

Original Research

Received 12 June 2026

Revised 28 July 2026

Accepted 11 August 2026

Natural Resources for Human
Health 2026, Vol. 6 (17s): 1067–1078

KEYWORDS:

content, form, function, outlines,
writing skills.

Content, Form and Function Outlines Strategy for Improving EFL Students' Writing Skills in Iraqi Schools

Researcher Widad Rabea Howeer, Assit. Prof. Dr. Rusul Aasim Abood

University of Babylon / College of Basic Education

bas699.wdad.rbya@student.uobabylon.edu.iq russul.asim@uobabylon.edu.iq

ABSTRACT: The study investigated the effect of this strategy on the improving performance of EFL language fourth preparatory school learners who face difficulty in writing meaningful compositional writing. It aimed to examine whether the instruction based on the strategy was more effective than the conventional method in developing learners' writing performance. A quasi-experimental design involving two groups, an experimental group which was taught using the mentioned strategy and a control group following traditional way in teaching, the sample of the research involved 60 fourth preparatory school learners selected from EFL classrooms. Their achievement in writing skill was measured by administering two tests, a pre-test and post-test to both groups before and after the experiment. The obtained data were statistically analyzed t-test independent samples. The results revealed that the calculated value of experimental group in the post test was 24.527. To determine whether there were statistically significant differences. The improvement was evident in learners' ability to generate and organize ideas, use accurate grammatical structures and employed appropriate communicative language functions in their writing compositions. Findings suggest that integrating content development, linguistic form, and communicative function in teaching writing can enhance learners' performance by shifting from rote memorization to meaningful compositional writing, it is also highlighted the important role of structured outlines in helping learners produce coherent, organized, and meaningful written texts. The study therefore incorporating the CFFOs strategy to EFL writing instruction and provides teachers with training programs to support its effective implementation. The study also presents several suggestions for further research in the field of Iraqi EFL writing instructions.

1.1 The problem and its significance

Paragraph writing is something that most learners struggle with, learners' inability to articulate their ideas in writing limits their imaginations. A writer's expertise in using adequate vocabulary in a grammatical construction to make coherent sentences of different types, in choosing proper conjunctions to link sentences, and in choosing correct punctuation marks are all necessary skills for composition writing (Nasser, 2019).

Memorization was the primary method of learning texts, definitions, and new words for both good and bad learners. Because it helps them better demonstrate their English achievements, they were in favor of utilizing this technique. The emphasis should be on comprehension rather than rote memorization. Those learners who use this method are prone to forget what

they memorized, inability to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information, and poor inference skills. (Khamees, 2016).

One of the biggest issues facing Iraq's public school system is overcrowding in the classrooms. Learners have shown that teachers have difficulty coming up with fresh communication activities, especially when they have 40 to 50 learners in their courses. Teachers are compelled to employ group instruction rather than continuous interaction because of the challenges associated with supervising group tasks, multiple interactions, and personalized feedback. There is a lot of evidence that shows how huge class sizes make teachers less effective. (Hashim, 2025).

To address these scientific difficulties, the current study explores the influence of the Content, Form, and Function Outlines (CFFOs) technique on enhancing learners' writing skills. This strategy is designed to lead the learners from memorization activities to meaningful and creative writing by teaching them to discover core ideas, to organize them structurally and to use the proper grammatical forms with communicative roles. It is expected that the CFFOs approach application would improve the writing skills and the understanding of the writing process of Iraqi EFL learners.

In any EFL curriculum, learning to write is a foundational component. Teaching and evaluating second language writing is exceedingly challenging since it necessitates learners to use their linguistic knowledge, composition processes, and social and contextual awareness of the text's function for readers all at once. (Hyland, 2003). However; in many EFL contexts, learners struggle with writing tasks because instruction tends to focus strictly on grammatical accuracy without engaging content or communicative purpose of the text (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

When thinking about writing, one must first acknowledge that it is a skill, not a "natural gift." You can learn it just like any other skill, just like driving, typing, or cooking. Significant practice to strengthen writing skills is needed (Langan, 2011). Traditional teaching method often isolates grammar drills from real-world communication, which severely hinders writing fluency. Thereby CFFOs strategy integrates meaningful content with grammatical structures and communicative intent, providing a more holistic approach to writing instruction (Brown, 2007; Doughty & Willis, 1998).

Historically, the "rules of writing" in second language writing teaching were more focused on form accuracy than function, just like in native language training. Instead of freely expressing their own thoughts, learners spent a significant amount of class time in class duplicating models. Instead of having a solid grasp of the subject matter, writing was employed to demonstrate that learners had mastered a specific grammatical rule, the most crucial indicators of second language competency were proper spelling, grammar, and rigid organizational templates. For instance, it was believed that a learner's ability to correctly construct the future perfect tense demonstrated both their writing skills and their general proficiency in English (Nunan, 2003).

In light of the issues discussed above, the present study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What effect does the CFFOs strategy have on learners' ability to organize content, use grammatical forms accurately, and apply communicative functions appropriately in writing?
2. To what extent can the CFFOs strategy help learners move from memorization-based writing to meaningful and creative written expression?

1.5 Limits of the Study

This study is limited to:

- 1-4th preparatory As Sama School in Kerbala for girls
- 2- First term in year 2025-2026.
- 3- The participants were 60 females, 30 for experimental group and 30 for control group.
- 4- The use of CFFOs' strategy in the training of Iraqi EFL learners.
- 5- The writing activities in the prescribed textbook, which is "English for Iraq " (learner's book and activity book 2023 3rd ed.

1.2 Aims of the study

This study aims to

- 1- Investigate the effect of CFFOs 'strategy on improving Iraqi EFL 4th preparatory school learners' writing skills.
- 2- Assess the effect of using the strategy of CFFOs on writing skills of EFL learners in 4th preparatory school for.

1.3 Hypotheses of the study

In order to fulfill the objectives of this research, the subsequent hypotheses are examined:

1. There is no statistically significant difference at 0.05 between the mean scores of the experimental group taught by the CFFOs and the control group taught by the conventional methods in the posttest.
2. There is no statistically significant difference at 0.05 between the mean scores of the experimental group taught by the CFFOs in the pretest and posttest.

1.4 Content, Form, Function outline

Content, Form, and Function Outlines is a classroom assessment technique in which learners analyze a given text or message along three dimensions: the what (content — the informational message conveyed), the how (form — the structural and linguistic features used to present it), and the why (function — the communicative purpose behind its presentation) (Angelo & Cross, 1993). Learners record brief notes addressing these three questions in an outline format, which allows the instructor to quickly assess their ability to separate and analyze the message, its structure, and its communicative purpose (Angelo & Cross, 1993). Applied to writing instruction, the strategy provides learners with an explicit three-dimensional planning framework — what to say, how to encode it linguistically, and why it is being said for a given audience — reflecting the same content–form–use components identified in Bloom and Lahey's (1978) model of language.

Operationally, the Content, Form, and Function Outlines (CFFOs) strategy refers to the instructional treatment applied to the experimental group in this study, whereby learners are trained to complete a structured outline for each writing task, generating notes under three columns — Content (What), Form (How), and Function (Why) — before producing their final written text.

The strategy is operationalized through a set of guided lesson procedures and outline worksheets developed by the researcher, and its effect is measured by comparing the experimental group's pre-test and post-test writing scores with those of a control group taught through conventional instruction (Angelo & Cross, 1993; Creswell, 2012).

1.5 Writing skills

Writing skills refer to a learner's consistent ability to produce written texts that demonstrate control over content, organization, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, and mechanics appropriate to the writer's language level (Hughes, 2003). writing helps us achieve the aims of effective writing skills, learners must follow steps in order to become writers, writing process has four stages, including prewriting composing the initial draft, editing, revising, and proofreading (Hafidz, 2018).

Operationally, writing skill in this study refers to the level of learners' performance on writing tasks, as measured by the scores they obtain on a writing pre-test and post-test prepared by the researcher. In line with Weigle's (2002) After gathering data in the design phase, the next step is to formalize the test's specifications in the operationalization stage. Based on these specifications, test tasks and items are developed and eventually assembled into a full test. The last step is administration, which entails conducting both item and full test pre-tests with representative samples of the target population, as well as operational testing.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Writing Skills

Writing is one of the four basic language abilities, together with listening, speaking and reading and is widely considered to be the more cognitively demanding of the two productive skills (Nunan, 1999). Nunan argues that producing coherent, fluent, extended writing is arguably the most difficult task language users face, since, unlike speech, writing does not allow the writer to rely on intonation, facial expression, gesture, or the immediate feedback of a listener; the writer must instead make meaning fully explicit for a reader who is not present at the moment of composition. Byrne (1988) defines writing as an act of "encoding" a message: the writer converts thought into language and then into visual symbols, arranged according to certain conventions, so that a reader can decode and reconstruct the message accurately. Byrne (1988) further stresses that writing is not merely the transcription of speech into written symbols; producing a satisfactory piece of writing usually involves a good deal of mental effort which is the thinking about the topic, deciding what to include, organizing ideas, and finding the language to express them clearly. Similarly, Harmer (2004) describes writing as a process that is frequently, and productively, non-linear, in which writers plan, draft, and review what they have written before producing a final version. Taken together, these views support a definition of writing as the ability to express ideas, thoughts, and information in a coherent, organized, and grammatically accurate written form, tailored to a specific audience and purpose. Because writing requires the simultaneous control of ideas, organization, and language, it is often the last of the four skills to be mastered by foreign-language learners (Nunan, 1999).

2.2 The Process Approach

The process methodology counters the limited focus of the product approach by shifting instructional focus away from the finished writing, and toward the cognitive phases that authors go through in producing it. These stages are planning, drafting, revising, and editing (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Flower and Hayes (1981) show that good writers do not write in a linear fashion, from concept to finished text. Rather they write recursively, going back and forth between producing, organizing and reviewing what has been written. Under this view, the teacher's role shifts from evaluating only a finished product to facilitating each stage of the process — for example, through conferencing during drafting or guided peer feedback during revision. Badger and White (2000) note that a process-only approach can nonetheless underestimate the extent to which the type of text being produced shapes the choices a competent writer makes.

Particularly for learners, writers, they must understand that what they initially write on paper is only a draft, a starting point for their initial ideas, and not necessarily their final product. They shouldn't anticipate that the words they write will be flawless immediately. When a learner is given enough time to complete the process and receives constructive criticism from readers like the teacher or other learners, he will come up with new concepts, phrases, and vocabulary while planning and writing the first draft. Instructors who employ the process approach provide their pupils with two essential resources: opportunities to test ideas and comments on the content of their drafts (Raimes, 1983).

2.3 Stages of the Writing Process

Building on the process view of writing established by Flower and Hayes (1981), most models of writing instruction describe the writing process as consisting of five stages. Although presented sequentially below, Flower and Hayes (1981) emphasize that skilled writers move backward and forward between these stages rather than proceeding through them in a strict, linear order.

1. Prewriting (Planning): The writer selects and narrows a topic, considers the intended audience and purpose, and generates and organizes ideas through techniques such as brainstorming, free writing, mind-mapping, or outlining. Flower and Hayes (1981) identify planning as a distinct cognitive process in which writers generate ideas and set goals for the text, and this stage substantially shapes the quality of everything that follows.

Brainstorming is the process of generating words, phrases, and ideas as quickly as possible, without regard to accuracy, order, or appropriateness. We create connections and come up with ideas as we create free associations. Brainstorming can be done individually on paper or aloud in a class or group. Through brainstorming, learners can collaborate to say as much as they can about a subject while generating pertinent vocabulary, comments, questions, and associations as freely as possible in a short amount of time. Learners can write down as many ideas as they can without worrying about grammar, spelling, organization, or the quality of the ideas after brainstorming orally. (Raimes, 1983).

2. Drafting: The writer transfers ideas into sentences and paragraphs, producing a rough draft that prioritizes the flow and completeness of content over grammatical precision, corresponding to what Flower and Hayes (1981) call "translating," the process of turning ideas held in the mind into visible language.

3. Revising: The writer critically reviews the draft for clarity, coherence, and organization which means reordering paragraphs, strengthening supporting details, and removing irrelevant material. Flower and Hayes (1981) treat "reviewing" which is encompassing both revising and editing as a recursive process that can interrupt planning or drafting at any point, not only a final step.

Correctly arrange the sentences in the revision step. The learners pay attention to grammar. Learners are able to add, remove, or rearrange the sentence by sentence. When learners revise, they pay attention to the coherent sentences between the primary and supporting ideas (Hafidz, 2018).

4. Editing: The writer attends sentence-level and surface-level concerns consist of grammar, word choice, punctuation, spelling. Distinguishing this stage from revising by its focus on correctness and polish rather than on the substance of ideas (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

The editing process involves selecting which sentences are more interesting and pertinent. Reading the paper aloud is a useful strategy at this point, hearing awkward phrases, learners become conscious of where the punctuation needs to be adjusted. Make the necessary adjustments required for sentences to flow naturally and intelligibly. Reading the paper backwards, starting at the end, is another strategy. Reading sentences from the last to the first. This prevents from becoming entangled in

the paper's flow and overlooking minor errors, which is simple because learner knows exactly what he meant to say (Hafidz, 2018).

5. Publishing (Sharing): The finished text is shared with its intended audience whether this audience is a teacher, peers, or a wider readership that is formatted appropriately for that audience; in the classroom, this often takes the form of submission or presentation to classmates (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

2.4 The Product Approach

Badger and White (2000) characterize the product approach as one that views writing as primarily concerned with knowledge about the structure of language, and treats the composing of a text as a matter of applying that knowledge correctly. Under this approach, learners study a model text, then practice the language forms it contains, and finally produce a parallel text of their own, with success measured mainly by the accuracy and structural resemblance of the final product to the model. Badger and White (2000) argue that this approach pays insufficient attention to the skills involved in constructing a piece of writing and to the needs and knowledge learners bring to a writing task.

2.5 CFFOs' Strategy

The Content, Form, and Function Outlines Strategy is an instructional strategy helps learners to organize, express and develop their ideas in effective way in their writing assignment. It integrates three important components of writing: content, form and function and utilizing from using the outlines. Content refers to the main ideas that the learners want to communicate in their writing. Form refers to how the learners can organize their ideas in appropriate grammar and sentence structure while function to how the learners can express their communicative purpose and intention of their writing and texts. Outline supports learners with a plan that relates these three components before starting their draft, so CFFOs strategy motivates learner to think about what to say, how to say, and why they are saying it.

CFFOs strategy considers writing as a meaningful, purposeful and organized process rather than producing correct grammatical sentences, it encourages learners to scaffold during planning especially when the learners face challenges in generating and organizing the ideas, CFFOs motivates learners to plan, draft, revise and edit their written text, CFFOs improves organization, coherence. Clarity and communicative purpose in learners' writing EFL classroom. It gives learners a framework to transfer their ideas into meaningful and well-structured written text.

2.6 Teaching Procedures of CFFOs strategy

The implementation of the CFFOs strategy follows six sequential steps:

1. Select an appropriate text or message, the teacher selects a short text, passage, or message that contains important content and has a clear organizational structure suitable for analysis.
2. Identify the structural sections of the text, if the text does not contain explicit headings or divisions, the teacher identifies and marks its structural subsections to ensure that all learners analyze the same components.

3. Prepare a model outline. The teacher prepares a sample Content, Form, and Function Outline for a parallel text to demonstrate how the technique should be applied.
4. Model the analysis, the teacher distributes the sample outline and explains the analytical process step by step, clarifying the distinction between content, form, and function through several examples.
5. Provide an outline form, learners receive an outline template that helps them organize their responses systematically and facilitates comparison of their analyses.
6. Assign the analysis task, after learners understand the technique, they analyze the assigned text by identifying its content, form, and communicative function. Sufficient time should be provided to complete the task carefully (Angelo & Cross, 1993).

This step by step sequence moves learners gradually from teacher modeling to independent analysis, which reduces the cognitive demands of the task and prepares learners to apply the techniques with increasing autonomy

2.7 Theoretical Foundations of the (CFFOs) Strategy

The CFFOs Strategy is supported by several educational and linguistic theories that stress active learning, cognitive processing, meaningful communication, and structured organization of knowledge. Although Angelo and Cross (1993) put forth the technique as a method of classroom assessment, its ideas are consistent with present theories of learning and writing instruction.

The CFFOs Strategy is based on the principles of Cognitive Learning Theory, which considers learning to be an active mental process of attention, organization, interpretation and retrieval of information. Learners analyze the content, identify the organizational patterns, determine the communicative purposes and organize the information into structured outlines as they implement the strategy. These activities promote deep processing of information by the learners rather than memorizing isolated facts. In this way, the strategy ensures meaningful learning and long-term retention.

Constructivist Theory Constructivist theory suggests that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction with learning tasks and prior experiences. The CFFOs Strategy encourages learners to examine real texts, analyze their meaning, and arrange ideas on their own before they begin to write. Learners move from being passive recipients of information to being active participants in constructing understanding through analysis and reflection. This learner-centred approach aligns with the principles of constructivism.

Strategy closely corresponds to the Process Writing Theory, which views writing as a recursive process consisting of planning, drafting, revising, and editing. The outline developed through the CFFOs Strategy is a planning tool that helps students organize their ideas before they write a draft. This strategy minimizes cognitive overload and allows for the creation of coherent and meaningful written texts by emphasizing planning and organization.

A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing Flower and Hayes (1981) argued that successful writing depends on recursive cognitive processes such as planning, translating and reviewing. The CFFOs Strategy directly addresses the planning stage by helping learners identify relevant content, decide on the organizational form, and clarify the communicative function before writing starts. The structured outline also aids learners to review, providing them with a framework within which to evaluate the completeness and organization of their texts.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Communicative Language Teaching emphasizes teaching language as a means of communication rather than as isolated grammatical structures. This principle is reflected in the function component of the CFFO Strategy, which encourages learners to consider the communicative purpose of their writing and the needs of their audience. Hence, learners concentrate on how well communication works and on grammatical correctness. The above mentioned theoretical bases provide a strong argument for using the Content, Form and Function Outlines Strategy to improve the writing skills of fourth preparatory school EFL learners. Cognitive Learning Theory accounts for deep information processing. Constructivist Theory highlights the active role of learners in constructing knowledge. Process Writing Theory and Flower and Hayes' model justify outlines as planning tools. Communicative Language Teaching

emphasizes the importance of writing for meaningful communication. These theories combined explain the expected advantages of the strategy for the learners' idea generation, text organization and communication.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

In this study, we have an experimental group that is exposed to CFFOs' strategy to improve writing.

3.2 Population and Sample of The Study

A research population is made up of the individuals selected for each given study. The specific sample chosen serves as the foundation for generalizability. We would like our specific participant group to be selected at random from the population which we intend to generalize (Mackey & Gass, 2016).

This study covered schools located in the city center for the academic year 2025–2026. Following the researcher's visit to the Statistics Department of the Kerbala Directorate of Education, facilitated by the official letter of the University of Babylon

The sample for this study was selected at random from nine classes at As-Sama Preparatory School for Girls to guarantee impartial representation. Thirty students have been selected to be the experimental group, and thirty students have been selected to be the control group. In the fourth year of the English preparatory school in Karbala, the researcher rejected repeaters and older learners. The total number of participants in the initial sample is sixty learners.

3.3 Instrument

This study adopted an experimental pre-test/post-test procedure to examine the impact of CFFOs on the writing skills of EFL learners. The sample consisted of 60 participants (N=60), chosen from two classes at As Sama preparatory school in Kerbala.

3.4 Scoring Scheme for Writing Test skills

The initial three questions comprised five items each, whilst the fourth question contained three items, resulting in a total of 18 items. The items in question were carefully designed to fit in with the subject's learning objectives and to represent different levels of cognitive load. Each item was evaluated using adichotomous scoring system: two points for a correct response and zero points for an incorrect one, while the fourth question consists of subjective questions that is scored according Brown's correction criteria , twenty marks are divided for five criteria (content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics , poor (1) ; fair (2) ; good (3) and excellent (4)

3.5 Validity

Face validity was established by presenting the test to a panel of EFL experts and college instructors who evaluated the items for clarity, linguistic suitability, and compatibility with the subject matter, the number of experts is thirteen who are specialized in ELT methods and Linguistics, they suggested some changes as follow;

- 1- The wording of items were changed in Q1 ,Q2 and Q4
- 2- Some questions were deleted ,unseen passage ,timestory ,punctuation and spelling
- 3- The number of items is reduced to five items only
- 4- The distribution of marks were changed

While achieving content validity is that all items were aligned with the course's learning outcomes, Moreover, expert evaluators affirmed that the items sufficiently encompassed the curriculum and linguistic areas specified by the researcher. The item-total correlations validated the internal relationships among items, with nearly every item indicating important positive correlations with the total score, soreinforcing contentalignment.

Construct validity was achieved as follows, by determining the ease, difficulty, and discriminatory power indices for the pre-test items using the extreme groups method. It was found that all test items were of moderate ease and difficulty and had acceptable discrimination.

3.6 Reliability of the test

The researcher used Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to calculate the test's reliability. The reliability coefficient was (0.90), indicating that the test has a good reliability coefficient. A test is considered good if its reliability coefficient is (0.67) or higher

4. THE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Result Related to the First Hypothesis

The first null hypothesis states: (There is no statistically significant difference between the result of the experimental group which is taught by the CFFOs strategy and control group which is taught by traditional method in posttest. To verify this hypothesis, the researcher administered the writing skills test to learners in both the experimental and control groups. The learners' scores were calculated for both groups (see appendix). The mean score for the experimental group was 41.300 (standard deviation 3.131), and the mean score for the control group was 34.033 (standard deviation 5.301). To determine the difference between the mean scores. The researcher used the independent samples t-test to calculate the scores of the experimental group learners and the average scores of the control group learners. The results are shown in Table (1).

Table 1 Independent sample's T-test

Groups	N.	Mean	S.D.	D.F.	Group Statistics		
					T-Value		Level of Seg.
					Calculated	Tabulated	
EG	30	41.300	3.131	58	6.465	2.00	0.05
CG	30	34.033	5.301				

The table above shows that the calculated t-value (6.465) exceeds the critical t-value (2.00) at the significance level of (0.05) and degrees of freedom (58). This indicates a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group in the writing skills test, favoring the experimental group. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups in the writing skills test, is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis, which confirms the existence of a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups, is accepted, CFFOs strategy led to greater improvement in writing skills than the traditional way.

4.2 Results That are Related to the Second Hypothesis

The second null hypothesis which states there is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level between the mean scores of the experimental group learners in the pre- and post-tests of writing skills. To evaluate this hypothesis, the researcher used a paired-samples t-test to detect differences between the pre- and post-tests regarding the mean scores of the experimental group in the writing skills test, the results were analyzed to determine whether there was a significant improvement in their achievement after applying CFFOs in teaching, table (2) shows the results related to this hypothesis.

Table 2 Learners' Mean Scores in the Pre- and Post-Achievement Test

EG	N.	Mean	S.D.	Difference between two means	S.D. of differences	D.F.	Group Statistics		
							T-Value		Level of Seg.
							Calculated	Tabulated	
Pre – test	30	21.133	3.071	20.167	4.503	29	24.527	2.045	0.05
Post – test	30	41.300	3.131						

From observing the table above, it is clear that the calculated t-value for the difference between the pre- and post-applications of the writing skills test amounted to (24.527), which is greater than the tabulated t-value of (2.045) at a significance level of (0.05) and degrees of freedom of (29). This means that there is a statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-test of the writing skills test, in favor of the post-application, so CFFOs effects positively in skills writing.

To measuring Effect Size Using eta-squared (η^2), the researcher used the eta-squared (η^2) formula to ensure that the resulting differences are genuine differences attributable to the independent variable. The effect size can be calculated by dividing the squared t-value by (the squared t-value + degrees of freedom). Knowing the effect size helps us determine the magnitude of the effect. After calculating the eta-squared value, we compare it to the criteria established in Table (3).

Table 3 Criteria Used to Determine Effect Size

Effect size			Method
Large effect	Medium effect	Small effect	N ²
0.14	0.06	0.01	

The eta-squared value (η^2), which represents the effect size of the strategy on the writing skills variable, was calculated. Table (4) shows the value of (η^2) and the magnitude of the effect.

Table 4 The Value of η^2 and the Magnitude of the Effect of the Strategy in Writing Skills.

Independent variable	Dependent variable	T - Value	N ² -Value	Magnitude of the effect
CFFOs Strategy	Writing Skills	6.465	0.42	Large

The table above shows the impact of the strategy in the writing skills of the experimental group learners. The effect size of the strategy in writing skills was large, as the eta-squared value was greater than the established standard. This indicates the effectiveness of the CFFOs strategy in improving the writing skills of the experimental group learners.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

1. Learners taught with the CFFOs strategy significantly outperformed those taught traditionally in overall writing, they improved in the three main aspects: content, form, and function.
2. They expressed their communicative intentions more clearly. They demonstrated noticeable advancement in grammatical accuracy and sentence formation.
3. They made better use of functional language, the outlining component acted as a cognitive scaffold, helping learners overcome difficulty starting to write.
4. The strategy clarified what to write, how to write it and why to write, reducing uncertainty during drafting.
5. Learners became more confident, less anxious, and more engaged in the writing process, they also became more independent in planning and producing their writing.

5.2 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study the following recommendations are proposed:

1. English language teachers are encouraged to use the strategy of content, form and function outlines in teaching writing. It will help the students to organize their ideas in the right forms of language and to achieve their communicative purposes.
2. Curriculum designers and textbook writers are advised to include CFFOs-based activities and tasks in the English language textbooks for the preparatory schools to facilitate balanced writing instruction.
3. The teacher training programs should provide workshops and practical sessions on how to effectively implement the CFFOs strategy in EFL classrooms.
4. Educational supervisors and policymakers are encouraged to support teaching methods that prioritize integrated writing skills over mere grammatical correctness.
5. EFL learners should be trained to use outlines independently as a pre-writing strategy to improve planning, coherence, and clarity in their writing.

5.3 Suggesting for further studying

- 1 The Impact of the Content, Form and Function Outlines Strategy on Developing Reading Comprehension of Iraqi EFL Students in Intermediate School.
- 2 Comparing the Effectiveness of the Content, Form and Function Outlines Strategy and Process Writing in Developing EFL Students' Writing Skills in Iraqi Universities.
- 3 EFL Learners' Perceptions of the Content, Form and Function Outlines Strategy on Enhancing Skills in Writing.

Lesson Experimental Plan

Unit One

lesson two (changes)

Date : 22/10/2025

Time: 40 minutes

Class : 4th preparatory

General Aim : Students will learn how to express changes in different context using suitable vocabulary and the present continuous tense

Behavioral Objectives :

1. Explaining changes by using words (going up ,rising, going down ,falling)
2. Use the present continuous to express changes

Materials

Student Book p.8 ,Activity Book p.6

White board , some pictures to show the continuous action of falling or rising

Presentation

Warm up : The pupils write a homework about simple present they prepare some words at home (5 minutes)

Procedures

I write new words on the board in present simple tense (go up , rise , fall , go down), I lead them into today's topic by showing a picture as thermometer rising or a bird falling and ask them (what is happening in this picture)

Step (1) Choose a short text

I ask them to open their books on page 8 , I read the four paragraphs (A,B,C and D) (6 minutes)

Step (2) Define the structural subsections by subheading or numbers

Try to divide each paragraph two parts to make it easily comprehend (3minutes)

Step (3) Write a Content ,Form, and Function Outlines

I explain the main idea (What is falling or rising...) and write the sentence and pay their attention to new tense , then explain the purpose for this tense (change) and write it on the board (10 minutes)

Step (4) Hand out the outlines to the pupils and model the process that I want to use

I give many example and outline it on the board , I try to make them distinguish between the main ideas and expressing changes (5 minutes)

Step (5) prepare an outline form for students to use (5 minutes)

Ask them about the main ideas , and writing on the board the sentence that contain present continuous and write the word change (purpose) by asking them

What is changing ? How is changing ? Why do we use this tense ?

Step (6) I'm confident that students understand and give them sufficient time to do the exercise (c) in Activity book ,I ask them to write paragraph from three sentences, so can be easily assessed (7 minutes)

Unit one lesson two page 8 (present continuous)

changes

Content	Form	Function
Increasing the number	The number of people in American University is <u>going up</u> N + is + V + ing The number of internal students in UK universities <u>is rising</u> Languages <u>are rising</u> N + is + V + ing	To talk about changing situations
Decreasing the number	Students learning Spanish <u>is falling</u> N + is + V + ing The number of the languages in the world <u>is going down</u> N + is + V + ing	To talk about changing situations
Planning	We are having dinner with my uncle at 8:00 We + are + V + ing What are you doing at the weekend	To talk about planning future events
Continuity	It is not raining now It + is + not + v + ing	Something happening now or around now

REFERENCES

- [1] Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=590442>
- [2] Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- [3] Bloom, L., & Lahey, M. (1978). *Language development and language disorders*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.7916/D8QZ2GQ5>
- [4] Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3672310>
- [5] Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skills* (New ed.). Longman. https://www.scribd.com/document/229219346/Byrne-D-1988-Teaching-Writing-Skills#google_vignette
- [6] Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/ReferencesPapers?ReferenceID=757162>
- [7] Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=951710>
- [8] Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). *A cognitive process theory of writing*. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc198115885>

- [9] Hafidz, M. (2018). *Basic academic writing*. STKIP PGRI Bangkalan. <https://stkippgri-bkl.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Basic-Academic-Writing.pdf>
- [10] Hafidz, M. (2018). *Basic academic writing*. STKIP PGRI Bangkalan. <https://stkippgri-bkl.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Basic-Academic-Writing.pdf>
- [11] Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Longman. <https://can-ada.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/How-to-Teach-Writing.pdf>
- [12] Hashim, A. (2025). The Challenges Faced by Iraqi EFL Secondary School Teachers in Teaching English Language. *Journal of Al-Farabi for Humanity Sciences*, 8(5), 760-773. <https://repository.uobaghdad.edu.iq/articles/9Elrk5sBMeyNPGM3mN3z>
- [13] Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251>
- [14] Khamees, K. S. (2016). An evaluative study of memorization as a strategy for learning English. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(4), 248– 259. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n4p248>
- [15] Langan, J. (2011). *College writing skills with readings* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill. <https://www.scribd.com/document/1014417028/College-Writing-Skills-with-Readings-8th-Edition-John-Langan>
- [16] Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://acasearch.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/techniques-in-language-teaching.pdf>
- [17] Mackey, A., & Gass, S.M. (2015). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315750606>
- [18] Nasser, S. M. (2019). Iraqi EFL students' difficulties in writing composition: An experimental study (University of Baghdad). *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 178–184. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p178>
- [19] Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Heinle & Heinle. https://books.google.iq/books/about/Second_Language_Teaching_Learning.html?id=svPtAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- [20] Nunan, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. McGraw-Hill. <https://archive.org/details/practicalenglish0000nuna>
- [21] Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press. <https://enjoymysite.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/24688339-techniques-in-teaching-writing.pdf>
- [22] Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532207077217>