of narrative writing performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 148-161.
- Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (2004). What underlies immersion students 1 production: The case of avoir besoin de. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 349-355.
- Levenston, E. A. (1978). Error analysis of free composition: The theory and the practice. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4 (1), 1-11.
- Li, H. H., Zhang, L. J., & Parr, J. M. (2020). Small-group student talk before individual writing in Tertiary English writing classrooms in China: Nature and insights. *Front. Psychol.* 11, 570565. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.570565



- Moore, T. (1997). From text to note: cultural variation in summarization practices. *Prospect*, 12, 54–63.
- Pavio, A. (1990). *Imagery and verbal processes*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Qi, D. S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 277–303.
- Robinson, L. K., & Howell, K. W. (2008). Best practices in curriculum-based evaluation & written expression. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 439-452). Bethesda, MD:
- Salvberg, A., & Valas, H. (1995). Effects of a mnemonic-imagery strategy on students' prose recall. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 39(2), 107–119.
- Ting, F. (2003). An investigation of cohesive errors in the writing of PRC tertiary EFL students. *STETS Language & Communication Review*, 2(2), 1-8.
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 321–331.
- Yang, L., & Zhang, L. (2010). Exploring the role of reformulations and a model text in EFL students' writing performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 14, 464–484.

### Appendix: Writing Skills Checklist

(Robinson & Howell, 2008)

Directions: Use this checklist to inventory students' writing skills. Any sub-skill that is marked 'N[o]' is a likely target for intervention.

Grammar, Syntax & 'Syntactic Maturity'

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed • Syntactic Maturity. The student is able to produce sentences that are appropriate to the student's age, course placement, and writing assignment, including:

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed • Complete Sentences. The student can judge accurately whether a word string represents a complete sentence.

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed • Sentence Complexity. Student writing samples show an acceptable range of simple, compound, and complex sentences for the age- or grade level.

Fluency

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed • Writing Fluency. The student produces written content at an age-, grade-, or course-appropriate rate.

Writing Process

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed • STEP 1: PLANNING. The student carries out necessary pre-writing planning activities, including content, format, and outline. Specific planning tasks can include these skills:

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed ☐ Note-Taking. The student researches topics by writing notes that capture key ideas from the source material

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed ☐ Audience. The student identifies the targeted audience for writing assignments and alters written content to match the needs of the projected audience

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed ☐ Topic Selection. The student independently selects appropriate topics for writing assignments Writing Process (Cont.)

☐ Y | ☐ N | ☐ More data needed • STEP 2: DRAFTING. The student writes or types the composition.



\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • STEP 3: REVISION. The student reviews the content of the composition-in-progress and makes changes as needed. After producing an initial written draft, the student considers revisions to content before turning in for a grade or evaluation

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • STEP 4: EDITING. The student looks over the composition and corrects any mechanical mistakes (capitalization, punctuation, etc.).

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • STEP 5: 'PUBLICATION'. The student submits the composition in finished form.

#### Other Writing-Related Elements

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Adequate 'Seat Time'. The student allocates a realistic amount of time to the act of writing to ensure a quality final product.

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Plagiarism. The student accurately identifies when to credit authors for the use of excerpts quoted verbatim or unique ideas taken from other written works

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Timely Submission. The student turns I

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed □ Writing Plan. The student creates a writing plan by breaking larger writing assignments into sub-tasks (e.g., select a topic, collect source documents, take notes from source documents, write outline, etc.)

#### Conventions of Writing

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Spelling. The student's spelling skills are appropriate for age and/or grade placement.

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Punctuation, capitalization. The student is able to apply punctuation, and capitalization rules correctly in writing assignments.

#### Legibility/Physical Production of Writing

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Writing Speed. The student writes words on the page at a rate equal to or nearly equal to that of classmates.

\_\_Y| \_\_N| \_\_More data needed • Handwriting. The student's handwriting is legible to most readers.1Jim Wright, Presenterwww.interventioncentral.org in written assignments (classwork, homework) on time