

Pakistan Journal of Education

Vol. 36, No. 1, 2019, 47-60

Effect of Communicative Approach on Creative Writing at Secondary Level in Pakistan

Muhammad Samiullah*

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to examine the effect of communicative approach on creative writing among 9th graders. It was found from the literature that different aspects of creative writing can be developed through communicative approach. The pretest posttest nonequivalent control group design, that is, Quasi Experimental design was used. To carry out this investigation six classes from two schools, one public and one private, were selected to collect data for the purpose. 206 students were conveniently selected for experimentation. There were 33 girls and 173 boys in all the experimental and control groups. Four tasks of the creative writing were carefully chosen from literature and were pilot tested at a smaller group of students. After pilot testing, minor changes were incorporated. The pre-test was administered to control and experimental groups. Communicative lessons were delivered in the experimental classrooms only. The same pre-test was used as the post-test as well. The creative compositions were evaluated in the light of scoring rubrics. They were rechecked by relevant class instructors for inter-rater reliability. The data were analyzed using t-statistics and the software SPSS. Results of the research showed that communicative approach had a noteworthy influence on the increase of creative writing skills among secondary level learners. The outcomes of the research are worthwhile for teachers, curriculum specialists, syllabi designers and policy makers. In addition, communicative approach is recommended for teaching of writing any genre in English.

Keywords: communicative approach/communicative language teaching (CLT), creative writing, grammar translation method (GTM)

* Assistant Professor, Science Education, Allama Iqbal Open University Islamabad, Pakistan, Email: sami.ullah@aiou.edu.pk

Introduction

The importance of English language is accepted throughout the world because it has become a language for communication and the language of science and technology. It has attained the status of compulsory subject in the academic institutions of Pakistan from grade 1 to graduation level. Creative writing is an important language skill. The script that encompasses the usage of skillfulness and the mind to yield somewhat innovative is creative writing. In Pakistan, research communicates that maximum learners don't acquire proficiency of writing innovatively. Rahman (2002) witnessed that maximum pupils depend on memorizing rather than consuming their intellectual talent. They are not inculcated any training of creative writing. The foremost cause of this condition is the teaching methodology used in classroom. Maximum teachers practice the grammar translation method (GTM) of teaching English which is obsolete nowadays (Ali & Javed, 2004). Because of the pitiable worth of teaching English, creative writing is not advanced appropriately and the percentage of failure in English is the uppermost at secondary school level (Rahman, 2007).

Absence of apt guidance and training is one major obstacle in mode of creative writing. Rahman (2002) detailed that in Pakistan, subject matter is conveyed to the schoolchildren through rote memorization. The independence to discourse in classroom is wanting.

Statement of Research Problem

The creative faculty of writing among high school is not developed properly in Pakistani classroom, as established from the literature, but can be enhanced through communicative teaching. This research study proposed to discover the effect of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on increase of creative writing among schoolchildren at high school.

Objectives of the Research

Main objectives of this study were:

1. To examine the effect of CLT on Creative writing skills of high school students. More precisely these were the purposes (sub-objectives) of the research:
2. To examine the effect of CLT on descriptive domain of writing.

3. To explore the result of CLT on narrative domain of writing.
4. To find the outcome of CLT on functional domain of writing.
5. To examine the influence of CLT on story writing.

Research Questions

The research aimed to answer the questions ahead:

1. Does CLT benefit in enhancement of descriptive domain of writing?
2. Does CLT assist in up gradation of narrative domain of writing?
3. Does CLT support in enhancement of functional domain of writing?
4. Does CLT aid in progress of story domain of writing?
5. Has CLT the equal influence on girls' & boys' creative skills of writing?
6. Has CLT the identical result for learners' creativity in government and private zone?

Significance of the Study

This research was an effort to advance creative writing abilities by using CLT amongst 9th graders. Outcomes of research deliver evidence to educators about practice of CLT with support of which creative writing talents of pupils at high school may possibly be value-added. Results might be valuable for English instructors at high school because they propose an efficient instructional method to teach creative skills like descriptive, narrative, functional and story writing domains. Teachers training organizations might get advantage from outcomes of research for prospective educators of English at high school by concentrating on CLT and delivering future instructors suitable pre-service preparation. Teachers training institutes may possibly organize training gatherings for on-job English tutors so that they may advance their approaches concerning teaching creative skills of writing.

The results of this research provide valuable data to syllabi specialists and curriculum designers of English in scheming communicative syllabi and books for high schools. In the light of outcomes, the experts will be capable to include CLT as methodological part of curriculum for high school. Additionally, the outcomes of the research will be of assistance for the scholars who want to explore the arena of English teaching at high school.

Literature Review

In mainstream of institutes due to addiction on memorization of notes, artistic ability of intellectual cognizance is not established rightly, reasoned Siddiqui (2007). Schooling supports cramming of information. Pupils just get respectable grades but creative writing is not enhanced in this state of affairs.

Siddiqui (2007) opined that educators implement tight controls, and deliver grammatical constructions. In such sort of English teaching situations, there is a lack of natural/communicative atmosphere available to scholar. Likewise, Hayes & Craig (2007) highlighted suppression of youngsters expressively and mentally by fathers, instructors as well as seniors. The kids are constantly anticipated to be submissive and obedient thoughtlessly. Due to these causes, schoolchildren do not grow self-reliance for the creative writing skills. It occurs merely due to low quality of instruction and poor pedagogic services at the institute. Rahman (2007) found that pupils make sure of satisfactory performance in memorized subjects but show is much reduced in elementary intellectual capacity and comprehension of any theme. In addition conceptions in the school books are incompatible to mental level of kids. In such state, the learners have the one and only choice to cram.

Rasool (2009) reported that extensive course outline with unfavorable attitude of school management are a difficulty in tactic of increasing creative writing skills. The educators face an issue of accomplishment of course in accord with claim and hope of institutional management. In about 40 minutes for English lessons, attention of the tutor is accomplishment of course topics, leaving hardly any time for creative writing. The scholars are inactive and quiet hearers. This state does not benefit scholars in recognizing their ingenious powers. Progressively these natural talents die within them as if capability is not used, finishes inevitably.

From preceding argument it might be determined that in Pakistan, instructional method is centered on structural approach. Outdated GTM stresses the rote-learning of structural forms as well as constructions. Bajwa (2004) reported that by using grammatical style, communicative ability is not created that is why Pakistani students are inept to express themselves properly through script. In the same way critiquing grammatical method, Cooze (2006) had not been contented with structural method in language teaching.

Students feel trouble to write their own idea, Harmer (2004) reported, but it should be necessary to form the habit of creative writing. In the same concern, Coombe (2009) views that educators, managers, and school administrators area countable to increase writing talents of

pupils. Graham & Johnson(2003) indicated that there is a substantial concern that pupils do not improve their writing skills up to the mark for the school even. A common reason is that institutes do not do a decent job of educating this intricate skill. Griffith (2006) suggested CLT for development of writing domains. Similarly Zafar (2009) perceived that CLT might be beneficial to promote creative skills because it syndicates the practical as well as structural aspects of language. Siddiqui (2007) mentioned that an institute ought to support youngsters in progress of intellectual expertise together with creative skills. Raji (2009) indicated that a little significance is granted to the talent of writing imaginatively. In schoolrooms the extra worth is granted to write grammatically accurate sentences whereas Fatima and Zubeda (2009) speak out that writing skill is best learnt in a collaborative environment. Iqbal (2011) too, favors the communicative approach for the development of communicative competence in writing.

Prentice (2000), Marsh (2003), Craft (2000), Gurevitch (2000) favored Communicative approach for the development of creative writing skills among high school students. Siddiqui (2007) noted that children did no creative writing in the school. All the writing that took place was writing from teacher's dictation. The creative activity to which Craft (2001) called little 'c' was considered appropriate to develop through development of the own ideas of the individual through communicative approach. Griffith (2006) gave the idea of the use of communicative strategy for flourishing the writing skills of learners. According to Ahmad and Rao (2013), the communicative approach should be applied on primary, elementary, secondary and higher level of education to judge its effectiveness. According to Rahman (2002), girls are more creative and similarly private school students show more creative talent in terms of writing. In Pakistan, there are separate systems for girls and boys in public and private sector. Therefore, the researcher undertook the above mentioned streams for the generalize ability of the results.

Method and Procedure

The details regarding method and procedure are as ahead:

Design

The general plan of this research was quasi experimental design. More precisely, the Pretest Posttest Non Equivalent Control Group Design is used. Two schools, one each from public and private sector, were selected for experiment.

Sample

The total participants in experimentation were 206. There were 33 girls and 173 boys in the study. There were six sections of class 9 from two schools. The details of the participants are evident from the tables ahead related to the data analysis. The technique of "convenient sampling" was used. The schools and the participants were chosen on the foundation of the criteria as under:

- Consent from the heads of the institutes
- Accessibility to at least two sections of 9th class in the institutes
- Readiness of the instructors to spare their classes willingly for the treatment

Instrument

The instrument for collecting data was the test to evaluate the creative writing abilities at the high school level. The four tasks were modified from the related literature. The test was authenticated by the professionals' opinion. The same was piloted and the reliability analysis had been done and the value obtained from reliability analysis was 0.863. The groups were pre-tested. 32 Intervention lessons were delivered by using communicative approach. Both the groups were post tested. The data were analyzed by using SPSS and t-statistics were applied.

Data Analysis

This section describes analysis of data. The data were examined in the subsequent ways by using t-statistics with the help of SPSS:

- Over-allocation of experimental and control groups in creative writing talents.
- Gender-wise differences of experimental and control groups in creative writing abilities.
- The sector-wise comparison of experimental and control groups.

Overall Results

Table 1 shows the evaluation of gain and effect sizes of together the control and experimental groups. It was difficult that pretest & posttest average scores of control & experimental groups should be same. It is clarified that one control group performed better than its corresponding experimental group in pretest whereas two experimental groups performed better than their respective controls in pretest. It was hard to equalize the groups. However, data analysis has been done on basis of gain scores and effect sizes. The analysis has been presented as ahead.

The table 1 displays that the control group developed in descriptive writing and narrative writing considerably. The progress was not significant in functional and story writing skills. Generally in over-all score of creative writing abilities, control group developed significantly. The experimental group was upgraded more significantly in average totals of descriptive, narrative, story and functional writing because the experimental group got effect sizes better than the control groups.

Table 1

Overall Comparison from Pretest to Posttest Gain Scores of Control and Experimental Groups

Group		Pre-Test Mean	SD (Pre-Test)	Post-Test Mean	SD (Post-Test)	Gain	Effect Size	t-value	Sig (2-tailed)
Control (N=101)	Descriptive Writing	8.05	4.066	11.21	4.899	3.158	0.500	5.80	0.000***
	Narrative Writing	6.11	3.955	8.56	4.485	2.455	0.452	5.081	0.000***
	Story Writing	3.78	4.018	4.31	3.890	0.525	0.143	1.452	0.150
	Functional Writing	1.99	3.314	2.07	3.085	0.079	0.021	0.212	0.833
	Total (Creative Writing)	19.93	12.507	26.20	12.542	6.267	0.497	5.739	0.000***
Experimental (N=105)	Descriptive Writing	9.01	3.279	13.49	3.801	4.476	0.739	11.200	0.000***
	Narrative Writing	8.68	3.111	12.37	3.474	3.705	0.658	8.920	0.000***
	Story Writing	4.58	4.649	8.51	3.733	3.933	0.597	7.593	0.000***
	Functional Writing	4.31	3.765	8.15	4.373	3.838	0.585	7.359	0.000***
	Total (Creative Writing)	26.58	8.902	42.45	10.558	15.876	0.785	12.965	0.000***

Gender Wise Comparison

The analysis of data on the basis of gender has is shown in Table2.

Table 2

Gender Wise Comparison of the Gain Scores of Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Gender		Pre-Test Mean	SD (Pre-Test)	Post-Test Mean	SD (Post-Test)	Gain	Effect Size	t-value	Sig (2-tailed)
Control (N=21)	Female	Descriptive Writing	7.35	4.436	10.66	4.377	3.250	0.461	2.329	0.031*
		Narrative Writing	5.50	4.176	7.85	4.307	2.350	0.402	1.966	0.060
		Story Writing	1.75	2.864	3.35	2.976	1.600	0.517	2.707	0.014*
		Functional Writing	0.25	1.043	1.60	2.502	1.350	0.419	2.064	0.053
		Total (Creative Writing)	14.85	10.157	23.15	9.234	8.300	0.409	2.008	0.055
Experimental (N=12)	Female	Descriptive Writing	11.58	2.673	16.67	2.675	5.083	0.842	5.814	0.000**
		Narrative Writing	10.75	2.507	14.83	2.478	4.083	0.740	3.653	0.004***
		Story Writing	6.00	4.649	13.42	2.364	7.417	0.825	4.848	0.001***
		Functional Writing	4.67	4.047	8.92	3.215	4.250	0.622	2.639	0.023*
		Total	33.00	7.355	53.92	6.690	20.917	0.914	7.499	0.000***
Control (N=81)	Male	Descriptive Writing	8.24	3.873	11.32	5.016	3.073	0.504	5.221	0.000***
		Narrative Writing	6.24	3.983	8.72	4.324	2.476	0.466	4.713	0.000***
		Story Writing	4.23	4.197	4.49	4.232	0.256	0.068	0.613	0.541
		Functional Writing	2.16	3.423	2.39	3.691	0.232	0.060	0.543	0.589
		Total (Creative Writing)	21.11	12.764	26.80	13.110	5.695	0.465	4.709	0.000***
Experimental (N=92)	Male	Descriptive Writing	8.66	3.714	13.11	3.705	4.446	0.748	10.110	0.000***
		Narrative Writing	8.39	3.016	12.09	3.473	3.696	0.675	8.193	0.000***
		Story Writing	4.34	3.506	7.83	3.822	3.489	0.584	6.441	0.000***
		Functional Writing	4.32	3.747	8.00	4.435	3.685	0.598	6.690	0.000***
		Total	25.71	8.391	40.91	10.821	15.207	0.786	11.368	0.000***

Sector-Wise Comparison

The analysis on the basis of sector (public and private) is presented in table 3 as displayed ahead. The controls in public sector developed knowledge in descriptive, narrative, functional domain and overall in

creative writing. There was not a substantial improvement in the story inscription. Likewise, in the private schools the controls got noteworthy upgrading in descriptive and narrative domains. Other sub skills of story and functional domains were not considerably upgraded. The scores of experimental group (both in public and private sector) were developed significantly on all the skills. Private school students performed superior than those of government school students in collective creative writing because of better effect sizes.

Table 3

Sector-wise Comparison of the Gain and Effect Size

Group	Sector		Pre-Test Mean	SD (Pre-Test)	Post-Test Mean	SD (Post-Test)	Gain	Effect Size	t-value	Sig (2-tailed)
Control (N=54)	Public	Descriptive Writing	7.11	3.544	9.94	4.343	2.833	0.482	4.009	0.000***
		Narrative Writing	5.37	3.815	7.50	4.254	2.130	0.423	3.407	0.001***
		Story Writing	2.41	3.142	3.06	2.933	0.648	0.193	1.432	0.158
		Functional Writing	0.93	2.618	1.74	2.664	0.815	0.315	2.417	0.036*
		Total (Creative Writing)	15.81	10.374	22.24	10.738	6.426	0.515	4.375	0.000***
Experimental (N=57)	Public	Descriptive Writing	9.00	3.331	13.88	3.949	4.476	0.729	11.200	0.000***
		Narrative Writing	8.60	3.241	12.49	3.613	3.705	0.639	8.920	0.000***
		Story Writing	5.11	3.503	7.26	3.989	3.933	0.373	7.593	0.000***
		Functional Writing	4.56	3.823	7.42	4.438	3.838	0.502	7.359	0.000**
		Total	27.26	9.366	40.88	11.785	15.876	0.696	12.965	0.000***
Control (N=47)	Private	Descriptive Writing	9.13	4.317	12.66	5.147	3.532	0.521	4.140	0.000***
		Narrative Writing	6.96	4.070	9.79	4.288	2.830	0.484	3.754	0.000***
		Story Writing	5.36	4.450	5.74	4.566	0.383	0.096	0.659	0.513
		Functional Writing	2.45	3.688	3.21	3.793	0.766	0.169	1.163	0.251
		Total (Creative Writing)	24.66	13.226	30.74	12.987	6.085	0.478	3.694	0.001
Experimental (N=48)	Private	Descriptive Writing	9.00	3.128	13.09	3.550	4.085	0.777	8.351	0.000***
		Narrative Writing	8.74	2.938	12.30	3.394	3.553	0.700	6.659	0.000***
		Story Writing	3.83	3.875	9.94	3.506	6.106	0.814	9.526	0.000***
		Functional Writing	4.11	3.760	8.94	4.002	4.830	0.662	5.992	0.000***
		Total	25.68	7.948	44.28	9.837	18.596	0.885	12.913	0.000***

Some findings have been written after careful analysis of data.

Findings

These findings were observed from the analysis of the data:

In case of (Public Sector Control Group-Boy the progress in the average marks was 2.833 in the descriptive domain of writing; the development in the average marks was 2.130 in the narrative domain of writing; the growth in the average marks was 0.648 in the story script domain; the advancement in the average marks was 0.815 in the functional writing domain and the increase in total scores of the creative writing has been 6.426.

In case of (Public Sector: Experimental Group-Boys) the progress in the average marks was 4.877 in the descriptive domain of writing; the development in the average marks was 3.895 in the narrative domain of writing; the growth in the average marks was 2.158 in the story script domain; the advancement in the average marks was 2.860 in the functional writing domain and the increase in total scores of the creative writing has been 13.614.

In case of (Private Sector: Control Group-Boys) the progress in the average marks was 3.741 in the descriptive domain of writing; the development in the average marks was 3.185 in the narrative domain of writing; the growth in the average marks was -0.519 in the story script domain; the advancement in the average marks was -2.483 in the functional writing domain and the increase in total scores of the creative writing has been 4.444.

In case of (Private Sector: Experimental Group-Boys) the progress in the average marks was 3.743 in the descriptive domain of writing; the development in the average marks was 3.371 in the narrative domain of writing; the growth in the average marks was 5.657 in the story script domain; the advancement in the average marks was 5.029 in the functional writing domain and the increase in total scores of the creative writing has been 17.800.

In case of (Private Sector: Control Group-Girls) the progress in the average marks was 3.250 in the descriptive domain of writing; the development in the average marks was 5.50 in the narrative domain of writing; the growth in the average marks was 1.600 in the story script domain; the advancement in the average marks was 1.350 in the functional writing domain and the increase in total scores of the creative writing has been 8.300.

Similarly, in case of (Private Sector: Experimental Group-Girls) the progress in the average marks was 5.083 in the descriptive domain of writing; the development in the average marks was 4.083 in the narrative domain of writing; the growth in the average marks was 7.417 in the story script domain; the advancement in the average marks was 4.250 in

the functional writing domain and the increase in total scores of the creative writing has been 20.917.

Some conclusions were drawn out of the preceding findings.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were made from the findings and data analysis:

The descriptive domain of writing might be upgraded significantly by using CLT among the boys and girls in public and private sector. The narrative domain of writing might be improved significantly by using CLT among the boys and girls in public and private sector. The story script domain might be promoted significantly by using CLT among the boys and girls in public and private sector. The functional domain of writing might be advanced significantly by using CLT among the boys and girls in public and private sector. The skills of creative writing might be progressed significantly by using CLT among the boys and girls in public and private sector.

From the preceding conclusions, the replies for the research questions were found as written in proceeding lines:

Answers to the Research Questions

The replies to the research questions are ahead number-wise:

1. Yes. CLT assists in educating the descriptive writing.
2. Yes. CLT aids in advancing the narrative writing.
3. Yes. CLT is useful in developing the functional script.
4. Yes. CLT is beneficial in improving the story writing.
5. CLT had better effect on creative writing of girls.
6. CLT had more significant effect in private sector than the public sector.

Recommendations

These recommendations are suggested:

- CLT may be useful to teach play/drama writing.
- CLT may be advantageous to teach prose writing.
- CLT may be worthwhile to teach the writing of an imaginative and argumentative essay.
- CLT may be suitable to teach dialogue writing.
- CLT may be handy to teach any other genre in English creative writing skills.

References

- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2013). *Applying Communicative Approach in Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Case Study of Pakistan*. *Porta Linguarum*, 20, 187-203
- Ali, S. M. & Javaid S. B. (2004). *An approach to the teaching of English*, Lahore: New Kitab Mahal.
- Bajwa, S. (2004). *Teaching of English*, Bahawalpur: Mian Brothers
- Coombe, C. (2009). *Washback and the impact of high-stakes tests on teaching and learning*, in Mansoor, S, Sikandar, A, Hussain, N, & Ahsan N. M. (eds.) *Emerging Issues in TEFL Challenges for Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Cooze, A. (2006). *100 Ideas for Teaching of English*, New York: Continuum
- Craft, A. (2000). *Creativity Across the Primary Curriculum: Framing and Developing Practice*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Craft, A. (2001). 'Little c: creativity in craft', in A. Craft, B. Jeffrey and M. Liebling (eds) *Creativity in Education* London: Continuum.
- Fatima, Z. D. & Zubeda, K. A. (2009). *Cooperative learning: Is it an aid to learning?*, in Mansoor, S, Sikandar, A, Hussain, N, & Ahsan N. M. (eds.) *Emerging Issues in TEFL Challenges for Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Graham, L. & Johnson, A. (2003). *Writing Journals*, Cambridge: United Kingdom Reading Association.
- Grainger, T. (2002). 'Storytelling: the missing link in story writing', in S. Ellis and C. Mills (eds) *Connecting, Creating: New Practices in the Teaching of Writing*, Leicester: United Kingdom Reading Association
- Griffith, N. (2006). *100 Ideas for Teaching Language*, New York: Continuum

- Gurevitch, Z. (2000). 'The Serious Play of Writing', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(1), 3-8.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*, Pearson Longman: New Delhi
- Hayes, S. & Craig, H. (1991). *This is the Bear and the Scary Night*, London: Walker
- Marsh, J. (2003). 'Contemporary models of communicative practice: Shaky foundations in the foundation stage', *English in Education*, 37(1), 38-46
- Iqbal, H. M. (2011). *Education in Pakistan: Developmental milestones*, Lahore: Paramount Publishing Enterprise.
- Prentice, R. (2000). Creativity: A reaffirmation of its place in early childhood education, *The Curriculum Journal*, 11(2), 145-58.
- Rahman, T. (2002). *Language, ideology, and power: Language learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rahman, T. (2007). *Denizens of alien worlds a study of education, inequality, and polarization in Pakistan*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raji, M. Z. (2009). *Globalization and EFL/ESL pedagogy: Implications*, in Mansoor, S, Sikandar, A, Hussain, N, & Ahsan N. M. (eds.) *Emerging Issues in TEFL Challenges for Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rasool, N. (2009). *Quality issues in language teaching in higher Education*, in Mansoor, S, Sikandar, A, Hussain, N, & Ahsan N. M. (eds.) *Emerging Issues in TEFL Challenges for Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siddiqui, S. (2007). *Rethinking education in Pakistan: Perceptions, practices, and possibilities*, Karachi: Paramount Publishing Enterprise

Zafar, S. K. (2009). *Computer mediated communication for language learning*, in Mansoor, S, Sikandar, A, Hussain, N, & Ahsan N. M. (eds.) *Emerging Issues in TEFL Challenges for Asia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Citation of this Article:

Samiullah, M. (2019) Effect of communicative approach on creative writing at secondary level in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 36(1), 47-60.