6.1. **Aim:** "To develop the skills in descriptive writing."

6.2. **Method:** One Experimental group, and one control group. Beneficial teaching given only to the experimental group. (Teaching of the five levels). Pre-test, progressive tests (including tests on levels already taught put together) and one conducted post test to both groups.

6.3. **Grading:** By two teachers. (One internal and the other external).

6.4. **Findings:**

1. The experimental group's overall performance after receiving the training based on the strategies developed by the researcher is greater than its performance before receiving the training.

2. The experimental group's overall performance after receiving the training is better than that of the control group, which received no such training.

3. The experimental group's performance in L1 (nouns, adjectives, etc.) is the best among the
levels and the performance in L2 (grammar) is the least.

4. The experimental group's performance in each level (L1, L2, L3, L4, L5) is greater than its performance than the levels are grouped (L1 + L2, L1 + L2 + L3, etc.). This may be due to the need to recollect and practice what has been already learnt in a unified manner.

5. The experimental group's performance when the levels are put together is consistently better than their performance in the same before training (pre-test).

6. The overall performance of the female students in the experimental group is better than the male students of the same group before and after being trained in all levels.

7. Residential background or educational background of the parents has little impact over the performance of the students.

8. A moderate improvement is found in L1, L2, & L4, in the control group which received no training. This may be due to the effect of the regular formal teaching. This effect was
minimum when they are tested in the levels put together. (L1 + L2, L1 + L2 + L3, etc.).

9. When the performance of these two groups (experimental and control) are compared, the difference is greater in favour of experimental group in the following order:
   a. L3 (Sentence Structure)
   b. L2 (Grammar)
   c. L5 (Logical Development)
   d. L1 (Nouns, Verbs, etc.)
   e. L4 (Linking Devices)

10. When the performance of these two groups (experimental and control) are compared in levels put together (L1 + L2, etc.), the difference is greater in favour of the experimental group in the following order:
    a. L1 + L2
    b. L1 + L2 + L3 + L4
    c. L1 + L2 + L3

11. The performance of the experimental group in L2 (grammar) and in the same in the overall performance after receiving training (post-test) is
the same. In all other levels, there is a moderate decline in the post-test in all the levels.

After the experiment, the following qualities have improved only among the learners of the experimental group.

1. **Analytical ability:** has improved and as a result, learners have started attempting a variety of interpretations.

2. **Fluency:** not so spontaneous but less hesitant and have improved self-awareness during writing tasks.

3. **Confidence:** confusions arising at early stages removed by group discussions and thus, more confidence is gained.

4. **Demand:** expect the teacher to be more explanatory.

5. **Style:**
   a. Less variation is obtained.
   b. Short and familiar terms attempted but repetition is not minimised (of structures and words).
   c. Occasionally sentences with insufficient information are encountered.
   d. Difficulties still exist in the areas of
      i. Denotative and connotative meanings.
ii. Figurative language.

iii. Homonyms.

iv. Word variety.

v. Opening a paragraph.


7. *Logical Continuity:* Well developed. Can focus on the following more efficiently.

   i. Cause and effect relationships.

   ii. Reducing undue importance to minor details.

   iii. Distinguishing between fact and opinion.

   iv. Minimising transitions and omissions.

   v. Developing ideas and concepts with illustrations and examples.

   vi. Fair amount of development in sequencing of facts.

8. *Tasks:* Spontaneity lacking in field specific topics (Breathalyser) but have attempted to be more specific and precise. Cultural contexts are helpful in evoking prior knowledge (*The Verger*). Controversial topics create more interest (*The Verger*).
9. **Rules:** ability to analyse, synthesis and manipulate has been fairly mastered.

10. **Revision and re-writing:** a. Some felt shameful. But very useful for rectification of errors and mistakes.
    b. Better cohesive passages written after revisions.
    c. Short topics with limited scope offered little chance for re-writing (The Breathalyser).

11. **Guided Writing:** Initial disdain by a few, overcome by group discussions – students being peer audience is more helpful.

12. **Free Writing:** a. Teacher also takes part along with the learners.
    b. Content damage is minimum.
    c. Less fluent, less variant than guided writing even after revisions. (Breathalyser).
    d. Interest to develop has improved (The Verger).

6.5. **Suggestions for further Study:** 1. Similar studies can be conducted in other areas of discourse – Narration, Argumentation etc.
2. Studies can be conducted in developing strategies to improve the ability in oral description of objects and processes.

3. Comparative studies like description versus narration, description versus exposition and so on can be attempted.

4. Similar studies in the same area can be conducted to the Higher Secondary Students.

5. The same study can be repeated to an extended period of time.