

CHAPTER 4  
DATA ANALYSIS AND  
INTERPRETATION

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

---

#### 4.0 Introduction

The chapter – 4 presents the analysis and interpretation of data in terms of different components of Creative Writing identified through recitation of model poems namely, **“The River”**, **“Daffodils”** and **“Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening”** by the investigator, thereafter the poems composed by the students have been analyzed. It is followed by analysis of the data on reactions of the students towards the Participatory Approach of Creative Writing of poetry. The data analysis and interpretation are presented under the following steps:

Step 1: Analysis and interpretation of Model Poems & Poems composed by students in groups,

Step 2: Analysis and interpretation of Poems composed by students individually, and

Step 3: Analysis and interpretation of the data on Reaction scale on Participatory approach for creative writing of poetry.

In the same way, the analysis and interpretation of data has been done in terms of different components of Creative Writing identified through reading of model Non-fiction essays by the investigator, namely, **“The story of my experiments with truth”** by M. K. Gandhi and **“The Great fire of London”** by Samuel Pepys, Unit : 10 from Std. 9 English Textbook. Thereafter the Non-fiction essays composed by the students have been analyzed. It is followed by analysis of the data on reactions of the students towards the Participatory Approach of Creative Writing of Non-fiction. The data analysis has been presented under the following steps:

Step 1: Analysis and interpretation of Model Non-fiction essays & Non-fiction essays composed by students,

Step 2: Analysis and interpretation of Non-fiction essays composed by students individually, and

Step 3: Analysis and interpretation of the data on Reaction scale on Participatory approach for creative writing of Non-fiction.

#### 4.1 Analysis and interpretation of Model poems & Poems composed by students in groups

**Table 1.1 a: Frequencies, percentage and responses of the students on the rubric for poetry against various components of Creative Writing on the poem “The River” (Day 1) by Caroline Southey**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 13(20%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 24(40%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 24(40%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 0(0%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 24 (40%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 13 (20%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 24(40%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 0(0%)
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 24(40%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 24(40%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 13 (20%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 24(40%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 24(40%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 13 (20%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in

			to theme of the poem. 6(10%)	sustain unity. 13 (20%)	the theme. 18 (30%)	an artistic way. 24(40%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 24(40%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 13(20%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 24(40%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 13(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 13(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 35(60%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 24(40%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 13(20%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 24(40%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 13(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 13(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 35(60%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 13(20%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 13(20%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 35(60%)

		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 24(40%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 13(20%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 24(40%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 24(40%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 24(40%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 13(20%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 0(0%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 35(60%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 13(20%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 13(20%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 6(10%)	2. The poem is natural. 42(70%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 13(20%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 13(20%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 24(40%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 24(40%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme,	2. There is consistently confusing or	2. The poet has also used sound	2. The poet has also used sound devices	2. The poet has used sound

	alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 13(20%)	such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 24(40%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 24(40%)
--	---	---	---	--	--

**Table 1.1 b: Frequencies, percentage and responses of the students on the rubric for poetry against various components of Creative Writing on the poem “The River” (Day 2) by Caroline Southey**

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 30(60%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 30(60%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 10(20%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 10(20%)
	2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 20 (40%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 0(0%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 30(60%)	
	3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 10(20%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 30(60%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 10 (20%)	
	4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate	

		the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	tried in the poem. 0(0%)	poem. 0(0%)	sequencing is logical. 30(60%)	words. 20 (40%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 20 (40%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 30(60%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 10(20%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 30(60%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 10(20%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 10(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 40(80%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 20(40%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 30(60%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 25(50%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 25(50%)

		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 30(60%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 20(40%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 25(50%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 25(50%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 10(20%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 40(80%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 5(10%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 5(10%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 40(80%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 0(0%)	2. The poem is natural. 10(20%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 40(80%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not	1. The poet has tried to	1. The poet has used	1. The poet has used	1. The poet has

<b>Speech</b>	used in the poem. 0(0%)	use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 10(20%)	artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 40(80%)
	2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 5(10%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 45(90%)

**Table 1.1 a and Table 1.1 b present the relative rating scenario of the students on Day 1 and Day 2 as follows:**

**1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 40% and capable by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated satisfactory by 60% capable by 20% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated emerging by 40%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on the second day the poem was rated satisfactory by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 20% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 60%, and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 20% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

## **2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated emerging by 40%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 60%, and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

## **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20% and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 60%, and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 20%, proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that **“The River”** poem was rated emerging by 40%, satisfactory by 40%, capable by 20% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### 4. Interest

4.1 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated satisfactory by 60%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 20% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 10%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 70% and proficient by 20% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

#### 5. Figure of Speech

5.1 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “**The River**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 10% and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, and onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the poem “**The River**” by Caroline Southey in a better way on Day two in comparison with Day one. As the frequencies and percentage on the second day of Orientation was found at higher points of the rubric, namely, Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient. These have been found to be greater than those on first day of Orientation. So, the orientation of students to components of Creative writing of poetry using the poem “The River” has been found to be effective. So, it can be said that most of the students could identify different components of Creative writing on through the orientation programme.

**Table 1.2 a: Frequencies, percentage and responses of the students on the rubric for poetry against various components of Creative Writing on the poem “The Daffodils” by William Wordsworth (Day 3)**

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient
--	--	----------	----------	--------------	---------	------------

<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 25(50%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 25(50%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 20(40%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 30(60%)
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 10(20%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 40(80%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 20(40%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 30(60%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 5(10%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 25(50%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 20(40%)

		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 20(40%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 25(50%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 20(40%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 20(40%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 10(20%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 20(40%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 25(50%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 5(10%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 10(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 20(40%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 20(40%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 18(36%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 12(24%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 20(40%)

		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 5(10%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 25(50%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 20(40%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 25(50%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 25(50%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 10(20%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 20(40%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 20(40%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 5(10%)	2. The poem is natural. 5(10%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 40(80%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 5(10%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 15(30%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 15(30%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 15(3%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme,	2. There is consistently confusing or	2. The poet has also used sound	2. The poet has also used sound devices	2. The poet has used sound

		alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 10(20%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 40(80%)
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**Table 1.2 b: Frequencies, percentage and responses of the students on the rubric for poetry against various components of Creative Writing on the poem “The Daffodils” by William Wordsworth (Day 4)**

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 10(20%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 40(80%)
	2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 10(20%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 40(80%)	
	3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 5(10%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 5(10%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 40(80%)	
	4. Content is not related and sequencing is	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using	

		not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	logical in the poem. 0(0%)	well and sequencing is logical. 5(10%)	appropriate words. 45 (90%)
2.	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 15 (30%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 35(70%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 20(40%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 30(60%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 15(30%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 35(70%)
3.	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 10(20%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 40(80%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 5(10%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 45(90%)

		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 15(30%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 35(70%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 10(20%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 40(80%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 15(30%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 35(70%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 10(20%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 40(80%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 0(0%)	2. The poem is natural. 20(40%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 30(60%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not	1. The poet has tried to	1. The poet has used	1. The poet has used	1. The poet has

	<b>Speech</b>	used in the poem. 0(0%)	use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 15(30%)	artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 35(70%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 10(20%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 40(80%)

**Table 1.2 a and Table 1.2 b present the relative rating scenario of the students on Day 3 and Day 4 as follows:**

**1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on the second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 10% and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

**2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 50%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 10% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 20% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

### **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 50%, and proficient by 10% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 36%, capable by 24%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 50%, proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that **“The Daffodils”** poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### 4. Interest

4.1 It was found that “**The Daffodils**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that “**The Daffodils**” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 10% and proficient by 80% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

#### 5. Figure of Speech

5.1 It was found that “**The Daffodils**” poem was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30% and proficient by 30% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “**The Daffodils**” poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the poem “**The Daffodils**” by William Wordsworth in a better way on Day two in comparison with Day one. As the frequencies and percentage on the second day of Orientation was found at higher points of the rubric, namely, Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient. These have been found to be greater than those on first day of Orientation. So, the orientation of students to components of Creative writing of poetry using the poem “**The Daffodils**” has been found to be effective. So, it can be said that most of the students could identify different components of Creative writing on through the orientation programme.

**Table 1.3 a: Frequencies, percentage and responses of the students on the rubric for poetry against various components of Creative Writing on the poem “Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening” by Robert Frost (Day 5)**

	Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient
--	----------	----------	--------------	---------	------------

<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 14(32%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 13(30%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 17(38%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 13 (30%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 13(30%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 18(40%)
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 11(25%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 11(25%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 22 (50%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 22(50%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 22 (50%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 4(10%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 22 (50%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 18(40%)

		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 22(50%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 22(50%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 22(50%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 22(50%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 0(0%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 22(50%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 22(50%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 5(10%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 11(25%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 11(25%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 22(50%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 11(25%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 22(50%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 11(25%)

		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 18(40%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 26(60%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 8(20%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 18(40%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 18(40%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 26(60%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 18(40%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 11(25%)	2. The poem is natural. 11(25%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 22(50%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 18(40%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 26(60%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme,	2. There is consistently confusing or	2. The poet has also used sound	2. The poet has also used sound devices	2. The poet has used sound

		alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 22(50%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 22(50%)
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**Table 1.3 b: Frequencies, percentage and responses of the students on the rubric for poetry against various components of Creative Writing on the poem “Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening” by Robert Frost (Day 6)**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 15(30%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 35(70%)
	2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 10(20%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 40(80%)	
	3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 15(30%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 35(70%)	
	4. Content is not related and	4. Content is somewhat related to	4. Content is related to topic and	4. The content of the poem relates	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas	

		sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 10(20%)	using appropriate words. 40 (80%)
2.	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 10 (20%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 40(80%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 45(90%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 10(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 40(80%)
3.	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in Imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 10(20%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 40(80%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 15(30%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind.

						35(70%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 5(10%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 45(90%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 10(20%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 40(80%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 15(30%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 35(70%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poet makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 15(30%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 35(70%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 0(0%)	2. The poem is natural. 10(20%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 40(80%)

5.	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 10(20%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 40(80%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 15(30%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 35(70%)

**Table 1.3 a and Table 1.3 b present the relative rating scenario of the students on Day 4 and Day 5 as follows:**

**1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 32% and capable by 30% and proficient by 38% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on the second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 25%, capable by 25%, and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on

second day the poem was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

## **2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 50%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 10% and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 50% and capable by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

## **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 25%, capable by 25% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 25%, capable by 50%, and proficient by 25% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 40% and capable by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on

second day the poem was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### **4. Interest**

4.1 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 60%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

#### **5. Figure of Speech**

5.1 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 20% and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day whereas on second day the poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the poem “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” by Robert Frost in a better way on Day two in comparison with Day one. As the frequencies and percentage on the second day of Orientation was found at higher points of the rubric, namely, Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient. These have been found to be greater than those on first day of Orientation. So, the orientation of students to components of Creative writing of poetry using the poem “**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening**” has been found to be effective. So, it can be said that most of the students could identify different components of Creative writing on through the orientation programme.

#### 1.4 - a Model Diamante poem - Seasons

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 5(10%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 10(20%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 15(30%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 20(40%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 0(0%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 15(30%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 10(20%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 20(40%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 5(10%)
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 17(34%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 18(36%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 15(30%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 12(24%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 8(16%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 30(60%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the	1. The sensory images are limited and	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to

		poem. 5(10%)	inappropriate to theme of the poem. 25(50%)	but fails to sustain unity. 20(40%)	relevant to the theme. 0(0%)	the theme in an artistic way. 0(0%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 30(60%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 15(30%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 5(10%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 28(56%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 7(14%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 10(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 0(0%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 15(30%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 20(40%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 15(30%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 10(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 10(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 30(60%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 10(20%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 10(20%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 13(26%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 12(24%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 5(10%)

		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 19(38%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 18(36%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 10(20%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 3(6%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 15(30%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 15(30%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 20(40%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 0(0%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 21(42%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 24(48%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 5(10%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 0(0%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 10(20%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 10(20%)	2. The poem is natural. 30(60%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 0(0%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 25(50%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 25(50%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 0(0%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 0(0%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme,	2. There is consistently confusing or	2. The poet has also used sound	2. The poet has also used sound devices	2. The poet has used sound

		alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 39(78%)	inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 11(22%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 0(0%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**1.4 – b Group Diamante poem – FOOD & WATER composed by students :**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 40(80%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 10(20%)	
	2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 40(80%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 10(20%)	
	3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 40(80%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 10(20%)	
	4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical.	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 35	

		difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	poem. 0(0%)		15(30%)	(70%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 30 (60%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 20(40%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 16(32%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 29(58%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 10(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 35(70%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 5(10%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 15(30%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 30(60%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 5(10%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 10(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 35(70%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 5(10%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are	3. The ideas presented in the poem are	3. Original ideas evident in the poem.	3. The poet has tried to create	3. The poet has used words to

		not original. 0(0%)	somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	10(20%)	curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 30(60%)	convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 10(20%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 10(20%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 20(40%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 20(40%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 10(20%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 35(70%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 5(10%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 5(10%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 40(80%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 5(10%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 5(10%)	2. The poem is natural. 30(60%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 15(30%)

5.	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 15(30%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 35(70%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 0(0%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 0(0%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 20(40%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 30(60%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)

**Table 1.4 a and Table 1.4 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model Diamante poem and Diamante poem composed in group as follows:**

### **1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 30% and capable by 40% of the students on the in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated emerging by 30%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of form of the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 90% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated satisfactory by 34%, capable by 36%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated satisfactory by 24%, capable by 16%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

## **2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated beginner by 10%, emerging by 50%, satisfactory by 40% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated beginner by 60%, emerging by 30%, satisfactory by 10% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 32%, Capable by 58% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated beginner by 10%, emerging by 56%, satisfactory by 14%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

## **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated satisfactory by 30%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 30%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated beginner by 20%, emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 26%, capable by 24%, and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated emerging by 38%, satisfactory by 36%, capable by 20%, proficient by 6% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated emerging by 30%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 40% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### **4. Interest**

4.1 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated emerging by 42%, satisfactory by 48%, and capable by 10% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 80% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 60% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

#### **5. Figure of Speech**

5.1 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated beginner by 50%, and emerging by 50%, of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Beginner by 60% and Emerging by 40% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “**Season**” poem was rated beginner by 78% and emerging by 22% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem. Whereas the the diamante poem composed by a group of students was rated Beginner by 70% and Emerging by 30% of the students in terms of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the Diamante poem “**Season**” which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Diamante poem whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of poetry in the Diamante poem composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Diamante poem in small group.

### 1.5 – a Model Acrostic poem - “An Acrostic” by Edgar Allan Poe

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient
<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 15(30%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 25(50%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 10(20%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 10(20%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 7 (14%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 23(46%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 10(20%)
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 8(16%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 15(30%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 12(24%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 15 (30%)
		4. Content is not related	4. Content is somewhat	4. Content is related to	4. The content of the	4. There is continuity in

		and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 25(50%)	poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 10(20%)	flow of ideas using appropriate words. 15 (30%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 10(20%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 15 (30%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 25(50%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 30(60%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 15(30%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 15(30%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 15(30%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 20(40%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 9(18%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 11(22%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 30(60%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind.	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions.	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's

				10(20%)	15(30%)	mind. 25(50%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 6(12%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 20(40%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 24(48%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 3(6%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 20(40%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 27(34%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 2(4%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 18(36%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 10(20%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 20(40%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 1(2%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 15(30%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 15(30%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 19(38%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 3(6%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 20(40%)	2. The poem is natural. 17(34%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 10(20%)

<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 5(10%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 25(50%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 20(40%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 5(10%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 25(50%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 20(40%)

**1.5 – b Acrostic poem – “CHAITALI” composed by group of students**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 40(80%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 10(20%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 45(90%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 5(10%)

		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 10(20%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 35(70%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 5(10%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 10(20%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 30(60%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 10(20%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 25(50%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 25(50%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 45(90%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 35(70%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 15(30%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve	1. The form of the poem should be more	1. Original idea is evident in the poem.	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of

	<b>imagination</b>		himself in the poem. 0(0%)	appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	35(70%)	topic, ideas. 15(30%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 5(10%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 30(60%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 15(30%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 40(80%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 10(20%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 40(80%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 10(20%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 35(70%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 15(30%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create

				to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 35(70%)	interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 15(30%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 5(10%)	2. The poem is natural. 30(60%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 15(30%)
5.	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 10(20%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 30(60%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 10(20%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 30(60%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 20(40%)

**Table 1.5 a and Table 1.5 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model Acrostic poem and Acrostic poem composed in group as follows:**

**1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that “An Acrostic” poem was rated satisfactory by 30% and capable by 50% and proficient by 20% of the students on the in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 14%, capable by 46%, and proficient by 20 % of the students in terms of form of the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 90% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated emerging by 16%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 24%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 50%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

## **2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 60% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 90% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

## **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 18%, capable by 22%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated

Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 12%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 48% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated satisfactory by 6%, capable by 40%, proficient by 54% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated emerging by 4%, satisfactory by 36%, capable by 20% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### **4. Interest**

4.1 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated emerging by 2%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 38% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that “**An Acrostic**” poem was rated emerging by 6%, satisfactory by 40%, capable by 34% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of

students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

### 5. Figure of Speech

5.1 It was found that “An Acrostic” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 50% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “An Acrostic” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 50% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem. Whereas the the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the Acrostic poem “An Acrostic” by Edgar Allen Poe which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Acrostic poem whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of poetry in the Acrostic poem composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Acrostic poem in small group.

### 1.6 – a Model limerick poem - “A Man from Beijing”

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient
1.	Organization	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 5(10%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 15(30%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 30(60%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form.	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors.	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 35(70%)

			0(0%)	poetic form. 10(20%)	5(10%)	
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 5(10%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 20(40%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 25(50%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 5(10%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 20(40%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 25 (50%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 20(40%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 29 (58%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 1(2%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 14(28%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 26(32%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 10(20%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 10(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 20(40%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 20(40%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 0(0%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp;</b>	1. The poem appears to be	1. The poet has tried to	1. The form of the poem	1. Original idea is	1. The poem is original in

<b>Richness in imagination</b>	thoughtless. 0(0%)	think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 10(20%)	evident in the poem. 12(24%)	terms of choice of topic, ideas. 28(56%)
	2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 10(20%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 2(4%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 38(76%)
	3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 25(50%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 25(50%)
	4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 4(8%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 20(40%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 26(52%)
	5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 25(50%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 25(50%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 0(0%)

4.	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 20(40%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 30(60%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 0(0%)	2. The poem is natural. 15(30%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 35(70%)
5.	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 20(40%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 25(50%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 5(10%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 5(10%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 25(50%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 20(40%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)

**1.6 – b Limerick poem composed by group of students - An app in a zoo**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
--	--	-----------------	-----------------	---------------------	----------------	-------------------

<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 35(70%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 15(30%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 25(50%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 25(50%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 0(0%)
		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 20(40%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 25(50%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 5(10%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 20(40%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 25(50%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 5(10%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 30(60%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 20(40%)

		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 45(90%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 5(10%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 10(20%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 30(60%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 10(20%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 15(30%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 30(60%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 5(10%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 5(10%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 45(90%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 5(10%)
		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 5(10%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 40(80%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 5(10%)

		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 40(80%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 10(20%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 40(80%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 10(20%)
4.	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 5(10%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 35(70%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 10(20%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 10(20%)	2. The poem is natural. 30(60%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 10(20%)
5.	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 20(40%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 25(50%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 5(10%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme,	2. There is consistently confusing or	2. The poet has also used sound	2. The poet has also used sound devices	2. The poet has used sound

		alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 20(40%)	such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 30(60%)	devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**Table 1.6 a and Table 1.6 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model limerick poem and limerick composed in group as follows:**

### **1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 10% and capable by 30% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 10% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of form of the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 50%, Capable by 50% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated emerging by 10%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

### **2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 58%, and proficient by 2% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated emerging by 28%, satisfactory by 52%, capable by 20% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 90% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 40%, capable by 40% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

### **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 24%, and proficient by 56% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 30%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 4% and proficient by 76% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 90% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 80% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 8%, capable by 40%, proficient by 52% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 50%, capable by 50% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 80% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### **4. Interest**

4.1 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

#### **5. Figure of Speech**

5.1 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “**A Man from Beijing**” poem was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 50%, and capable by 40% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem. Whereas the Limerick poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by

60% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the Limerick poem “A Man from Beijing” which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Limerick poem whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of poetry in the Limerick poem composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Limerick poem in small group.

**1.7 a- Model free verse poem “Sunday Night Meltdown”**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem uses an appropriate form. 14(30%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 34(70%)
	2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 24(50%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 24(50%)	
	3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 14(30%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 34(70%)	
	4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 24	

		difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	poem. 0(0%)		logical. 24(50%)	(50%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 24 (50%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 24(50%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 14(30%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 34(70%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 14(30%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 34(70%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve himself in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The form of the poem should be more appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	1. Original idea is evident in the poem. 14(30%)	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of topic, ideas. 34(70%)
		2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 24(50%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 24(50%)

		3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 24(50%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 24(50%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 0(0%)
		4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 14(30%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 34(70%)
		5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 24(50%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 24(50%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 14(30%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 34(70%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 0(0%)	2. The poem is natural. 24(50%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 24(50%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not	1. The poet has tried to	1. The poet has used	1. The poet has used	1. The poet has

	<b>Speech</b>	used in the poem. 0(0%)	use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 14(30%)	artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 34(70%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 24(50%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 24(50%)

**1.7 – b Free-verse poem – “YOU ARE MY TRUE FRIEND” composed by group of students**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. No identifiable structure is evident in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its form but the structure does not show organization of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem is written in its proper form with a few mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poem effectively uses an appropriate form. 24(50%)	1. The poem has used a logically effective organizational strategy and follows format of the poem exactly. 24(50%)
		2. The poet doesn't follow the form of the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet tends to use an appropriate poem form. 0(0%)	2. The poet has effectively used appropriate poetic form. 0(0%)	2. The poetry form has emerged with a few or no errors. 24(50%)	2. The poem is in a form to present ideas effectively. 24(50%)

		3. The focus is not clear, ideas are not connected and not developed in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Subject is developed to a limited extent or lacks continuity in the poem. 0(0%)	3. The poet has tried to develop subject in the poem. 0(0%)	3. Ideas are focused and clear to the reader in the poem. The poem has a strong structure. 14(30%)	3. The poet has very effectively presented the subject and ideas in the poem. 34 (70%)
		4. Content is not related and sequencing is not evident in the poem. The poet has difficulty in understanding the genre of the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is somewhat related to topic and sequencing is tried in the poem. 0(0%)	4. Content is related to topic and sequencing is logical in the poem. 0(0%)	4. The content of the poem relates to the topic well and sequencing is logical. 24(50%)	4. There is continuity in flow of ideas using appropriate words. 24 (50%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	1. The sensory images are missing in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The sensory images are limited and inappropriate to theme of the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions but fails to sustain unity. 0(0%)	1. The poem clearly presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme. 24 (50%)	1. The poem presents ideas and emotions relevant to the theme in an artistic way. 24(50%)
		2. There is no use of sensory details or whenever used, it is consistently confusing in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use sensory details in the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute to the meaning of the poem. 0(0%)	2. Sensory details contribute effectively to the meaning of the poem. 24(50%)	2. Sensory details contribute masterfully to the meaning of the poem. 24(50%)
		3. The poem does not sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem has tried to sensitize the reader. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader to some extent. 0(0%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader. 34(70%)	3. The poem sensitizes the reader fully. 14(30%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in</b>	1. The poem appears to be thoughtless. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to think and involve	1. The form of the poem should be more	1. Original idea is evident in the poem.	1. The poem is original in terms of choice of

<b>imagination</b>		himself in the poem. 0(0%)	appropriate to the subject of the poem. 0(0%)	24(50%)	topic, ideas. 24(50%)
	2. The poet fails to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has tried to use words to express ideas and emotions. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words to create curiosity in reader's mind. 0(0%)	2. The poet has used words in an appropriate way to express ideas and emotions. 24(50%)	2. The poet has used words in an effective way to arouse curiosity in the reader's mind. 24(50%)
	3. The ideas presented in the poem are not original. 0(0%)	3. The ideas presented in the poem are somewhat repetitive. 0(0%)	3. Original ideas evident in the poem. 14(30%)	3. The poet has tried to create curiosity in the reader's mind through ideas and imagination. 34(70%)	3. The poet has used words to convey ideas and emotions in effective way in the poem. 0(0%)
	4. There is no linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is some linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a linkage between ideas and emotions in the poem. 0(0%)	4. There is a logical link between ideas and emotions in the poem. 34(70%)	4. There is a link established in an effective way by the poet between ideas and emotions in the poem. 14(30%)
	5. The poem is very repetitive. 0(0%)	5. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	5. The poet has involved himself in the poem. 0(0%)	5. A couple of phrases or ideas may be revisited, but the overall product is carefully written. 24(50%)	5. The poet has used his personal feelings and involves himself in the poem. 24(50%)

4.	<b>Interest</b>	1. The poem lacks interest. 0(0%)	1. The poet tries to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The poet attempts to create interest in reader's mind. The poet has tried to use words to make reader smile and feel excited. 0(0%)	1. The poet successfully creates interest in reader's mind. The poem makes the reader smile and feel exciting. 34(70%)	1. The poet uses significant words appropriately to create interest in reader's mind by making him/her smile. 14(30%)
		2. The poem looks artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat artificial. 0(0%)	2. The poem looks somewhat natural. 0(0%)	2. The poem is natural. 24(50%)	2. The poem looks very natural and authentic. 24(50%)
5.	<b>Figures of Speech</b>	1. Figure Of Speech is not used in the poem. 0(0%)	1. The poet has tried to use Figures of Speech. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech but there are some mistakes. 0(0%)	1. The poet has used Figures of Speech in an appropriate way. 24(50%)	1. The poet has artistically used Figures of Speech in the poem. 24(50%)
		2. The sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a are not used in the poem. 0(0%)	2. There is consistently confusing or inappropriate use of sound devices in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in the poem. 0(0%)	2. The poet has also used sound devices such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in a meaningful way in the poem. 24(50%)	2. The poet has used sound devices, such as, rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoei a in an effective way to contribute to the meaning of the poem. 24(50%)

**Table 1.7 a and Table 1.7 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model free-verse poem and free-verse poem composed in group as follows:**

### **1. Organization**

1.1 It was found that “**Sunday Night Meltdown**” poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students on the in terms of use of effective

organizational strategy and format of the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of effective organizational strategy and format of the poem.

1.2 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of form of the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of form of the poem.

1.3 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of subject and ideas in the poem.

1.4 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of continuity in flow of ideas in the poem.

## **2. Sensitivity**

2.1 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of presentation of ideas and emotions relevant to theme in the poem.

2.2 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of sensory details in the poem.

2.3 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of sensitization of the reader towards the poem.

## **3. Originality & Richness in Imagination**

3.1 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of choice of topic and ideas in the poem.

3.2 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of words to arouse curiosity in the mind of reader for poem.

3.3 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated satisfactory by 50%, and capable by 50% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 30%, and Capable by 70% of the students in terms of use of words to convey ideas and emotions in an effective way in the poem.

3.4 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of linkage established between ideas and emotions by the poet in the poem.

3.5 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of personal feelings in the poem.

#### **4. Interest:**

4.1 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of words to create interest in reader’s mind by making him/her smile.

4.2 It was found that **“Sunday Night Meltdown”** poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the

poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of naturalness and authenticity in the poem.

### 5. Figure of Speech

5.1 It was found that “**Sunday Night Meltdown**” poem was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of figures of speech in the poem.

5.2 It was found that “**Sunday Night Meltdown**” poem was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem. Whereas the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of sound devices like rhyme, alliteration, onomatopoeia in the poem.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the free-verse poem “**Sunday Night Meltdown**” which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Free-verse poem whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of poetry in the Free-verse poem composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Free-verse poem in small group.

## 4.2 Analysis and interpretation of Model Essays & Non-fiction essays composed by students in groups

### 1.8 a - Orientation – Non-fiction - “The Great fire of London” by Samuel Pepys

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 1(2%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 15(30%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 15(30%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 19(38%)

		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 5(10%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 15(30%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 5(10%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 25(50%)
2.	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 6(12%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 6(12%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 12(24%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 26(52%)
		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 10(20%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 10(20%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 30(60%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 5(10%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 20(40%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 25(50%)
3.	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the

			unclear and confusing. 0(0%)		the type of essay. 5(10%)	reader. 35(70%)
4.	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 20(40%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 5(10%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 8(16%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 12(24%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 25(50%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 3(6%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 27(54%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge.	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source.	1. The writer has used information based on both	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively.

		based only on imagination. 0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	personal knowledge and other resources. 25(50%)	25(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to support point of view. 10(20%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 15(30%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 25(50%)
<b>6.</b>	<b>Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 5(10%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 5(10%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 15(30%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 15(30%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 10(20%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 5(10%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 20(40%)
<b>7.</b>	<b>Grammar,</b>	1. Numerous	1. The writer	1. The writer	1.	1. The writer

	<b>Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 1(2%)	Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 20(40%)	has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 29(58%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 25(50%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 25(50%)

### 1.8 b - The Great fire of London – by Samuel Pepys

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>		1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 20(40%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 20(40%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 10(20%)
		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 20(40%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 30(60%)
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>		1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that

		to topic. 0(0%)	which are of topic. 0(0%)	support the topic. 10(20%)	support the topic. 10(20%)	support the topic effectively. 30(60%)
		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 35(70%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 15(30%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 10(20%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 30(60%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 10(20%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 35(70%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and

		reader's interest. 0(0%)			inaccurately. 10(20%)	placement of words is accurate and natural. 40(80%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 15(30%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 35(70%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 0(0%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 30(60%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 35(70%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point

			lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	support point of view. 0(0%)	effectively to support point of view. 20(40%)	of view. 30(60%)
6.	<b>Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 0(0%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 25(50%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 20(40%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 30(60%)
7.	<b>Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 45(90%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate	2. The writer has limited accuracy in	2. The writer has some accuracy in	2. The writer has general	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in

		grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 5(10%)	grammar, mechanics and spelling. 45(90%)
--	--	---	---	---	---	--

**1.8 a and 1.8 b present the relative rating scenario of the students on day 19 and 20 day :**

**1) Organization**

**1.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated emerging by 2%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30% and proficient by 38% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 40% capable by 40% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind.

**1.2** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 10% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on the second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs.

**2) Ideas & Purpose**

**2.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated emerging by 12%, satisfactory by 12%, capable by 24%, and proficient by 52% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively.

**2.2** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20% and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 70%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay.

**2.3** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 60%, and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader.

### **3) Point of view/ voice**

**3.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 10%, and proficient by 70% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay.

### **4) Word – choice, Sentence – structure & Paragraphs:**

**4.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer.

**4.2** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 16%, capable by 24% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way.

**4.3** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 6%, capable by 40% and proficient by 54% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details.

### **5) Research Sources & Relevance of supporting facts & details**

**5.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively.

**5.2** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view.

### **6) Character, Plot and Setting**

**6.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 10%, capable by 30% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act.

**6.2** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated emerging by 30%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 10% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event.

**7.) Grammar, Mechanics & Spelling**

**7.1** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated satisfactory by 2%, capable by 40% and proficient by 58% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

**7.2** It was found that “**The Great fire of London**” essay was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the essay “**The Great fire of London**” by Samuel Pepys, Unit :10 from Std. 9 English Textbook (First language) of Gujarat State Board of school Textbook in a better way on Day two in comparison with Day one. As the frequencies and percentage on the second day of Orientation was found at higher points of the rubric, namely, Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient. These have been found to be greater than those on first day of Orientation. So, the orientation of students to components of Creative writing of poetry using the poem “The Great fire of London” has been found to be effective. So, it can be said that most of the students could identify different components of Creative writing on through the orientation programme.

**1.9 a - Orientation Non-fiction - “The story of my experiments with truth” by M. K. Gandhi**

	<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
--	-----------------	-----------------	---------------------	----------------	-------------------

<b>1. Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 1(2%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 10(20%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 10(20%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 29(58%)
	2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 25(50%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 25(50%)
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 4(8%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 10(20%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 10(20%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 26(52%)
	2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 15(30%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 15(30%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 20(40%)
	3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader.	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and

				10(20%)	reader. 12(24%)	engages the reader. 28(56%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 15(30%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 2(4%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 10(20%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 12(24%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 26(52%)

		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 5(10%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 25(50%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 1(2%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 20(40%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 29(58%)
6.	<b>Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 20(40%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures,	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 15(30%)

					expressions. 15(30%)	
		2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 25(50%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 25(50%)
7.	<b>Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 10(20%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 30(60%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 5(10%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 10(20%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 35(70%)

**1.9 – b The story of my experiments with truth – by M. K. Gandhi**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
1.	<b>Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 0(0%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed

					not all the three. 20(40%)	middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 30(60%)
		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 15(30%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 35(70%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 35(70%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 15(30%)
		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 10(20%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 20(40%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 20(40%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 10(20%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 10(20%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 30(60%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to	1. The writer has tried to use point of view	1. The writer has used the point of view	1. The writer has used the point of	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in

		the type of essay. 0(0%)	according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	according to the type of essay. 10(20%)	view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 5(10%)	an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 45(90%)
4.	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 40(80%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 5(10%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 10(20%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 35(70%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contain ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 0(0%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 30(60%)

<b>5. Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 20(40%)
	2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 15(30%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 35(70%)
<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 0(0%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 5(10%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 45(90%)
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 45(90%)

				know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	essay. 5(10%)	
7.	<b>Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 35(70%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 20(40%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 30(60%)

**Table 1.9 a and Table 1.9 b present the relative rating scenario of the students on Day 21 and Day 22 as follows:**

**1) Organization**

**1.1** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated emerging by 2%, satisfactory by 20% and capable by 20% and proficient by 58% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind.

**1.2** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on the second day the essay was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs.

**2) Ideas & Purpose**

**2.1** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated emerging by 8%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 52% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 70%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively.

**2.2** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30% and proficient by 40% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details in the poem.

**2.3** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 24%, and proficient by 56% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader.

### **3) Point of view/ voice**

**3.1** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 30% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay.

### **4) Word – choice, Sentence – structure & Paragraphs**

**4.1** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 20%, and proficient by 80% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer.

**4.2** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated emerging by 4%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 24% and proficient by 52% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way.

**4.3** It was found that **“The story of my experiments with truth”** essay was rated emerging by 4%, satisfactory by 40%, capable by 6% and proficient by 54% of the

students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details.

#### **5) Research Sources & Relevance of supporting facts & details**

**5.1** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 10% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively.

**5.2** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated satisfactory by 2%, capable by 40% and proficient by 58% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view.

#### **6) Character, Plot and Setting**

**6.1** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 30%, capable by 30% and proficient by 30% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act.

**6.2** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 10%, and proficient by 90% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event.

#### **7.) Grammar, Mechanics & Spelling**

**7.1** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20% and proficient by 60% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

**7.2** It was found that “**The story of my experiments with truth**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 20% and proficient by 70% of the students on the first day, whereas, on second day the essay was rated capable by 40%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative Writing in the autobiographical passage from “**The Story of my experiment with truth**” by M. K. Gandhi in a better way on Day two in comparison with Day one. As the frequencies and percentage on the second day of Orientation was found at higher points of the rubric, namely, Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient. These have been found to be greater than those on first day of Orientation. So, the orientation of students to components of Creative writing of poetry using the autobiographical passage from “**The Story of my experiment with truth**” has been found to be effective. So, it can be said that most of the students could identify different components of Creative writing on through the orientation programme.

### 1.10 a- Model Autobiography - “A Visit to Cambridge” by Firdaus Kanga

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 10(20%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 15(30%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 25(50%)	
	2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 20(40%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 12(24%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 18(36%)	
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 5(10%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 10(20%)	1. The writer uses developed ideas that support the topic. 25(50%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 10(20%)	

		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 10(20%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 12(24%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 28(56%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 10(20%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 15(30%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 25(50%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 15(30%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural.

						20(40%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 5(10%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 20(40%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 25(50%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 10(20%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 20(40%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 4(8%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 26(52%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 5(10%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 20(40%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 25(50%)

					20(40%)	
<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 10(20%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 20(40%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 20(40%)	
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 10(20%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 10(20%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 15(30%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 15(30%)	
<b>7. Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 20(40%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 15(30%)	
	2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling.	

		spellings. 0(0%)	0(0%)	spellings. 5(10%)	and spelling. 20(40%)	25(50%)
--	--	---------------------	-------	----------------------	--------------------------	---------

**1.11 b - Autobiography – THE MOST UNFORGETTABLE MOMENT OF MY LIFE composed by group of students :**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 0(0%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 25(50%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 25(50%)	
	2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 35(70%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 15(30%)	
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 25(50%)	1. The writer uses developed ideas that support the topic. 25(50%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 0(0%)	
	2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 20(40%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 25(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 5(10%)	

		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 15(30%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 30(60%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 5(10%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 25(50%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 35(70%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 10(20%)

		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 10(20%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 35(70%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 5(10%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 25(50%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 5(10%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 30(60%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 10(20%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 20(40%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 25(50%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 5(10%)

<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 15(30%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 30(60%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 5(10%)
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 10(20%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 35(70%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 5(10%)
<b>7. Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 25(50%)
	2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 20(40%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 30(60%)

**Table 1.10 a and 1.10 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model Autobiography and Autobiography composed in group:**

**1) Organization**

**1.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20% and capable by 30% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind.

**1.2** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated emerging by 40%, satisfactory by 24%, capable by 36% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs.

**2) Ideas & Purpose**

**2.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated emerging by 10%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 50%, and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 50%, and Capable by 50% of the students in terms of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively.

**2.2** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 24% and proficient by 56% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details.

**2.3** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 30%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of

strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader.

### **3) Point of view/ voice**

**3.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay.

### **4) Word – choice, Sentence – structure & Paragraphs**

**4.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 38%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 32% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer.

**4.2** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way.

**4.3** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details.

### **5) Research Sources & Relevance of supporting facts & details**

**5.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 8%, capable by 40% and proficient by 52% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by

20% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively.

**5.2** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view.

## **6) Character, Plot and Setting**

**6.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 30%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act.

**6.2** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event.

## **7.) Grammar, Mechanics & Spelling**

**7.1** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 30% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

**7.2** It was found that “**A Visit to Cambridge**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. Whereas the Autobiography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Autobiographical essay “A Visit to Cambridge” which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Autobiographical essay whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of Non-fiction at higher points like Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient in most of categories of rubric in the Autobiographical essay composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Autobiographical essay in small group.

**1.11 a - Model Biography – “The Kite Maker” by Ruskin Bond**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 5(10%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 20(40%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 25(50%)	
	2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 20(40%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 30(60%)	
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 24(48%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 26(52%)	

		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 20(40%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 5(10%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 25(50%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 10(20%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 20(40%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 20(40%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 25(50%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural.

						30(60%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 25(50%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 25(50%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 10(20%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 12(24%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 28(56%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 15(30%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view.	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 20(40%)

				15(30%)	view. 15(30%)	
<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 5(10%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 20(40%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 25(50%)	
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 12(24%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 18(36%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 20(40%)	
<b>7. Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 24(48%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 26(52%)	
	2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar,	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and	

	and spellings. 0(0%)	and spellings. 0(0%)	and spellings. 0(0%)	mechanics and spelling. 20(40%)	spelling. 30(60%)
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------

**1.11 b - Biography – SARDAR PATEL composed by group of students :**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 0(0%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 25(50%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 25(50%)	
	2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 5(10%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 25(50%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 20(40%)	
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 20(40%)	1. The writer uses developed ideas that support the topic. 25(50%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 5(10%)	
	2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 25(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 25(50%)	

		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 25(50%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 25(50%)
3.	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 10(20%)
4.	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 30(60%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 20(40%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex,	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 20(40%)

				incorrectly. 5(10%)	compound and simple. 25(50%)	
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 10(20%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 20(40%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 15(30%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 25(50%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 10(20%)
6.	<b>Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look

				behave and feel. 10(20%)	they look like, gestures, expressions. 30(60%)	and act. 10(20%)
		2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 40(80%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 10(20%)
7.	<b>Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 30(60%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 20(40%)

**Table 1.11 a and 1.11 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model Biography and Group Biography:**

**1) Organization**

**1.1** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated emerging by 6%, satisfactory by 4% and capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms

of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader's mind. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader's mind.

**1.2** It was found that **“The Kite Maker”** essay was rated satisfactory by 2%, capable by 40% and proficient by 58% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs.

## **2) Ideas & Purpose**

**2.1** It was found that **“The Kite Maker”** essay was rated capable by 48%, and proficient by 52% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 40%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 10% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively.

**2.2** It was found that **“The Kite Maker”** essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 10% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 70% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details.

**2.3** It was found that **“The Kite Maker”** essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader.

## **3) Point of view/ voice**

**3.1** It was found that **“The Kite Maker”** essay was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 30%, Capable by 50% and proficient by

20% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay.

#### **4) Word – choice, Sentence – structure & Paragraphs**

**4.1** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer.

**4.2** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way.

**4.3** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 24% and proficient by 56% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details.

#### **5) Research Sources & Relevance of supporting facts & details**

**5.1** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated emerging by 20%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively.

**5.2** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated emerging by 18%, satisfactory by 20%, capable by 30% and proficient by 32% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 30%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of

#### **6) Character, Plot and Setting**

**6.1** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated satisfactory by 52%, capable by 24% and proficient by 36% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act.

**6.2** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated satisfactory by 24%, capable by 36% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 60% and proficient by 20% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event.

### **7.) Grammar, Mechanics & Spelling**

**7.1** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated capable by 48% and proficient by 52% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

**7.2** It was found that “**The Kite Maker**” essay was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling. Whereas the biography composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Biographical essay “**The Kite Maker**” which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Biographical essay whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of Non-fiction at higher points like Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient in most of categories of rubric in the Biographical essay composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Biographical essay in small group.

**1.12 a - Model Travelogue - “Travelogue” by James Morris**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>		1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 5(10%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 20(40%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 25(50%)
		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 20(40%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 30(60%)
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>		1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 10(20%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 40(80%)
		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 25(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 25(50%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader.	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way.	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing

			0(0%)	clear to the reader. 10(20%)	Purpose is clear to the reader. 20(40%)	is very much clear and engages the reader. 20(40%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 15(30%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 15(30%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 20(40%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 15(30%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 15(30%)

		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 0(0%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 20(40%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 30(60%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to support point of view. 20(40%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 24(48%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 26(52%)
6.	<b>Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 10(20%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures,	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 25(50%)

					expressions. 15(30%)	
		2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 24(48%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 26(52%)
7.	<b>Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 20(40%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 30(60%)

**1.12 b - Travelogue – AKSHARDHAM TEMPLE - GANDHINAGAR  
composed by group of students :**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
1.	<b>Organization</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other.	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 0(0%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a

		0(0%)			ending but not all the three. 25(50%)	developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 25(50%)
		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 35(70%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 15(30%)
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>		1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 25(50%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 5(10%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 25(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 20(40%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 10(20%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 20(40%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 20(40%)
<b>3. Point of View / Voice</b>		1. The writer hasn't used point of view	1. The writer has tried to use point of	1. The writer has used the point of	1. The writer has used the	1. The writer has used the point of view

		according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 35(70%)	effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 15(30%)
4.	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 10(20%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 20(40%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 25(50%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 25(50%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 0(0%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 15(30%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 35(70%)

<b>5. Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 5(10%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 20(40%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 25(50%)
	2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 35(70%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 15(30%)
<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 5(10%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 0(0%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 30(60%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 20(40%)
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 25(50%)

				know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	essay. 25(50%)	
7.	<b>Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 25(50%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 25(50%)
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 5(10%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 25(50%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 20(40%)

**Table 1.12 a and 1.12 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model Travelogue and Travelogue composed in group:**

**1) Organization**

**1.1** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10% and capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 5% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind.

**1.2** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs.

**2) Ideas & Purpose**

**2.1** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated satisfactory by 2%, capable by 20%, and proficient by 78% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively.

**2.2** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details.

**2.3** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated satisfactory by 20%, capable by 40%, and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader.

### **3) Point of view/ voice**

**3.1** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 30%, and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay.

### **4) Word – choice, Sentence – structure & Paragraphs**

**4.1** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 10%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 20%, Capable by 40% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer.

**4.2** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated satisfactory by 40%, capable by 30% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students

was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way.

**4.3** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated satisfactory by 2%, capable by 40% and proficient by 58% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details.

#### **5) Research Sources & Relevance of supporting facts & details**

**5.1** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated satisfactory by 10%, capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 10%, Capable by 40% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively.

**5.2** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated capable by 48% and proficient by 52% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view.

#### **6) Character, Plot and Setting**

**6.1** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated satisfactory by 30%, capable by 10% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 60% and proficient by 40% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act.

**6.2** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated capable by 48% and proficient by 52% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event.

#### **7.) Grammar, Mechanics & Spelling**

**7.1** It was found that “**Travelogue**” essay was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50%

and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

**7.2** It was found that **“Travelogue”** essay was rated capable by 40% and proficient by 60% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. Whereas the travelogue composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model travelogue essay **“Travelogue”** which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Travelogue whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of Non-fiction at higher points like Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient in most of categories of rubric in the Travelogue essay composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Travelogue in small group.

**1.13 A - Model Review of a movie – “The Amazing Spider Man”**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>		1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 0(0%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 24(50%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 24(50%)
		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 0(0%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 24(50%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 24(50%)

<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 14(30%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 34(70%)
	2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 24(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 24(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 0(0%)
	3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 14(30%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 34(70%)
<b>3. Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 24(50%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 24(50%)
<b>4. Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create

		communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	in reader's mind. 0(0%)	mind, but lack variety and flair. 0(0%)	mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 24(50%)	image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural. 24(50%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 34(70%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 14(30%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 0(0%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 24(50%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 24(50%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 24(50%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 24(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and	2. The writer has used appropriate examples,	2. The writer has used appropriate	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate

		other details. 0(0%)	other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 12(25%)	examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 12(25%)	examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 24(50%)
<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 0(0%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 24(50%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 24(50%)	
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 14(30%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 34(70%)	
<b>7. Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 24(50%)	

					way. 24(50%)	
		2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. 0(0%)	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 24(50%)	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling. 24(50%)

**1.13 b - Review of movie- “ICE AGE” composed by group of students :**

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>1. Organization</b>		1. The writer hasn't written enough to say one way or the other. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is rough but workable. 0(0%)	1. Organization of the essay is in logical order. 0(0%)	1. The essay has either a strong lead, a developed middle or a satisfying ending but not all the three. 34(70%)	1. The essay has a strong lead that develops reader's interest, a developed middle and a satisfying ending that provides closure. 14(30%)
		2. The writer is aimless or disorganized and lacks direction. 0(0%)	2. The writer gets off topic once or twice. 0(0%)	2. The essay moves through the beginning, middle and end in a logical order. 24(50%)	2. The writer tries to drag the middle too long or the ending abrupt. 24(50%)	2. All paragraphs are in a logical order. 0(0%)
<b>2. Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>		1. The writer uses ideas which are not relevant to topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses only simple ideas, some of which are of topic. 0(0%)	1. The writer uses simple ideas that usually support the topic. 24(50%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic. 24(50%)	1. The writer uses well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. 0(0%)

		2. The writer has not used any strategy to express ideas. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is unclear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a conclusion that is not entirely clear. 0(0%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes some of the ideas presented. 24(50%)	2. The essay has a clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented. 24(50%)
		3. Purpose in the essay is unclear and confuses the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are rarely used to express ideas. Purpose is not clear to the reader. 0(0%)	3. Strategies are sometimes employed throughout. Purpose is somewhat clear to the reader. 12(25%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an effective way. Purpose is clear to the reader. 24(50%)	3. Strategies are employed to express ideas in an interesting way. Purpose of the writing is very much clear and engages the reader. 12(25%)
<b>3.</b>	<b>Point of View / Voice</b>	1. The writer hasn't used point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has tried to use point of view according to the type of essay but at some place it seems unclear and confusing. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view according to the type of essay. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used the point of view in somewhat effective way according to the type of essay. 24(50%)	1. The writer has used the point of view effectively in an interesting way according to the type of essay and engages the reader. 24(50%)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Word – choice, Sentence – structure &amp; Paragraphs</b>	1. The writer has used very limited vocabulary which doesn't communicate strongly and fails to capture reader's interest. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used a limited vocabulary and tried to create interest in reader's mind. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words that create image in reader's mind, but lack variety and flair. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used vivid words to create image in reader's mind, but occasionally the words are used inaccurately. 34(70%)	1. The writer has used vivid words in an interesting and effective way to create image in reader's mind and choice of words and placement of words is accurate and natural.

						14(30%)
		2. The writer has used incorrect and incomplete sentence structure. 0(0%)	2. The writer has tried to use simple sentence structures. 0(0%)	2. The writer has attempted to use a variety of sentence structures but some are used incorrectly. 24(50%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures effectively – complex, compound and simple. 24(50%)	2. The writer has used a variety of sentence structures in an artistic way. 0(0%)
		3. Paragraphs are written haphazardly and confuse the reader as they don't connect ideas and details logically. 0(0%)	3. Paragraphs contains ideas and details that are connected but fail at some places. 0(0%)	3. The essay includes ideas and details that are somewhat connected within paragraphs. 0(0%)	3. The essay has paragraphs; each contains ideas and details that are logically linked effectively. 34(70%)	3. The essay has paragraphs that are logically linked masterfully to connect ideas and details. 14(30%)
5.	<b>Research Sources &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	1. The writer has not used any information from any sources and based only on imagination. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on personal knowledge. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information mostly on a single source. 0(0%)	1. The writer has used information based on both personal knowledge and other resources. 24(50%)	1. The writer has used information from a variety of sources, effectively. 24(50%)
		2. The writer has not used any example, reasons and other details. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used examples, reasons and other evidences which are somewhat lacking or inappropriate. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidences to somewhat support point of view. 0(0%)	2. The writer has used appropriate examples, reasons and other evidence effectively to support point of view. 24(50%)	2. The writer has used clearly appropriate examples, reasons masterfully to support point of view. 24(50%)

					24(50%)	
<b>6. Character, Plot and Setting</b>	1. The writer hasn't written enough to judge the characters. 0(0%)	1. The writer has left significant characters out. 0(0%)	1. The writer has told who is the character, their names and ages but not shown how they behave and feel. 0(0%)	1. The writer has created characters by describing who they are, what they look like, gestures, expressions. 34(70%)	1. The writer has created complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. 14(30%)	
	2. The writer has not tried to develop plot and setting in a proper way in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has focused on more than one event, none of which has enough to give the essay a clear focus. 0(0%)	2. The writer has one main event but also includes less important events that don't help readers to know which one is important in the essay. 0(0%)	2. The writer has told about one specific event in detail but it isn't clear why it is important to the type of essay. 24(50%)	2. The writer has given details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. 24(50%)	
<b>7. Grammar, Mechanics &amp; Spelling</b>	1. Numerous problems with grammar, mechanics and spelling. 0(0%)	1. The writer has made frequent errors which are distracting but do not interfere with the meaning. 0(0%)	1. The writer has generally used correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. 0(0%)	1. Mechanics are good. Errors may be from taking risks, trying to say things in a new and unusual way. 24(50%)	1. The writer has used correct grammar punctuation and spelling. 24(50%)	
	2. The writer has used inaccurate grammar, mechanics and	2. The writer has limited accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.	2. The writer has some accuracy in grammar, mechanics and	2. The writer has general accuracy in grammar, mechanics	2. The writer has consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spelling.	

		spellings. 0(0%)	0(0%)	spellings. 0(0%)	and spelling. 14(30%)	34(70%)
--	--	---------------------	-------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------

**Table 1.13 a and 1.13 b present the relative rating scenario of the students of Model Review of Movie and Review of Movie composed in group:**

### **1) Organization**

**1.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind. Whereas the review of movie – **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of organization of the essay that has a strong lead, developed middle and a satisfying ending to create interest in reader’s mind.

**1.2** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs. Whereas the review of movie – **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 50%, and Capable by 50% of the students in terms of logical order of all paragraphs.

### **2) Ideas & Purpose**

**2.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Emerging by 10%, Satisfactory by 50%, and Capable by 50% of the students in terms of use of well developed ideas that support the topic effectively.

**2.2** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated satisfactory by 50%, and capable by 50% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of clear conclusion that summarizes all the ideas presented in the essay of sensory details.

**2.3** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 30%, and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage

reader. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 25%, Capable by 50% and proficient by 25% of the students in terms of use of strategies to express ideas in an interesting way and purpose of the writing to engage reader.

### **3) Point of view/ voice**

**3.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of the point of view by writer in an interesting way according to the type of essay.

### **4) Word – choice, Sentence – structure & Paragraphs**

**4.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50%, and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer. Whereas the review of movie - **ICE AGE** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of vivid words to create image in reader’s mind and choice and placement of words by writer.

**4.2** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Satisfactory by 50%, and Capable by 50% of the students in terms of use of variety of sentence-structures in an artistic way.

**4.3** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use of paragraphs that are logically linked to connect ideas and details.

### **5) Research Sources & Relevance of supporting facts & details**

**5.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and

proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of information from a variety of sources effectively.

**5.2** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated satisfactory by 25%, capable by 25% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of clearly appropriate examples, reasons to support point of view.

#### **6) Character, Plot and Setting**

**6.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 70% and proficient by 30% of the students in terms of use complex characters by showing them in action, describing how they look and act.

**6.2** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of details about one exciting, sad, funny or unusual event.

#### **7.) Grammar, Mechanics & Spelling**

**7.1** It was found that Model Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of correct grammar punctuation and spelling.

**7.2** It was found that Review of movie **“The Amazing Spider Man”** was rated capable by 50% and proficient by 50% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings. Whereas the review of movie - **“ICE AGE”** composed by a group of students was rated Capable by 30% and proficient by 70% of the students in terms of use of consistent accuracy in grammar, mechanics and spellings.

It was found that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Review of movie “**The Amazing Spider Man**” which indicates that the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing in the Model Review of movie whereas the students were able to identify various components of Creative writing of Non-fiction at higher points like Satisfactory, Capable and Proficient in most of categories of rubric in the Review of movie - “**ICE AGE**” composed by a group of students which indicates the students were able to compose Review of movie in small group.

### 4.3 Analysis and interpretation of Poems composed by students individually

**Objective 5** - To study the enhancement of creative writing ability of learners through participatory approach in

- a) Poetry, and
- b) Essays.

#### 2.1 Diamante poem – DAY & NIGHT

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\bar{x}$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	21	64	115	0	200	104.34	*
		0	0	30	100	70	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	21	94	215	70	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	60	90	0	150	60	*
		0	0	20	90	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	80	180	40	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	20	110	115	5	250	57.15	*
		0	0	55	125	20	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	165	240	25	450		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	15	40	45	0	100	36.69	*
		0	0	30	50	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	70	95	20	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	17.77	*
		65	35	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	130	70	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.1. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value =13.28 at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

**2.2 Diamante poem – MONEY & DOLLAR**

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	34	81	85	0	200	216.31	*
		0	0	5	80	115	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	34	86	165	115	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	5	50	95	0	150	134.72	*
		0	0	5	60	85	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	55	155	85	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	15	110	110	15	250	125.68	*
		0	0	40	95	115	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	150	205	130	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	5	45	45	5	100	10.29	**
		0	0	40	45	15	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	85	90	20	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	20	60	20	0	0	100	9.91	**
		10	35	55	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	30	95	75	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.2. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value =13.28 at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry except 4. Interest and 5. Figures of speech are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 4. Interest and 5. Figures of speech are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

**2.3 Diamante poem – SWEET & SOUR**

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	10	85	105	0	200	225	*
		0	0	0	75	125	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	85	180	125	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	30	50	70	0	150	183.33	*
		0	0	0	50	100	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	50	120	100	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	45	100	105	0	250	162.1	*
		0	0	60	85	105	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	160	190	105	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	5	45	50	0	100	105.26	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	45	95	55	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	80	20	0	0	0	100	13.33	*
		40	20	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	120	40	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.3. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value =**13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

#### 2.4 Diamante poem – KIDS VS. TEACHERS

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	25	50	90	35	200	44.33	*
		0	0	25	110	65	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	75	200	100	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	20	50	80	0	150	112.48	*
		0	0	20	55	75	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	70	135	75	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	20	85	145	0	250	200.59	*
		0	0	25	90	135	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	110	235	135	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	10	35	55	0	100	99.33	*
		0	0	15	20	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	50	75	65	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	13.27	**
		30	30	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	95	65	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.4. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value =**13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry except 5 – figures of speech , are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level

of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 5. Figures of speech is greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.5 Diamante poem – SUN & MOON

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	24	86	90	0	200	153.11	*
		0	0	25	80	95	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	24	111	170	95	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	23	57	70	0	150	117.57	*
		0	0	20	55	75	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	23	77	125	75	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	105	110	35	250	48.01	*
		0	0	55	95	100	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	160	205	135	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	5	30	55	10	100	67.15	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	30	100	65	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	12.53	**
		40	60	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	105	95	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

### Table 2.5. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry

Table value =13.28 at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry except 5 – figures of speech, are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 5. Figures of speech is greater than the

table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.6 Diamante poem – WINTER & SUMMER

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	5	90	105	0	200	218.37	*
		0	0	0	80	120	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	90	185	120	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	35	55	60	0	150	119.52	*
		0	0	15	75	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	70	135	60	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	15	90	145	0	250	205.44	*
		0	0	30	79	141	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	120	224	141	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	5	45	50	0	100	93.11	*
		0	0	5	40	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	50	90	55	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	60	40	0	0	0	100	20	*
		20	40	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	80	80	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.6. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention

observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.7 Diamante poem – WATER & LAND

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	10	75	115	0	200	201.17	*
		0	0	15	55	130	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	90	170	130	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	10	60	80	0	150	169.62	*
		0	0	0	55	95	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	60	135	95	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	20	90	140	0	250	230.9	*
		0	0	20	80	150	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	110	220	150	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	5	45	50	0	100	106.38	*
		0	0	0	44	56	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	45	94	56	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	75	25	0	0	0	100	18.75	*
		45	55	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	120	80	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.7. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.8 Diamante poem – LIGHT & DARK

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	9	85	106	0	200	224.3	*
		0	0	0	75	125	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	9	85	181	125	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	25	30	95	0	150	152.9	*
		0	0	0	60	90	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	30	155	90	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	50	60	135	5	250	239.14	*
		0	0	5	95	150	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	230	155	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	20	30	50	0	100	103.33	*
		0	0	10	25	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	40	75	65	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	60	40	0	0	0	100	20	*
		20	40	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	80	80	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.8. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.9 Diamante poem – DREAMS & REALITY

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	15	75	110	0	200	190.17	*
		0	0	20	55	125	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	95	165	125	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	20	45	85	0	150	135.81	*
		0	0	20	40	90	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	65	125	90	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	35	70	145	0	250	252.86	*
		0	0	15	75	160	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	85	220	160	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	10	40	50	0	100	117.64	*
		0	0	0	35	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	40	85	65	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	60	20	20	0	0	100	10.66	**
		40	40	20	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	100	60	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.9. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components except 5 – figures of speech, are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 5. Figures of speech is greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.10 Diamante poem – BIG & LITTLE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	75	90	35	0	200	263.01	*
		0	0	15	55	130	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	75	105	90	130	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	65	85	0	0	150	235.23	*
		0	0	20	30	100	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	105	30	100	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	45	115	90	0	250	256.99	*
		0	0	20	85	145	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	135	175	145	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	10	65	25	0	100	141.66	*
		0	0	0	35	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	65	60	65	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	12.53	**
		40	60	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	105	60	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.10. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components except 5 – figures of speech, are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 5. Figures of speech is greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.11 Acrostic - HARRY

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	45	120	35	0	0	200	40.31	*
		10	110	80	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	55	230	115	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	75	75	0	0	0	150	155.17	*
		0	70	80	0	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	75	145	80	0	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	80	160	10	0	0	250	159.21	*
		0	145	105	0	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	80	305	115	0	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	15	45	40	0	0	100	94.08	*
		80	20	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	95	65	40	0	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	90	10	0	0	0	100	17.92	*
		65	35	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	155	45	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.11. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.12 Acrostic - DIVYA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	35	145	20	0	0	200	110.67	*
		0	90	105	5	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	35	235	125	5	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	45	105	0	0	0	150	139.41	*
		0	65	85	0	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	45	170	85	0	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	65	165	20	0	0	250	167.85	*
		0	110	115	25	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	65	275	135	25	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	25	70	5	0	0	100	105.98	*
		0	26	50	24	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	25	96	55	24	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	60	20	20	0	0	100	22	*
		20	30	50	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	80	50	70	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.12. 2 × 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.13 Acrostic - HET

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	56	120	24	0	0	200	145.73	*
		0	70	100	30	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	56	190	124	30	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	40	105	5	0	0	150	128.52	*
		0	60	75	15	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	40	165	80	15	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	72	119	39	20	0	250	128.03	*
		0	85	115	50	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	72	204	154	70	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	30	35	35	0	0	100	96.94	*
		0	5	55	40	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	30	40	90	40	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	64.15	*
		20	40	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	85	75	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.13. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.14 Acrostic - DIV

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	115	85	0	0	200	200.97	*
		0	0	120	80	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	115	205	80	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	90	45	15	0	150	132	*
		0	0	90	60	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	135	75	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	121	119	10	0	250	179.176	*
		0	5	150	95	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	126	269	105	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	60	30	10	0	100	86.78	*
		0	0	65	35	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	95	45	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	55	45	0	0	0	100	22.66	*
		40	40	20	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	95	85	20	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.14. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.15 Acrostic - DHARTI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	95	75	30	0	200	100.114	*
		0	10	105	85	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	105	180	115	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	85	60	5	0	150	137.53	*
		0	0	90	60	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	85	150	65	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	145	85	20	0	250	196.181	*
		0	15	95	140	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	160	180	160	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	75	20	5	0	100	88.53	*
		0	10	55	35	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	85	75	40	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	75	25	0	0	0	100	51.20	*
		40	20	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	115	45	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.15. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.16 Acrostic - BHAVANA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	25	110	65	0	0	200	167.55	*
		0	25	90	85	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	25	135	155	85	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	15	90	45	0	0	150	90.83	*
		0	25	120	5	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	15	115	165	5	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	40	140	70	0	0	250	195.11	*
		0	35	155	60	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	40	175	225	60	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	15	40	45	0	0	100	61.63	*
		0	10	65	25	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	15	50	110	25	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	55	20	15	10	0	100	23.41	*
		15	25	35	25	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	70	45	50	35	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.16. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.17 Acrostic - DAMINI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	100	80	20	0	200	149.28	*
		0	0	110	90	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	100	190	110	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	45	85	20	0	150	77.46	*
		0	0	75	75	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	160	95	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	115	120	15	0	250	208.27	*
		0	5	100	145	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	120	220	160	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	50	40	10	0	100	72	*
		0	0	60	40	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	100	50	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	60	40	0	0	0	100	115.29	*
		0	45	55	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	60	85	55	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.17. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.18 Acrostic - SAGAR

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	40	110	50	0	0	200	247.53	*
		0	5	100	95	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	40	115	150	95	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	10	90	50	0	0	150	183.33	*
		0	0	70	80	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	10	90	120	80	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	35	155	60	0	0	250	326.97	*
		0	0	155	95	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	35	155	215	95	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	15	55	30	0	0	100	135.38	*
		0	0	35	65	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	15	55	65	65	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	41.43	*
		20	80	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	85	115	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.18. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.19 Acrostic - DEEP

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	70	125	5	0	0	200	343.91	*
		0	10	100	90	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	70	135	105	90	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	15	80	55	0	0	150	87.25	*
		0	25	90	35	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	15	105	145	35	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	40	145	65	0	250	130.99	*
		0	145	105	0	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	185	250	65	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	10	55	35	0	0	100	55.77	*
		0	20	55	25	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	75	90	25	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	60	40	0	0	0	100	30.46	*
		15	25	25	35	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	75	65	25	35	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.19. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.20 Acrostic - PRITHVI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	110	90	0	200	15.9	*
		0	0	75	120	5	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	185	210	5	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	55	95	0	150	17.36	*
		0	0	40	95	15	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	95	190	15	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	80	150	20	250	37.24	*
		0	0	40	145	65	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	120	295	85	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	40	60	0	100	48	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	50	120	30	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	25	75	0	0	0	100	60.71	*
		0	65	35	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	25	140	35	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.20. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.21 Acrostic - PRIYA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	120	80	0	0	0	200	30.42	*
		65	135	0	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	185	215	0	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	86	64	0	0	0	150	12.85	**
		55	95	0	0	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	141	159	0	0	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	158	92	0	0	0	250	98.02	*
		55	170	25	0	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	213	262	25	0	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	80	20	0	0	0	100	60.55	*
		26	64	10	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	106	84	10	0	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	85	15	0	0	0	100	15.67	*
		60	40	0	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	145	55	0	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.21. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry except 2. Sensitivity, are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 2. Sensitivity is greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.22 Acrostic - RAHUL

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	20	140	40	0	0	200	57.75	*
		0	95	105	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	20	235	145	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	85	65	0	0	150	23.10	*
		0	50	90	10	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	135	155	10	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	20	150	80	0	0	250	103.09	*
		0	65	165	20	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	20	215	245	20	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	10	65	25	0	0	100	93.11	*
		0	10	65	25	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	75	90	25	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	75	25	0	0	0	100	33.50	*
		20	35	45	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	95	60	45	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.22. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.23 Acrostic - HIRAL

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	25	120	55	0	0	200	36.66	*
		0	105	95	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	25	225	150	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	30	70	50	0	0	150	58.33	*
		0	35	100	15	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	30	105	150	15	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	30	150	70	0	0	250	187.21	*
		0	95	135	20	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	30	245	205	20	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	25	70	5	0	0	100	146.42	*
		0	10	65	25	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	25	80	70	25	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	69.87	*
		10	75	15	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	75	110	15	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.23. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.24 Acrostic - JAYDEEP

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	90	85	25	0	200	22.64	*
		0	45	120	35	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	135	205	60	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	65	75	10	0	150	80.66	*
		0	10	75	65	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	75	150	75	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	35	140	75	0	250	36.90	*
		0	25	100	100	25	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	240	175	25	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	20	56	24	0	100	29.47	*
		0	0	50	50	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	106	74	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	80.49	*
		20	25	25	30	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	85	60	25	30	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.24. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.25 Acrostic - KHUSHI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	30	105	65	0	200	45.99	*
		0	0	85	115	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	190	180	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	20	75	55	0	150	27.14	*
		0	0	65	85	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	140	140	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	35	165	50	0	250	82.98	*
		0	0	115	135	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	280	185	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	15	50	35	0	100	32.09	*
		0	0	35	55	10	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	85	90	10	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	55	45	0	0	0	100	63.29	*
		10	60	30	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	65	105	30	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.25. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.26 Acrostic - KOMAL

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	30	120	50	0	0	200	106.667	*
		0	60	100	40	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	30	180	150	40	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	15	75	60	0	0	150	92.84	*
		0	20	90	40	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	15	95	150	40	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	25	160	65	0	0	250	188.46	*
		0	45	125	80	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	25	205	190	80	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	10	65	25	0	0	100	107.74	*
		0	5	70	25	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	70	95	25	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	85	15	0	0	100	91.60	*
		0	20	40	40	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	105	55	40	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.26. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.27 Acrostic - KREENA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	100	100	0	0	200	185.03	*
		0	5	96	99	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	105	196	99	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	5	71	74	0	0	150	133.6	*
		0	0	95	55	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	5	71	169	55	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	165	85	0	0	250	325.14	*
		0	0	90	160	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	165	175	160	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	40	60	0	0	100	97.14	*
		0	0	45	55	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	105	55	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	35	65	0	0	0	100	109	*
		0	35	65	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	35	100	65	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.27. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.28 Acrostic - MILI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	110	80	10	0	0	200	70.35	*
		30	150	20	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	140	230	30	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	90	60	0	0	0	150	48.54	*
		40	85	25	0	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	130	145	25	0	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	170	75	5	0	0	250	174.77	*
		35	130	85	0	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	205	205	90	0	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	70	25	5	0	0	100	50.2	*
		25	35	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	95	60	45	0	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	85	15	0	0	0	100	51.60	*
		20	40	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	105	55	40	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.28. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.29 Acrostic - CHIRAGH

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	105	80	15	0	0	200	154.87	*
		0	125	75	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	105	205	90	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	95	50	5	0	0	150	141.109	*
		0	65	66	0	0	131		
	<b>Total</b>	95	115	71	0	0	281		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	140	95	15	0	0	250	234.336	*
		0	120	125	5	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	140	215	140	5	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	25	35	40	0	0	100	30.95	*
		0	35	65	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	25	70	105	0	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	87.91	*
		20	20	30	30	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	85	55	30	30	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.29. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.30 Acrostic - MANAN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	120	80	0	0	0	200	204.878	*
		0	125	75	0	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	120	205	75	0	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	90	60	0	0	0	150	157.85	*
		0	80	65	5	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	90	140	65	5	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	145	105	0	0	0	250	246.41	*
		0	160	90	0	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	145	265	90	0	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	70	30	0	0	0	100	120	*
		0	60	40	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	70	90	40	0	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	65	35	0	0	0	100	117.64	*
		0	50	50	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	65	85	50	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.30. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.31 Limerick – THERE ONCE WAS A CAT FROM NEWYORK

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	95	100	5	0	200	162.99	*
		0	0	120	80	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	95	220	85	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	85	60	5	0	150	137.58	*
		0	0	90	60	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	85	150	65	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	155	95	0	0	250	235.25	*
		0	0	120	80	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	155	215	80	0	450		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	70	30	0	0	100	117.89	*
		0	0	65	35	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	95	35	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	20	40	30	10	0	100	54.66	*
		0	20	30	40	10	100		
	<b>Total</b>	20	60	60	50	10	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.31. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.32 Limerick – THERE ONCE WAS A GIRL NAMED MORGAN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	115	85	0	200	200.97	*
		0	0	0	120	80	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	115	205	80	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	90	60	0	150	152.9	*
		0	0	0	95	55	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	90	155	55	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	5	130	115	0	250	228.92	*
		0	0	0	165	85	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	130	280	85	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	41.25	*
		0	0	25	45	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	80	90	30	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.32. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.33 Limerick – I ONCE MET A MAN FROM GREECE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	105	95	0	200	187.9	*
		0	0	0	120	80	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	105	215	80	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	100	50	0	150	176.92	*
		0	0	0	80	70	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	100	130	70	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	10	135	105	0	250	246.41	*
		0	0	0	160	90	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	135	265	90	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	100.95	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	105	35	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	101	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	100	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.33. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.34 Limerick - THERE ONCE WAS A HUNTER NAMED PAUL

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	120	80	0	200	195.53	*
		0	0	5	110	85	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	125	190	85	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	90	60	0	150	150	*
		0	0	0	100	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	90	160	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	126	124	0	250	228.46	*
		0	0	0	150	100	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	126	274	100	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	116.97	*
		0	0	0	51	49	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	86	49	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	121.25	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	80	55	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.34. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.35 Limerick – THERE ONCE WAS A MAN FROM JAPAN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	120	80	0	200	211.28	*
		0	0	0	115	85	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	120	195	85	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	85	65	0	150	160.71	*
		0	0	0	75	75	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	85	140	75	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	150	100	0	250	266.66	*
		0	0	0	140	110	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	150	240	110	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	100.95	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	105	35	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	110	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	90	55	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.35. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.36 Free verse - LOVE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	100	95	5	0	200	177.52	*
		0	0	110	65	25	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	100	205	70	25	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	70	70	10	0	150	110.5	*
		0	0	90	40	20	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	160	50	20	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	105	125	20	0	250	287.14	*
		0	0	50	140	60	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	105	175	160	60	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	125.33	*
		0	0	40	60	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	75	60	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	182.5	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	40	50	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.36. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.37 Free verse – EACH TIME

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	5	100	95	0	200	143.33	*
		0	0	20	95	85	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	120	190	85	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	90	60	0	150	152.9	*
		0	0	0	95	55	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	90	155	55	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	10	135	105	0	250	193.24	*
		0	0	0	160	40	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	135	265	40	450		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	100.95	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	105	35	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	114.44	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	90	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.37. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.38 Free verse – TIME IS EVERYTHING

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	115	85	0	200	204.5	*
		0	0	0	115	85	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	115	200	85	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	90	60	0	150	155.36	*
		0	0	0	91	59	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	90	151	59	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	165	85	0	250	277.95	*
		0	0	0	160	90	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	165	245	90	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	101	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	100	45	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	50	50	0	100	86.95	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	50	115	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.38. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

### 2.39 Free verse – MY HOUSE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	120	80	0	200	208	*
		0	0	0	120	80	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	120	200	80	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	0	90	60	0	150	150	*
		0	0	0	100	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	90	160	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	165	85	0	250	296.96	*
		0	0	0	126	124	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	165	211	124	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	93.63	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	110	35	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	100.95	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	105	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

#### **Table 2.39. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.40 free verse – A NEW EXPERIENCE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	115	85	0	0	200	220.55	*
		0	0	95	75	30	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	115	180	75	30	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	175.2	*
		0	0	65	75	10	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	125	75	10	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	151	99	0	0	250	279.01	*
		0	0	125	125	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	151	224	125	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	5	45	50	0	0	100	91.74	*
		0	0	59	41	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	5	45	109	41	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	20	60	20	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	20	60	20	65	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.40. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.41 Free verse – I KNOW NOT HOW TO THANK YOU

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	120	80	0	0	200	400	*
		0	0	0	106	94	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	120	80	106	94	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	300	*
		0	0	0	85	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	60	85	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	155	95	0	0	250	500	*
		0	0	0	141	109	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	155	95	141	109	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	55	45	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	45	55	45	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	141.66	*
		0	0	25	55	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	60	55	20	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.41. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.42 Free verse – ALWAYS THERE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	20	90	90	0	200	194.28	*
		0	0	0	120	80	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	90	210	80	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	45	60	45	0	150	175.86	*
		0	0	0	100	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	60	145	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	0	140	110	0	250	239.25	*
		0	0	0	160	90	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	140	270	90	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	25	55	20	0	100	38.09	*
		0	0	50	50	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	105	70	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.42. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.43 Free verse - SEASONS

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	70	90	40	0	200	287.05	*
		0	0	0	96	104	200		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	90	136	104	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	15	70	65	0	150	156.55	*
		0	0	0	80	70	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	70	145	70	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	5	140	105	0	250	248.96	*
		0	0	0	156	94	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	140	261	94	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	10	45	45	0	100	101	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	45	100	45	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	0	25	55	20	0	100	34.61	*
		0	0	55	45	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	110	65	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.43. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.44 Free verse – I AM THE RAINBOW

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	10	100	90	0	0	200	198.04	*
		0	0	115	85	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	10	100	205	85	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	0	80	65	5	0	150	141.12	*
		0	0	76	74	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	80	141	79	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	0	131	119	0	0	250	238.56	*
		0	0	145	95	10	250		
	<b>Total</b>	0	131	264	95	10	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	114.44	*
		0	0	55	45	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	90	45	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	10	65	25	0	0	100	94.37	*
		0	20	20	40	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	85	45	40	20	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.44. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

## 2.45 Free verse – I USED TO

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	120	80	0	0	0	200	400	*
		0	0	110	90	0	200		
	<b>Total</b>	120	80	110	90	0	400		
<b>2</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	90	60	0	0	0	150	300	*
		0	0	100	50	0	150		
	<b>Total</b>	90	60	100	50	0	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Originality &amp; Richness in imagination</b>	115	110	25	0	0	250	413.88	*
		0	0	155	95	0	250		
	<b>Total</b>	115	110	180	95	0	500		
<b>4</b>	<b>Interest</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	100	*
		0	0	50	50	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	100	50	0	200		
<b>5</b>	<b>Figures of speech</b>	50	50	0	0	0	100	100	*
		0	50	50	0	0	100		
	<b>Total</b>	50	100	50	0	0	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

### **Table 2.45. 2 x 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Poetry**

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of poetry are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of poetry is rejected.

#### 4.4 Analysis and interpretation of Non-fiction essays composed by students individually

##### 2.46 Autobiography – MY WORST DAY AT SCHOOL EVER

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	40	60	0	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	48	52	100		
	<b>Total</b>	40	60	0	48	52	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	76	69	5	0	0	150	300	*
		0	0	0	100	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	76	69	5	100	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	25	25	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	25	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	30	80	40	0	0	150	246.66	*
		0	0	20	70	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	30	80	60	70	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	51	49	0	0	100	133.78	*
		0	0	25	50	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	51	74	50	25	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	30	50	20	0	0	100	144.61	*
		0	0	45	45	10	100		
	<b>Total</b>	30	50	65	45	10	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	10	65	25	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	60	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	65	25	60	40	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

Table 2.46. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### 2.47 Autobiography- THE BEST DAY OF MY LIFE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	15	65	20	0	0	100	173.33	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	15	65	30	60	30	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	89	61	0	0	150	265.63	*
		0	0	10	95	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	89	71	95	45	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	25	25	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	25	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	85	65	0	0	150	238.82	*
		0	0	20	95	35	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	85	85	95	35	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	5	65	30	0	0	100	182.85	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	5	65	35	50	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	50	40	10	0	100	149.49	*
		0	0	5	45	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	45	55	50	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	60	40	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	40	65	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.47. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### 2.48 Autobiography – MY NAME

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	55	45	0	0	100	155	*
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	60	65	20	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	76	74	0	0	150	237.02	*
		0	0	20	90	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	76	94	90	40	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	30	20	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	20	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	252	*
		0	0	15	95	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	75	95	40	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	65	20	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	182.5	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	40	50	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	166.15	*
		0	0	10	65	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	65	65	25	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.48. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### 2.49 Autobiography – WHEN I WAS LITTLE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	35	65	0	0	100	181.42	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	70	50	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	45	105	0	0	150	232.8	*
		0	0	20	95	35	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	125	95	35	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	40	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	40	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-</b>	0	70	80	0	0	150	264.44	*

	<b>structure &amp; paragraphs</b>								
		0	0	10	95	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	90	95	45	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	25	55	20	0	100	126.28	*
		0	0	5	45	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	60	65	50	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	10	65	25	0	100	127.77	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	65	90	35	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	30	70	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	70	65	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.49. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.50 Autobiography – MY EDUCATION

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	166.66	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	60	60	30	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	35	105	10	0	150	244.44	*

		0	0	5	100	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	110	110	45	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	40	10	0	50	68.88	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	40	45	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	45	95	10	0	150	244.63	*
		0	0	5	100	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	100	110	45	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	35	40	25	0	100	115.55	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	45	75	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	165.71	*
		0	0	0	60	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	70	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	60	40	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	35	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	40	35	65	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.50. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.51 Autobiography – MY FIRST

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	55	45	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	40	60	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	45	40	60	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	40	110	0	0	150	247.2	*
		0	0	15	55	80	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	125	55	80	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	40	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	15	35	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	40	15	35	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	50	100	0	0	150	280.95	*
		0	0	5	55	90	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	105	55	90	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	15	40	45	0	100	92.22	*
		0	0	5	45	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	45	90	50	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	10	65	25	0	100	141.66	*
		0	0	0	35	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	65	60	65	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	135.38	*
		0	0	0	30	70	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	65	70	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.51. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.52 Autobiography – MY ROLE MODEL

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	60	40	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	49	51	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	40	49	51	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	281.53	*
		0	0	5	75	70	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	65	75	70	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	25	25	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	15	35	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	25	15	35	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	300	*
		0	0	0	90	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	60	90	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	55	45	0	0	100	182	*
		0	0	5	45	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	50	45	50	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	182.5	*
		0	0	5	55	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	40	55	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	35	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	50	35	65	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.52. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.53 Autobiography – FAMILY & FRIENDS

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	60	40	0	0	100	182.22	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	45	50	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	229.41	*
		0	0	25	75	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	85	75	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	50	0	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	5	35	10	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	5	35	10	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	4	81	65	0	0	150	265.33	*
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	4	81	75	75	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	50	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	35	50	50	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	35	45	55	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	60	40	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	35	65	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	40	35	65	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.53. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### 2.54 Autobiography – THE WRATH OF NATURE

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	40	15	0	100	120	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	50	75	30	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	60	60	30	0	150	164.72	*
		0	0	15	80	55	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	75	110	55	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	20	10	0	50	68.88	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	20	45	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	40	75	25	10	150	139.39	*
		0	0	15	85	50	150		

	<b>Total</b>	0	40	90	110	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	74.33	*
		0	0	10	65	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	75	100	25	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	20	65	15	0	100	92.66	*
		0	0	20	50	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	85	65	30	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	20	65	15	0	100	152.85	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	65	70	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.54. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.55 Autobiography – HOME IN PETLAD

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	55	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	60	85	5	0	150	281.33	*
		0	0	0	70	80	150		

	<b>Total</b>	0	60	85	75	80	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	15	35	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	15	35	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	60	90	0	0	150	281.05	*
		0	0	5	95	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	95	95	50	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	152.85	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	70	45	40	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	152.85	*
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	70	65	20	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	25	55	20	0	100	140	*
		0	0	0	60	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	55	80	40	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.55. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.56 Autobiography – A Proud Pathan

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	65	35	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	80	70	0	0	150	281.33	*
		0	0	5	80	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	80	75	80	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	30	10	0	50	68.88	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	30	45	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	70	70	10	0	150	215.58	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	85	80	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	35	65	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	65	55	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	40	50	10	0	100	121.84	*
		0	0	15	40	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	75	50	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	40	60	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	60	45	55	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.59. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.57 Autobiography – MY ROLE MODEL – MY MOTHER

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	166.15	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	65	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	70	80	0	0	150	223.8	*
		0	0	25	75	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	105	75	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	20	30	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	20	30	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	70	70	10	0	150	264	*
		0	0	0	90	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	70	100	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	181.81	*
		0	0	5	45	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	55	45	50	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	25	65	10	0	100	116.96	*
		0	0	15	60	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	80	70	25	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	25	75	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	75	45	55	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.63. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.58 Biography – AMITABH BACHCHAN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	70	30	0	0	100	182.85	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	35	50	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	7	79	64	0	0	150	239.04	*
		0	0	20	90	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	7	79	84	90	40	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	5	25	20	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	5	25	20	30	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	90	60	0	0	150	300	*
		0	0	0	100	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	90	60	100	50	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	56	44	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	56	44	55	45	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	25	75	0	0	100	150	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	90	45	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	50	65	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.56. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.59 Biography – SHRI RAMKRISHNA PARAMHANSA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	55	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	50	100	0	0	150	247.82	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	115	70	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	40	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	40	30	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-</b>	0	40	95	15	0	150	198.18	*

	<b>structure &amp; paragraphs</b>								
		0	0	15	75	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	110	90	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	55	45	0	0	100	155	*
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	60	65	20	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	10	70	20	0	100	109.61	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	80	65	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	20	65	15	0	100	151.25	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	65	80	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.57. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.60 Biography – HELEN KELLER

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	181.66	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	60	50	45	200		

<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	55	95	0	0	150	263.8	*
		0	0	10	85	55	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	105	85	55	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	30	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	30	20	100		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	166.15	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	65	45	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	182.5	*
		0	0	5	55	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	40	55	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	55	45	0	0	100	167.27	*
		0	0	10	30	60	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	55	30	60	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.58. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.61 Biography – SACHIN TENDULKAR

		Beginner	Emerging	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	50	0	0	100	200	*
		0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	35	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	45	35	0	150	125.51	*
		0	0	90	35	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	125	35	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	5	0	50	82.85	*
		0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	35	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	55	0	0	150	248.18	*
		0	0	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	70	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	0	0	100	166.15	*
		0	0	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	25	15	0	100	93.84	*
		0	0	50	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	65	30	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	20	15	0	100	152.85	*
		0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	70	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.60. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value =13.28 at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.62 Biography – CHARLIE CHAPLIN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	50	45	5	0	100	182	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	45	50	55	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	65	75	10	0	150	229.41	*
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	85	85	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	15	35	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	35	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	70	65	15	0	150	213.51	*
		0	0	10	95	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	75	110	45	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	51	40	9	0	100	169.49	*
		0	0	0	50	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	51	40	59	50	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	40	50	10	0	100	121.11	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	65	55	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	20	75	5	0	100	181.42	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	75	70	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.61. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value =13.28 at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.63 Biography – MOTHER TERESA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
1	Organisation	10	30	60	0	0	100	165.71	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	30	70	45	45	200		
2	Ideas & Purpose	10	70	70	0	0	150	250.58	*
		0	0	15	75	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	10	70	85	75	60	300		
3	Point of view/ voice	0	15	35	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	20	30	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	35	20	30	100		
4	Word-choice, sentence-structure & paragraphs	0	65	75	10	0	150	229.7	*
		0	0	10	70	70	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	85	80	70	300		
5	Research & Relevance of supporting facts & details	0	50	50	0	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	45	40	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	152.85	*
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	70	65	20	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	25	65	10	0	100	165.33	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	65	75	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.62. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### 2.64 Biography – ALBERT EINSTEIN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	166.66	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	60	45	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	60	75	15	0	150	213.27	*
		0	0	10	90	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	85	105	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	25	25	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	20	30	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	25	20	30	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-</b>	0	60	90	0	0	150	264	*

	<b>structure &amp; paragraphs</b>								
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	100	75	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	132.84	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	70	30	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	45	50	5	0	100	135.84	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	65	50	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	114.44	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	90	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.64. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.65 Biography – CHETAN BHAGAT

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	40	15	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	0	50	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	40	65	50	200		

<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	65	70	15	0	150	201.17	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	85	85	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	30	10	10	0	50	73.33	*
		0	0	0	20	30	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	10	30	30	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	70	70	10	0	150	246.03	*
		0	0	5	75	70	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	75	85	70	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	40	50	10	0	100	165.33	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	50	75	35	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	40	40	20	0	100	141.33	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	40	75	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	155	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	65	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.65. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.66 Travelogue - UDAIPUR

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	50	5	0	100	181.66	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	50	60	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	60	70	20	0	150	172.32	*
		0	0	20	90	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	90	110	40	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	25	25	0	50	45.45	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	25	55	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	70	70	10	0	150	246.03	*
		0	0	5	75	70	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	75	85	70	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	30	45	25	0	100	93.46	*
		0	0	15	40	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	60	65	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	40	45	15	0	100	107	*
		0	0	15	60	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	60	75	25	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	101	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	100	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.66. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.67 Travelogue – SOMNATH – THE LORD OF MOON

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	40	50	10	0	100	109.52	*
		0	0	20	50	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	70	60	30	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	20	40	90	0	150	104.36	*
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	50	165	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	35	15	0	50	58	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	35	50	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	60	85	5	0	150	216.19	*
		0	0	20	100	30	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	105	105	30	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	10	55	35	0	100	87.4	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	65	80	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	15	40	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	40	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	114.44	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	90	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.67. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.68 Travelogue - DHOLAVIRA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	166.55	*
		0	0	0	51	49	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	61	49	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	70	80	0	0	150	264.44	*
		0	0	10	90	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	70	90	90	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	25	25	0	50	13.09	*
		0	0	10	35	5	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	35	60	5	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	60	90	0	0	150	264	*
		0	0	10	90	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	100	90	50	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	181.66	*
		0	0	5	70	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	60	70	25	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	134.54	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	55	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	15	70	15	0	100	151.25	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	70	80	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.68. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.69 Travelogue - CHENNAI

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	132.998	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	70	30	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	20	80	50	0	150	144.44	*
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	90	125	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	35	15	0	50	60	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	35	45	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	20	90	40	0	150	126.1	*

		0	0	19	91	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	109	131	40	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	182.5	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	40	50	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	65	35	0	0	100	158	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	50	45	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	25	65	10	0	100	166.66	*
		0	0	0	50	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	65	60	50	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.69. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.70 Travelogue – MT. ABU

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	167.27	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	55	55	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	167.27	*

		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	55	55	200		
<b>3</b>									
	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>									
	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	65	60	25	0	150	173.73	*
		0	0	15	90	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	75	115	45	300		
<b>5</b>									
	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	122.27	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	60	55	40	200		
<b>6</b>									
	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	50	20	30	0	100	101.33	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	30	75	45	200		
<b>7</b>									
	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	10	65	25	0	100	127.77	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	65	90	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.70. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$X_2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $X_2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $X_2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.71 Travelogue – DHWARKA – THE HOME OF LORD KRISHNA

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	15	55	30	0	100	80.85	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	70	75	40	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	40	90	20	0	150	169.09	*
		0	0	20	90	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	110	110	40	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	35	5	0	50	82.5	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	35	40	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	75	75	0	0	150	250	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	75	90	70	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	40	45	15	0	100	106.25	*
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	60	80	20	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	50	45	5	0	100	149.09	*
		0	0	10	50	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	55	55	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	114.44	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	90	45	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.71. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.72 Travelogue - JAISALMER

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	40	40	20	0	100	138.82	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	40	40	85	35	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	65	65	20	0	150	234.54	*
		0	0	0	90	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	65	110	60	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	35	5	0	50	82.85	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	35	35	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	55	70	25	0	150	221.73	*
		0	0	0	90	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	55	70	115	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	165.33	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	75	35	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	114.44	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	90	45	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.72. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.73 Travelogue – GIRNAR – TOP OF GUJARAT

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	166.55	*
		0	0	0	51	49	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	61	49	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	35	60	55	0	150	102.48	*
		0	0	25	75	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	85	130	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	30	20	0	50	49.09	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	30	55	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	60	60	30	0	150	191.53	*
		0	0	5	90	55	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	65	120	55	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	55	0	0	100	181.66	*
		0	0	5	65	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	60	65	30	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	45	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	45	40	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.73. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### 2.74 Travelogue - MODHERA

		<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Capable</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Total</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of Significance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	110	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	90	55	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	0	76	74	0	150	66.55	*
		0	0	20	100	30	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	96	174	30	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	20	20	0	50	49.09	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	20	55	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	30	90	30	0	150	164.57	*

		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	105	100	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	20	60	20	0	100	90.82	
		0	0	15	65	20	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	75	85	20	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	115.29	
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	85	55	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	115.29	0
		0	0	0	45	55	100		0
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	85	55	200		0

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.74 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.75 Travelogue – LITTLE RUN OF KUTCH

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	115.29	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	85	55	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	0	55	95	0	150	86.95	*

		0	0	20	65	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	75	160	65	300		
<hr/>									
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	20	30	0	50	40	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	20	60	20	100		
<hr/>									
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	30	75	45	0	150	112.5	*
		0	0	25	75	50	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	100	120	50	300		
<hr/>									
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	99.07	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	70	85	45	200		
<hr/>									
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	0	15	65	20	100	12.95	**
		0	0	30	40	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	45	105	50	200		
<hr/>									
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.75. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays except 6. Character, plot and setting, are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. 6. Character, plot and setting is greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 9.88 at 0.05 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.76 Review of movie – EK THI DAYAN

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	10	40	40	10	0	100	166.25	*
		0	0	0	51	49	100		
	<b>Total</b>	10	40	40	61	49	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	30	80	40	0	0	150	256.36	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	30	80	55	70	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	25	25	0	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	25	25	0	30	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	35	95	20	0	0	150	273.33	*
		0	0	10	95	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	35	95	30	95	45	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	25	35	40	0	0	100	182.22	*
		0	0	5	45	50	100		
	<b>Total</b>	25	35	45	45	50	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	60	40	0	0	100	156.36	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	60	55	45	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	181.81	*
		0	0	5	55	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	55	55	40	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 277. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.77 Review of movie – TARE ZAMEEN PAR

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	165.33	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	75	35	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	85	60	5	0	150	233.17	*
		0	0	15	80	55	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	85	75	85	55	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	10	25	15	0	50	45.83	*
		0	0	5	25	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	30	40	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	65	85	0	0	150	222.72	*
		0	0	25	95	30	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	110	95	30	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	15	35	0	0	50	130.31	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	15	40	50	45	150		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	35	35	30	0	100	117.89	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	35	95	35	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	35	45	20	0	100	138.82	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	45	85	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.78. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.78 Review of movie – OH ! MY GOD

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	166.15	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	45	65	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	10	75	65	0	150	99.03	*
		0	0	15	90	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	90	155	45	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	30	20	0	50	34.85	*
		0	0	5	30	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	35	50	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	45	65	40	0	150	140.48	*
		0	0	15	90	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	80	130	45	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	45	45	10	0	100	134.54	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	55	55	45	200		

<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	45	50	5	0	100	135.84	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	45	65	50	40	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	72.5	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	80	80	40	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.79. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.79 Review of movie – KAI PO CHE

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	50	50	0	100	71.92	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	95	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	0	76	74	0	150	115.65	*
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	86	149	65	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	30	20	0	50	55.55	*
		0	0	0	25	25	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	30	45	25	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-</b>	0	5	75	70	0	150	115.37	*

	<b>structure &amp; paragraphs</b>								
		0	0	10	80	60	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	5	85	150	60	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	166.66	*
		0	0	10	60	30	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	60	60	30	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	25	45	30	0	100	75	*
		0	0	15	60	25	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	60	90	25	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.81. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.80 Review of movie – FERRARI KI SAWARI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	50	50	0	100	81.81	*
		0	0	5	50	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	100	45	200		

<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	10	80	60	0	150	131.17	*
		0	0	5	100	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	85	160	45	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	30	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	50	75	25	0	150	189.7	*
		0	0	10	75	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	85	100	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	0	50	50	0	100	86.95	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	50	115	35	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	60	40	0	100	115.29	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	85	55	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.82. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.81 Review of movie – BARFI

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	50	40	10	0	100	166.15	*
		0	0	0	55	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	40	65	45	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	65	55	30	0	150	150.13	*
		0	0	20	95	35	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	75	125	35	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	20	30	0	0	50	100	*
		0	0	0	35	15	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	20	30	35	15	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	35	85	30	0	150	165	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	35	100	100	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	153.84	*
		0	0	15	45	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	65	45	40	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	25	50	25	0	100	62.74	*
		0	0	25	60	15	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	25	75	85	15	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	109	*
		0	0	0	65	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	100	35	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.83. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

## 2.82 Review of movie – I AM LEGEND

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	0	50	50	0	100	70.83	*
		0	0	10	46	44	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	60	96	44	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	65	65	20	0	150	174.06	*
		0	0	20	85	45	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	65	85	105	45	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	30	20	0	50	52	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	30	50	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	0	90	60	0	150	95.21	*
		0	0	30	55	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	120	115	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	0	55	45	0	100	76.15	*
		0	0	10	45	45	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	90	45	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	0	50	50	0	100	72.72	*
		0	0	5	60	35	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	55	110	35	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	115.57	*
		0	0	0	60	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	95	40	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

Data have been analyzed in following ways:

**Table 2.84. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

### 2.83 Review of movie – BHAG MILKA BHAG

		Beginner	Emerging	Satisfactory	Capable	Proficient	Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Significance
<b>1</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	0	10	45	45	0	100	115.29	*
		0	0	0	40	60	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	45	85	60	200		
<b>2</b>	<b>Ideas &amp; Purpose</b>	0	10	60	70	10	150	58.78	*
		0	0	15	95	40	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	10	75	165	50	300		
<b>3</b>	<b>Point of view/ voice</b>	0	0	35	15	0	50	60	*
		0	0	0	30	20	50		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	35	45	20	100		
<b>4</b>	<b>Word-choice, sentence-structure &amp; paragraphs</b>	0	30	85	35	0	150	155.66	*
		0	0	15	70	65	150		
	<b>Total</b>	0	30	100	105	65	300		
<b>5</b>	<b>Research &amp; Relevance of supporting facts &amp; details</b>	0	50	50	0	0	100	166.66	*
		0	0	10	50	40	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	50	60	50	40	200		
<b>6</b>	<b>Character, plot &amp; setting</b>	0	46	44	10	0	100	121.92	*
		0	0	15	50	35	100		

	<b>Total</b>	0	46	59	60	35	200		
<b>7</b>	<b>Grammar, mechanics &amp; spellings</b>	0	0	65	35	0	100	121.25	*
		0	0	0	45	55	100		
	<b>Total</b>	0	0	65	80	55	200		

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

**Data have been analyzed in following ways:**

**Table 2.85. 2 X 5 Contingency table for Rubric of Non-fiction essays**

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 / fe = 44.76$$

Table value = **13.28** at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom

The computed  $\chi^2$  value of all the above components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays are greater than the table  $\chi^2$  value of 13.28 at 0.01 level of significance against 4 degrees of freedom. Therefore the Null Hypotheses that there will be no significant difference in the Pre-Intervention observed frequency distribution and Post-Intervention observed frequency distribution against the Five class Intervals on rubric for creative writing of Non-fiction essay is rejected.

#### **4.5 Analysis and interpretation of the data on Reaction Scale on Participatory approach for creative writing of poetry**

##### **3.1 Reaction Scale on Participatory Approach for Creative Writing of Poetry**

<b>Statement</b>		<b>Fully Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Fully Disagree</b>	$\chi^2$	<b>Level of significance</b>
<b>1</b>	The presentation on Elements of Creative Writing of Poetry was highly intelligible.	25(50%)	15(30)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	40	*
<b>2</b>	The analysis of the various model poems by the entire class was educational.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	65	*

<b>3</b>	The analysis of the different types of model poems of Diamante, Acrostic, Limerick and free verse helped me in understanding the components of creative writing of poetry.	26(32%)	10(20%)	0	10(20%)	4(8%)	39.2	*
<b>4</b>	Initially, I found it difficult to compose a poem.	35(70%)	10(20%)	0	5(10%)	0	85	*
<b>5</b>	Progressively I gained confidence in composing a poem.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
<b>6</b>	It was a thrilling experience for me to compose a poem in group as well as individually.	30(60%)	14(28%)	0	4(8%)	2(4%)	61.6	*
<b>7</b>	It was an edutaining experience to listen to the poems created by the classmates.	20(40%)	25(50%)	2(4%)	3(6%)	0	53.8	*
<b>8</b>	The analysis of the poems presented by the class was highly rewarding.	22(44%)	20(40%)	2(4%)	6(12%)	0	42.4	*
<b>9</b>	I have developed abilities to pick up appropriate words for composition of poem.	20(40%)	25(50%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
<b>10</b>	I can realize rhyme, rhythm, and coherence in my poem.	15(30%)	25(50%)	0	5(10%)	5(10%)	40	*
<b>11</b>	I like to cooperate with others in order to compose a poem.	20(40%)	25(50%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
<b>12</b>	I did not like to work in a group to compose poem.	2(4%)	3(6%)	0	10(20%)	35(70%)	83.8	*

13	Different activities for composition of poems were most joyful.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	65	*
14	I am not satisfied with my performance in composition of poems in a group.	5(10%)	2(4%)	5(10%)	20(40%)	18(36%)	27.8	*
15	The subject matter selected for creative writing of poetry was interesting.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	65	*
16	I did not get equal opportunity for the participation in the group work for composition of poems.	0	5(10%)	0	10(20%)	35(70%)	85	*
17	Time available for composition of poem in group was not sufficient.	0	5(10%)	0	20(40%)	25(50%)	55	*
18	Study material provided to us in group task of creating poem was not much supportive.	0	0	0	20(40%)	30(60%)	80	*
19	I dislike to present my composed poem in class situation.	0	10(20%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	60	*
20	Our entire class has developed love for creative writing of poems.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
21	I can appreciate the poems composed by others.	20(40%)	20(40%)	0	10(20%)	0	40	*
22	I can appreciate figures of speech in poetry.	25(50%)	15(30%)	0	10(20%)	0	45	*
23	I can fluently use figures of speech in poetry.	25(50%)	15(30%)	0	10(20%)	0	45	*

24	I find that every poet is unique in one way or the other.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	25	*
25	We have become more sensitive towards creative expression through poetry.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
26	I can express personal feelings, imagination and novel ideas by writing poem.	40(80%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	0	115	*
27	I can now do original composition of poem.	35(70%)	10(20%)	0	5(10%)	0	85	*
28	My creative writing manifests sensitivity to the environment.	20(40%)	20(40%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	35	*
29	I have learnt to do original production through the exposure on creative writing.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
30	I can establish relationship amongst remote elements and express.	20(40%)	25(50%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
31	Creative writing has made me sensitive to the self and others.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
32	Through creative writing, I have developed interest in creation and expression.	20(40%)	25(50%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
33	I try to strike an equation amongst reality and expression.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
34	I feel at ease after creative expression.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	65	*

35	We are gaining a lot through sharing.	30(60%)	15(30%)	5(10%)	0	0	65	*
36	Our entire class has developed affect attributes through creative writing.	25(50%)	15(30%)	0	10(20%)	0	45	*
37	We have become more sensitive towards creative expression.	25(50%)	20(40%)	5(10%)	0	0	55	*
38	My vocabulary has been enriched and increased.	25(50%)	15(30%)	0	10(20%)	0	45	*
39	I got a lot of opportunity to express my ideas freely.	30(60%)	10(20%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	55	*
40	The classroom environment and ambience for learning was conducive, motivating, and enthusiastic.	25(50%)	20(40%)	5(10%)	0	0	55	*
41	We did not understand the instructions properly during activities.	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	55	*
42	This programme helped me to enrich the knowledge of English literature and language.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	65	*
43	The programme was most useful in enhancement of my creative writing skills.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
44	Putting tick mark in rubrics was a tedious task.	10(20%)	5(10%)	0	5(10%)	30(60%)	55	*
45	My creative writing ability in English did not improve in this programme.	0	4(10%)	0	5(10%)	41(82%)	122.2	*

Table  $\chi^2$  Value against 4 df at 0.01 is 13.277, whereas at 0.05 is 9.488.

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

### **3.1. Interpretation**

The computed  $\chi^2$  value against each one of above mentioned 45 statements has been found to be greater than table  $\chi^2$  value at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom So the null hypothesis 'There will be no significant difference between observed frequencies and expected frequencies against equal probability on various statements of Reaction Scale on Participatory Approach for Creative Writing of Poetry is rejected at 0.01 level against all statements.

#### **Statement wise interpretation:**

1. After administering the reaction scale on students, it was found that 50% of the students fully agreed that the presentation on elements of Creative Writing was highly intelligible. 30% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the presentation on elements of Creative Writing was highly intelligible.
2. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed that the analysis of the various model poems by the entire class was educational. 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the analysis of the various model poems by the entire class was educational.
3. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 20% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed and 8% of the students fully disagree that the analysis of the different types of model poems of Diamante, Acrostic, Limerick and free verse helped them in understanding the components of creative writing of poetry.
4. It was found that 70% of the students fully agreed, 20% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that Initially, they found it difficult to compose a poem.
5. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that Progressively they gained confidence in composing a poem.
6. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 28% of the students agreed, whereas, 8% of the students disagreed, 4% of the students fully disagree that It

was a thrilling experience for them to compose a poem in group as well as individually.

7. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, 4% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 6% of the students disagreed that it was an edutaining experience to listen to the poems created by the classmates.
8. It was found that 44% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 4% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 12% of the students disagreed that the analysis of the poems presented by the class was highly rewarding.
9. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have developed abilities to pick up appropriate words for composition of poem.
10. It was found that 30% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed, 10% of the students fully disagree that they can realize rhyme, rhythm, and coherence in their poems.
11. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they liked to cooperate with others in order to compose a poem.
12. It was found that 4% of the students fully agreed, 6% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 70% of the students fully disagree that they did not like to work in a group to compose poem.
13. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that different activities for composition of poems were most joyful.
14. It was found that 10% of the students fully agreed, 4% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed 36% of the students fully disagree that they are not satisfied with their performance in composition of poems in a group.
15. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the subject matter selected for creative writing of poetry was interesting.
16. It was found that 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed 70% of the students fully disagree that they did not get equal opportunity for the participation in the group work for composition of poems.

17. It was found that 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 40% of the students disagreed, 50% of the students fully disagree that Time available for composition of poem in group was not sufficient.
18. It was found that 40% of the students disagreed, 60 % of the students fully disagree that Study material provided to them in group task of creating poem was not much supportive.
19. It was found that 20% of the students agreed, 20% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagree that they disliked to present their composed poem in class situation.
20. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that their entire class had developed love for creative writing of poems.
21. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that they can appreciate the poems composed by others.
22. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that they can appreciate figures of speech in poetry.
23. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that they can fluently use figures of speech in poetry.
24. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they find that every poet is unique in one way or the other.
25. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have become more sensitive towards creative expression through poetry.
26. It was found that 80% of the students fully agreed, 10% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided that they can express personal feelings, imagination and novel ideas by writing poem.
27. It was found that 70% of the students fully agreed, 20% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they can now do original composition of poem.

28. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that their creative writing manifests sensitivity to the environment.
29. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have learnt to do original production through the exposure on creative writing.
30. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they can establish relationship amongst remote elements and express.
31. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that Creative writing has made them sensitive to the self and others.
32. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that through creative writing, they have developed interest in creation and expression.
33. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they try to strike an equation amongst reality and expression.
34. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they feel at ease after creative expression.
35. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided that they are gaining a lot through sharing.
36. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that their entire class has developed affect attributes through creative writing.
37. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, that they have become more sensitive towards creative expression.
38. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that their vocabulary has been enriched and increased.

39. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 20% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they got a lot of opportunity to express their ideas freely.
40. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, that the classroom environment and ambience for learning was conducive, motivating, and enthusiastic.
41. It was found that 10% of the students fully agreed, 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that they did not understand the instructions properly during activities.
42. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that this programme helped them to enrich the knowledge of English literature and language.
43. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the programme was most useful in enhancement of their creative writing skills.
44. It was found that 20% of the students fully agreed, 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that Putting tick mark in rubrics was a tedious task.
45. It was found that 8% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed, 82% of the students fully disagreed that their creative writing ability in English did not improve in this programme.

#### 4.6 Analysis and interpretation of the data on Reaction Scale on Participatory approach for creative writing of Non-fiction essays

### 3.2 Reaction Scale on Participatory Approach for Creative Writing of Non-Fiction

Statement		Fully Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Fully Disagree	$\bar{x}$	Level of significance
1	The presentation on elements of creative	26(52%)	15(30%)	4(8%)	5(10%)	0	44.2	*

	writing of Non-fiction essays was highly intelligible.							
<b>2</b>	The analysis of the various essays by the entire class were educational.	22(44%)	25(50%)	0	3(6%)	0	61.8	*
<b>3</b>	The analysis of the model essays of autobiography, biography, travelogue and review of a movie helped me in understanding the components of Creative writing for Non-fiction essays.	26(52%)	23(46%)	0	2(4%)	0	68.9	*
<b>4</b>	Initially, I found it difficult to compose a Non-fiction essay.	20(40%)	20(40%)	0	10(20%)	0	40	*
<b>5</b>	Progressively, I gained confidence in writing a Non-fiction essay.	25(50%)	20(40%)	5(10%)	0	0	55	*
<b>6</b>	It was a thrilling experience for me to compose a Non-fiction essay in group as well as individually.	28(56%)	12(24%)	0	10(20%)	0	52.8	*
<b>7</b>	It was an edutainal experience to listen to the Non-fiction essays created by the classmates.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
<b>8</b>	The analyses of the Non-fiction essays presented by the classmates and the class was highly rewarding.	26(52%)	22(44%)	2(4%)	0	0	66.4	*
<b>9</b>	I have developed abilities to pick up appropriate words for composition of Non-fiction essays.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
<b>10</b>	I can realize grammatical structure, logical sequence and coherence in my Non-fiction essays.	25(50%)	20(40%)	2(4%)	3(6%)	0	53.8	*

11	I like to cooperate with others in order to compose non-fiction essay in group.	25(50%)	15(30%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	40	*
12	I did not like to work in group to compose non-fiction essay.	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	55	*
13	Different activities for composition of Non-fiction essays were most joyful.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
14	I am not satisfied with my performance in composition of Non-fiction essays in group.	0	10(20%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	60	*
15	The subject matter selected for creative writing of non-fiction essays was interesting.	30(60%)	10(20%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	55	*
16	I did not get equal opportunity for the participation in the group work for composition for non-fiction essays.	0	10(20%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	60	*
17	Time available for composition of non-fiction essay in group was not sufficient.	0	5(10%)	0	20(40%)	25(50%)	55	*
18	Study material provided to us in group task for creating non-fiction essay was not much supportive.	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	55	*
19	I dislike to present my composed Non-fiction essay in class situation.	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	10(20%)	30(60%)	55	*
20	Our entire class has developed love for creative writing of non-fiction essays.	25(50%)	20(40%)	5(10%)	0	0	55	*
21	I can appreciate the Non-fiction essays composed by others.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
22	I can appreciate figures of	26(52%)	20(40%)	0	2(4%)	2(4%)	58.4	*

	speech in Non-fiction essays.					)		
23	I can fluently use figures of speech in Non-fiction essays.	26(52%)	20(40%)	0	4(8%)	0	59.2	*
24	I find that every creative writer is unique in one way or the other.	28(56%)	20(40%)	0	2(4%)	0	68.8	*
25	We have become more sensitive towards creative expression through non-fiction essays.	30(60%)	15(30%)	0	5(10%)	0	65	*
26	I can express personal feelings, imagination and novel ideas by writing Non-fiction essays.	28(56%)	12(24%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	47.8	*
27	I can now do original composition of Non-fiction essays	25(50%)	15(30%)	5(10%)	5(10%)	0	40	*
28	My creative writing manifests sensitivity to the environment.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
29	I have learnt to do original production through the exposure on creative writing.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
30	I can establish relationship amongst remote elements and express.	26(52%)	12(24%)	2(4%)	10(20%)	0	42.4	*
31	Creative writing has made me sensitive to the self and others.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
32	Through creative writing, I have developed interest in creation and expression.	25(50%)	15(30%)	0	10(20%)	0	45	*
33	I try to strike an equation amongst reality and expression.	26(52%)	20(40%)	0	4(8%)	0	59.2	*
34	I feel at ease after creative expression.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
35	We are gaining a lot	25(50%)	18(36%)	2(4%)	5(10%)	0	47.8	*

	through sharing.							
36	Our entire class has developed affect attributes through creative writing.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
37	We have become more sensitive towards creative expression.	28(56%)	17(34%)	0	5(10%)	0	59.8	*
38	My vocabulary has been enriched and increased.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
39	I got a lot of opportunity to express my ideas freely.	26(52%)	20(40%)	0	4(8%)	0	59.2	*
40	The classroom environment and ambience for learning was conducive, motivating, and enthusiastic.	28(56%)	17(34%)	0	5(10%)	0	59.8	*
41	We did not understand the instructions properly during activities.	0	5(10%)	0	15(30%)	30(60%)	65	*
42	This programme helped me to enrich the knowledge of English literature and language.	30(60%)	15(30%)	5(10%)	0	0	65	*
43	The programme was most useful in enhancement of my creative writing skills.	25(50%)	20(40%)	0	5(10%)	0	55	*
44	Putting tick mark in rubrics was a tedious task.	6(12%)	5(10%)	0	10(20%)	29(58%)	50.2	*
45	My creative writing ability in English did not improve in this programme.	5(10%)	0	0	15(30%)	30(60%)	65	*

Table  $\chi^2$  Value against 4 df at 0.01 is 13.277, whereas at 0.05 is 9.488

\* Significant at 0.01 level

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level

### 3.1.5 Interpretation

The computed  $\chi^2$  value against each one of above mentioned 45 statements has been found to be greater than table  $\chi^2$  value at 0.01 level against 4 degrees of freedom So the null hypothesis 'There will be no significant difference between observed frequencies and expected frequencies against equal probability on various statements of Reaction Scale on Participatory Approach for Creative Writing of Non-fiction is rejected at 0.01 level against all statements.

**Statement wise interpretation:**

1. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, 8% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the presentation on elements of creative writing of Non-fiction essays was highly intelligible.
2. It was found that 44% of the students fully agreed, 50% of the students agreed, whereas, 6% of the students disagreed that the analysis of the various essays by the entire class were educational.
3. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 46% of the students agreed, whereas, 4% of the students disagreed that the analysis of the model essays of autobiography, biography, travelogue and review of a movie helped them in understanding the components of Creative writing for Non-fiction essays.
4. It was found that 40% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that Initially, they found it difficult to compose a Non-fiction essay.
5. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided that Progressively, they gained confidence in writing a Non-fiction essay.
6. It was found that 56% of the students fully agreed, 24% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that it was a thrilling experience for them to compose a Non-fiction essay in group as well as individually.
7. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that it was an edutainal experience to listen to the Non-fiction essays created by the classmates.
8. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 44% of the students agreed, 4% of the respondents were undecided, that the analyses of the Non-fiction essays presented by the classmates and the class was highly rewarding.

9. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have developed abilities to pick up appropriate words for composition of Non-fiction essays.
10. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 4% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 6% of the students disagreed that they can realize grammatical structure, logical sequence and coherence in their Non-fiction essays.
11. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they liked to cooperate with others in order to compose non-fiction essay in group.
12. It was found that 10% of the students fully agreed, 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that they did not like to work in group to compose non-fiction essay.
13. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that different activities for composition of Non-fiction essays were most joyful.
14. It was found that 20% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that they are not satisfied their performance in composition of Non-fiction essays in group.
15. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 20% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the subject matter selected for creative writing of non-fiction essays was interesting.
16. It was found that 20% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed 60% of the students fully disagreed that they did not get equal opportunity for the participation in the group work for composition for non-fiction essays.
17. It was found that 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 40% of the students disagreed, 50% of the students fully disagreed that time available for composition of non-fiction essay in group was not sufficient.
18. It was found that 10% of the students fully agreed , 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 60 % of the students fully disagreed that

Study material provided to them in group task for creating non-fiction essay was not much supportive.

19. It was found that 10% of the students fully agreed, 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that they disliked to present my composed Non-fiction essay in class situation.
20. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, that their entire class has developed love for creative writing of non-fiction essays.
21. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they can appreciate the Non-fiction essays composed by others.
22. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 4% of the students disagreed, 4 % of the students fully disagreed that they can appreciate figures of speech in Non-fiction essays.
23. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 8% of the students disagreed that they can fluently use figures of speech in Non-fiction essays.
24. It was found that 56% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 4% of the students disagreed that they find that every creative writer is unique in one way or the other.
25. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have become more sensitive towards creative expression through non-fiction essays.
26. It was found that 56% of the students fully agreed, 24% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they can express personal feelings, imagination and novel ideas by writing Non-fiction essays.
27. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they can now do original composition of Non-fiction essays
28. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that their creative writing manifests sensitivity to the environment.

29. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have learnt to do original production through the exposure on creative writing.
30. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 24% of the students agreed, 4% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that they can establish relationship amongst remote elements and express.
31. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that Creative writing has made them sensitive to the self and others.
32. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed that through creative writing, they have developed interest in creation and expression.
33. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 8% of the students disagreed that they try to strike an equation amongst reality and expression.
34. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they feel at ease after creative expression.
35. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 36% of the students agreed, 4% of the respondents were undecided, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they are gaining a lot through sharing.
36. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that their entire class has developed affect attributes through creative writing.
37. It was found that 56% of the students fully agreed, 34% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that they have become more sensitive towards creative expression.
38. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that their vocabulary has been enriched and increased.
39. It was found that 52% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 8% of the students disagreed that they got a lot of opportunity to express my ideas freely.

40. It was found that 56% of the students fully agreed, 34% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the classroom environment and ambience for learning was conducive, motivating, and enthusiastic.
41. It was found that 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 30% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that they did not understand the instructions properly during activities.
42. It was found that 60% of the students fully agreed, 30% of the students agreed, 10% of the respondents were undecided, that this programme helped them to enrich the knowledge of English literature and language.
43. It was found that 50% of the students fully agreed, 40% of the students agreed, whereas, 10% of the students disagreed that the programme was most useful in enhancement of their creative writing skills.
44. It was found that 12% of the students fully agreed, 10% of the students agreed, whereas, 20% of the students disagreed, 58% of the students fully disagreed that Putting tick mark in rubrics was a tedious task.
45. It was found that 10% of the students fully agreed, whereas, 30% of the students disagreed, 60% of the students fully disagreed that their creative writing ability in English did not improve in this programme.

#### **4.7 Conclusion**

It is evident from the above analysis that a large number of students were able to compose creative writing of poetry by analyzing different types of model poems of Diamante, Acrostic, Limerick and Free-verse poem. Though initially most of the students found it difficult to compose a poem but progressively they gained confidence in composing a poem. The participatory approach of creative composition was a thrilling experience for most of the students. They could realize rhyme, rhythm, and figures of speech in the poem. Most of the students could do original composition through full immersion. They could establish relationship amongst remote elements. Through creative composition, the students tended to be close to reality. Their affect attributes were developed immensely. They could express their feelings easily and precisely. The classroom ambience was found to be conducive and motivating. The students were found to have favourable reactions towards creative composition ability of poetry through participatory approach.

It is evident from above analysis that a large number of students were able to understand the components of creative writing of Non-fiction essays by analyzing different types of model essays of Autobiography, Biography, Travelogue and Review of movie. Though initially they found it difficult to compose Non-fiction essays but progressively they gained confidence. It was found to be a thrilling experience for most of the students to compose Non-fiction essays through participatory approach. Most of them could realize appropriate lexicon, grammatical structure, logical sequence and coherence in their Non-fiction essays. The participatory approach of creative composition of Non-fiction essays developed their affective attributes immensely. They could very well use and appreciate figures of speech in Non-fiction essays. They could easily, precisely and joyfully express their personal feelings, imagination and novel ideas by writing Non-fiction essays. Their originality and innovativeness found spontaneous expression in the form of Non-fiction essays. Most of them could establish relationship amongst remote elements. Most of them could realize reality through their creative composition of Non-fiction essays. They could express their ideas freely, joyfully and meaningfully. The class ambience was highly conducive, motivating and promoting. Most of the students were found to have favourable reactions towards participatory approach of creative composition of Non-fiction essays.

The proposition of the investigator regarding the potency and capability of creative composition in English in the forms of Poetry and Non-fiction essays was thoroughly tasted and not rejected. The blossom and bloom of the creative composition in Poetry and Non-fiction essays was found to be marvelous.