The effectiveness of writing instruction in the writing assessment among EFL Students

by Masrul Masrul

Submission date: 06-Feb-2024 07:39AM (UTC-0800)
Submission ID: 2287881997
File name: ing_instruction_in_the_writing_assessment_among_EFL_students.pdf (714.19K)
Word count: 6176
Character count: 33614

The effectiveness of writing instruction in the writing assessment among EFL Students

Masrul[1], Nurmalina[2]

Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai University, Jl. Tuanku Tambusai No. 23, Bangkinang, Kecamatan Bangkinang, Kabupaten Kampar, Riau 28412[1,2]

[1]Corespondence e-mail: masrulm25@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study involved 100 English Foreign Learners (EFL) students of SMA N 1 Malang. Students were assigned into the control class (N=50) who attended regular classes and the experimental class (N=50) who were given the treatment. A pre-test was performed in the first week, and the post test was conducted in the 11th week. The results of this study showed significant simultaneous effects between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

Keywords: *Writing Instruction, Writing Assessment, EFL Students, Teaching Writing, Writing*

I. INTRODUCTION

The act of writing poses a multifaceted challenge for students, demanding the organization of thoughts, adherence to proper grammar and spelling, and effective communication. Research underscores writing as a potent cognitive stimulant, fostering an enhancement in students' thinking skills. The pedagogy of writing involves a structured approach, guiding students through specific steps to refine their writing prowess (Boscolo & Cisotto, 1999). Yet, during the intricate process of idea generation and arrangement, the primary focus shifts away from grammar and spelling concerns. Consequently, teachers play a pivotal role in implementing strategies and techniques that optimally contribute to the enhancement of students' writing skills (Reed, 2014). As students embark on their college journey, writing assumes a pivotal role, and the expanding access to higher education introduces a considerable variation in students' writing proficiencies (Brown et al., 2020).

This variability raises concerns, given that writing is a skill with profound implications for students' success in high school, college, and future employment. Recognizing the importance of cultivating effective writing abilities becomes imperative in ensuring holistic academic and professional achievements.

Aligning with this perspective, (Troia & Maddox, 2010) reveals that educators perceive writing as a mirror reflecting students' cognitive processes. To enhance the art of writing, various teaching strategies are employed, encompassing activities like advanced planning, the use of graphic organizers, and insightful review lectures. Proficient writing not only aids in articulating ideas but also serves as a tool for students to refine and deepen their understanding of subject matter. Written language, surpassing oral communication in its explicitness and depth, uniquely

allows students to validate their grasp of intricate grammatical structures through active creation (Shanahan, 1980).

Central to honing writing skills is the cultivation of extensive practice within a linguistically rich environment (Sullivan & Sullivan, 2013). As students engage in the learning process, they inevitably confront challenges. (Roitsch et al., 2020) highlights that those grappling with writing often face foundational issues such as handwriting and spelling. These challenges echo the complexities encountered by school psychologists tasked with assessing and interpreting students' writing difficulties (Stein et al., 2019). The recognition and addressing of these challenges are vital steps toward fostering a comprehensive approach to advancing students' writing capabilities.

Several critics have voiced reservations regarding the process-writing technique, highlighting both concerns related to study findings and conceptual issues. Smagorinsky (1987) argued that Graves' characterization of effective writing techniques, derived from observations of 16 students, did not constitute a research study but rather represented a specific teaching approach effective in a particular context. In a parallel vein, Delpit (1988) discovered that students from diverse backgrounds might face disadvantages due to insufficient attention to the technical aspects of writing.

Delving into the realm of workshops for fifth and sixth graders, (Mccarthey, 1994) observed a prevalent focus on personal narratives. Teachers, in this context, tended to compare students' writings across diverse backgrounds. Simultaneously, Lensmire (2016) scrutinized the varied responses of working-class and middle-class students to their peers' writing. He advocated for a revision of both the concept of "voice" and the workshop practices to be more socially aware and responsive, taking into account issues of racism, class, and gender.

This present study narrows its focus to writing instruction and assessment specifically tailored for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students. Hillocks (2001) elucidated the concept of different "modes of instruction" in terms of how teachers impart writing skills to students. He identified four primary teaching modes: presentation, natural processes, environmental, and customized.

The presentation approach emphasizes the teacher's role as a source of knowledge about writing. The natural processes mode, in contrast, emphasizes the student as a creator of ideas, criteria, and structure. In the environmental mode, the teacher and student share more responsibility, with the teacher planning activities and selecting materials and the student brainstorming and learning writing skills. In the customized mode, the teacher serves as a facilitator, and students may be asked to keep a diary or participate in other pre-writing exercises to promote memory or creativity. Some theories suggest that writing instruction can help with the development of word recognition skills, and that it may be beneficial for voice recognition teaching.

Many writing experts have distinguished between traditional and workshop-based approaches to writing instruction. Cutler & Graham, (2008) divided writing education into these

two categories: Traditional education is often based on textbooks or worksheets where students are taught to master a set of abilities outlined by the teacher with main emphasizes on grammar and rules. In conventional writing class, the teacher determines and delivers instruction to the entire class, and students do not have the opportunity to choose their own topics or audiences. On the other hand, writing workshops often involve teachers sharing writing and providing mini lessons to the whole class or small groups based on what they have identified as students' needs. At any point in the writing process, students work independently, with peers, or with the teacher (pre-writing, writing, proofreading). Students select their own themes and genres, and can participate in a variety of activities such as teacher-student or peer conferencing (Pollington & Wilcox, 2001).

This study precisely delves into the realm of teaching writing through dedicated writing instruction. It is crucial for the researcher to deliberately narrow the scope of this investigation to mitigate potential misunderstandings. The primary focus of the research is on writing instruction, aiming to evaluate the writing proficiency of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students. The scrutiny extends to discerning simultaneous or partial correlations between groups across key dimensions such as planning, text generation, feedback processing, revising, translating, reviewing, organizing, citation creativity, content, and language use. Additionally, this study rigorously examines the differences between groups toward each dependent variable.

Previous Research of Writing Instruction.

As stated by (Brown et al., 2020), students who received direct instruction in writing increased their performance in certain categories, but the study did not find enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis stating that there is no relationship between direct instruction and student achievement. Brown et al. found that explicit instruction in planning, writing, revising, and text structure, as well as peer and teacher feedback, were effective interventions for improving writing quality and overall understanding of the writing process for students with learning disabilities.

Similarly, (Finlayson & Mccrudden, 2019) conducted a meta-analysis of 13 studies on writing instruction and found that instructional tactics were effective for increasing students' writing skills, regardless of their age, gender, or ethnicity. The overall impact size for 22 intervention conditions from 1990 to 2013 was g =.44, indicating that preschool writing interventions significantly improved early childhood reading outcomes. These findings have implications for written instruction in a preschool context (Hall et al., 2015).

A contemporary trend in writing instruction is the use of graphic organizers and a focus on specific genres by many teachers. Studies have found that professional development and state standards have a significant impact on teachers' instruction (Mccarthey et al., 2011). Furthermore, Grisham & Wolsey (2016) found that lesson plans and reflections at the end of an academic sequence demonstrated that candidate teachers' knowledge of writing instruction grew in complexity and that their attitudes and practices became more aligned. This suggests that

teacher education programs should provide structured and distributed education for new teachers in the field of writing.

Machili et al., (2019) used explicit SI (strategy instruction) intervention in an EAP course for one semester, where they found significant score improvement in writing, particularly in the quote and textual scales notably at the intermediate and advanced levels. The findings indicate that explicit SI has a positive effect on integrated write performance.

According to Commer-montreal et al., (2015), there are significant differences in students' growth in composition skills based on core writing teaching theories implemented through teaching practice, resulting in four specific recommendations for promoting effective instruction of this core skill.

II. METHODS

Participants

The participants in this study were English foreign language (EFL) students at SMA N 1 Malang. They voluntarily enrolled in writing instruction classes, which were selected randomly for the purpose of the study. There were 87 students from two classes assigned as a control group and an experimental group. Students averagely aged between 16-17. The study lasted for a semester, which presented logistical challenges for the curriculum if randomization was used. Efforts were made to ensure that the experimental and control groups were equal. For example, the English evaluation results of the courses were compared and the head of the English department or the vice principal was consulted concerning the comparability of the schools' classes. However, better classes served as the control group while weaker classes functioned as the experimental group since the participating schools wanted the intervention to improve the weaker classes.

Research Design

The correlation test was used in this research as a statistic test that determined the variables that showed the highest correlation. In correlation test, the strength and weakness were shown by the value 1 or -1. If the number obtained was closer to 0, the relationship between two variables it can be weak. Several correlation tests are available, including. Pearson, Kendal's, dan Spearman. In this research the Pearson correlation was utilized.

Data Collection

A pre-test was administered to all the participants to measure students' initial writing level before the experiment was performed. After the treatment, post-test was conducted to compare students' scores and observe the effectiveness of writing instruction toward EFL students' writing assessment. In the pre-test, students were instructed to write an essay about a topic that students were allowed to choose themselves.

Instruments

Writing test was used in this study to determine the presence of significant differences between the two classes (control class and experiment class). Students were asked to write a 150-word argumentative essay which results would reflect their writing ability.

The assessment focused on students' capacity to give and justify planning, text generation, feedback handling, revising, translating, reviewing, organizing, citation creativity, content, and language use. Students have 30 minutes to complete the test. The results of the tests were graded by two independent raters who had not taught the participants. The raters were all experienced EFL secondary school teachers who had extensive experience in evaluating essays.

Procedures

In the study, the pre-test was administered to both the experimental and control groups during the first week. The experimental group received nine writing instruction lessons over the course of nine weeks, with one session per week. Meanwhile, the teachers in the control group continued teaching using conventional method. The post-test was completed by all students from all classes in the 11th week.

The experimental group received a treatment based on the five-phase paradigm developed by (Chamot et al., 1992). This approach focuses on learners' mental processes for problem solving and includes a "preparation" phase where learners discuss their current learning methods, a "presentation" phase where the teacher explains and models the desired strategy, a "practice" phase where learners apply the new method to a task, an "assessment" phase where students assess their strategy utilization, and an "expansion" phase where learners apply the new method to a new assignment. The five recursive phases allow the teacher to shift between phases to meet the learners' needs for understanding and utilizing methods.

The students' role in the experimental group was to "attend and participate", meaning they were primarily regulated by the teacher. Gradually, the teacher delegated more responsibility to the students, who were asked to exercise self-regulation and target writing strategies. They were expected to self-regulate and take on the majority of the responsibility, including transferring methods to new tasks and employing their tactics independently. The control group, on the other hand, received no treatment but the class proceeded as usual because that teacher had previously taught at that school.

Data analysis

In addition to the correlation test, MANOVA test was also performed because the data of independent variable were categorical data, while the data of the dependent variable were interval scale numeric data. The MANOVA identified significant effects between multiple

independent variables to dependent variables. Therefore, the MANOVA test was used to measure the simultaneous effect of independent variable to several dependent variables. The dummy regression test was also carried out to examine the magnitude of differences between each category.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Result

Descriptive Statistic

Descriptive statistic describes the variables that have been measured. Descriptive statistic was also used to be data centering (mean, mode, median, etc.) and data debate (standard deviation, variance, etc.) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistic of research variable

Variable	Group	Mean	SD	N
planning Pre-test	Experiment	3.9290	.71494	50
	Control	1.2016	.71407	50
	Total	2.5653	1.54396	100
planning Post-test	Experiment	3.9670	.71482	50
	Control	1.2544	.71149	50
	Total	2.6107	1.53675	100
text-generating Pre-test	Experiment	3.8028	.69291	50
	Control	1.2316	.64775	50
	Total	2.5172	1.45423	100
text-generating Post-test	Experiment	3.8888	.70672	50
	Control	1.3212	.64504	50
	Total	2.6050	1.45531	100
feedback handling Pre-test	Experiment	3.8198	.76737	50
	Control	1.0992	.68334	50
	Total	2.4595	1.54650	100
feedback handling Post-test	Experiment	3.9200	.76421	50
	Control	1.1960	.68170	50
	Total	2.5580	1.54688	100
revising Pre-test	Experiment	3.8512	.67895	50
	Control	1.2250	.64182	50
	Total	2.5381	1.47435	100

revising Post-test	Experiment	3.9440	.68151	50
	Control	1.3200	.64237	50
	Total	2.6320	1.47406	100
translating Pre-test	Experiment	2.9592	.59791	50
	Control	1.4796	.31071	50
	Total	2.2194	.88179	100
translating Post-test	Experiment	3.1548	.47877	50
	Control	1.6082	.44089	50
	Total	2.3815	.90205	100
reviewing Pre-test	Experiment	3.3774	.40312	50
	Control	1.8284	.40128	50
	Total	2.6029	.87524	100
reviewing Post-test	Experiment	3.4430	.39377	50
	Control	1.8754	.39037	50
	Total	2.6592	.87904	100
organizing Pre-test	Experiment	3.8340	.73054	50
	Control	1.1196	.73818	50
	Total	2.4768	1.54740	100
organizing Post-test	Experiment	3.9116	.74506	50
	Control	1.2058	.74214	50
	Total	2.5587	1.54796	100
citation creativity Pre-test	Experiment	2.3028	.38253	50
	Control	.8942	.37065	50
	Total	1.5985	.80092	100
citation creativity Post-test	Experiment	2.3632	.37825	50
	Control	.9272	.37212	50
	Total	1.6452	.81245	100
content Pre-test	Experiment	4.0468	.70621	50
	Control	1.2472	.75536	50
	Total	2.6470	1.58382	100
content Post-test	Experiment	4.1264	.70357	50
	Control	1.3388	.74440	50
	Total	2.7326	1.57530	100
language use Pre-test	Experiment	3.7300	.74938	50
	Control	1.1756	.64901	50
	Total	2.4528	1.46087	100
language use Post-test	Experiment	3.8192	.75378	50
	Control	1.2800	.64571	50
	Total	2.5496	1.45456	100

The mean, standard deviation, and N (total number of observations) scores were calculated to describe the results of the study. The data consisted of 100 observations, with 50 observations in the experimental group and 50 in the control group through pre-test and post-test. The average mean score was found higher for the experimental group with a mean of 4.047 in the pre-test and 4.126 in the post-test. The lowest mean was found in the citation creativity variable obtained by the control group, with a mean of 0.894 in the pre-test and 0.927 in the post-test for the control group. Overall, the post-test scores were always higher than the pre-test scores and the scores in the control group were always lower than those in the experimental group.

Pearson's Correlation Test

Pearson's correlation is a measure of the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables. Two variables correlate if a change in one variable is followed by a change in the other variable in the same direction or vice versa. The following correlation matrix shows the relationship between the dependent variables.

Table 2. correlation matrix between dependent variables

		planning	Text-generating	Feedback handling	Revising	Translating	reviewing	organizing	citation creativity	Content	language use
Planning	Pearson Correlation	1	.998**	.999**	.997**	.990**	.996**	.999**	.997**	.996**	.997**
Text-generating	Pearson Correlation	.998**	1	.998**	.999**	.987**	.997**	.998**	.998**	.995**	.998**
Feedback handling	Pearson Correlation	.999**	.998**	1	.997**	.988**	.995**	.998**	.997**	.995**	.999**
Revising	Pearson Correlation	.997**	.999**	.997**	1	.985**	.998**	.998**	.998**	.995**	.996**
Translating	Pearson Correlation	.990**	.987**	.988**	.985**	1	.984**	.989**	.983**	.981**	.988**
Reviewing	Pearson Correlation	.996**	.997**	.995**	.998**	.984**	1	.996**	.998**	.994**	.995**
Organizing	Pearson Correlation	.999**	.998**	.998**	.998**	.989**	.996**	1	.997**	.996**	.998**

citation creativity	Pearson Correlation	.997**	.998**	.997**	.998**	.983**	.998**	.997**	1	.995**	.997**
content	Pearson Correlation	.996**	.995**	.995**	.995**	.981**	.994**	.996**	.995**	1	.993**
language use	Pearson Correlation	.997**	.998**	.999**	.996**	.988**	.995**	.998**	.997**	.993**	1

Table 2 presents the correlation matrix of the vertical and horizontal relationship between 100 dependent variables. Each dependent variable in the post-test are closely correlated as indicated by correlation value above 0.9 or come near to 1, indicating the presence of close relationship between dependent variables.

Table 3 The Correlation matrix of independent variable toward dependent variable

	planning	Text-generating	Feedback handling	Revising	Translating	reviewing	Organizing	citation creativity	content	language use
group	-.887**	-.887**	-.885**	-.895**	-.865**	-.896**	-.878**	-.888**	-.889**	-.878**

As seen in Table 3, the correlation between the variable group and each dependent variable is negative. Hence, an increase in the independent variable will lead to a decrease in the 10 dependent variables. Therefore, a change in status from the experimental group (value 1 on the independent variable) to the control group (value 2) will result in a decrease in the value of the 10 dependent variables. On the other hand, each correlation coefficient is quite large, indicating that there is a close relationship between the variable group and the 10 dependent variables.

MANOVA

MANOVA is a statistical test used to measure the effect of 12 independent variables (measured on a categorical scale) on several dependent variables (measured on a quantitative scale) at the same time. ANOVA (analysis of variance) allows multivariate texts that include multiple dependent variables. MANOVA evaluates the simultaneous impacts of an independent variable on multiple dependent variables.

Table 4. Manova simultaneous test for post-test

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.999	6210.554[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.001	6210.554[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	697.815	6210.554[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	697.815	6210.554[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
Group	Pillai's Trace	.875	62.533[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.125	62.533[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	7.026	62.533[b]	10.000	89.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	7.026	62.533[b]	10.000	89.000	.000

Table 4 shows that all of Pillai's Trace test, Wilks' lambda, hotelling's trace, and roys' largest root indicate significant influences. The results imply that at least one variable has simultaneous significant effect.

Table 5. Partial Manova test at in the post-test

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Group	Planning	183.955	1	183.955	361.693	.000
	Text-generating	164.814	1	164.814	360.045	.000
	Feedback handling	185.504	1	185.504	353.768	.000
	Revising	172.134	1	172.134	392.511	.000
	Translating	59.954	1	59.954	292.017	.000
	Reviewing	61.434	1	61.434	399.641	.000
	Organizing	183.088	1	183.088	330.823	.000
	citation creativity	51.552	1	51.552	366.211	.000
	Content	194.268	1	194.268	370.333	.000
	language use	161.544	1	161.544	330.440	.000

a. R Squared = ,787 (Adjusted R Squared = ,785)
b. R Squared = ,786 (Adjusted R Squared = ,784)
c. R Squared = ,783 (Adjusted R Squared = ,781)
d. R Squared = ,800 (Adjusted R Squared = ,798)
e. R Squared = ,749 (Adjusted R Squared = ,746)
f. R Squared = ,803 (Adjusted R Squared = ,801)
g. R Squared = ,771 (Adjusted R Squared = ,769)
h. R Squared = ,789 (Adjusted R Squared = ,787)
i. R Squared = ,791 (Adjusted R Squared = ,789)
j. R Squared = ,771 (Adjusted R Squared = ,769)

Based on Table 5 above, the variable group significantly affects all of the dependent variables, as indicated by the significant values in the sig. column. Each variable has a sig. value less than 0.05, indicating that the variable group has a significant effect on the dependent variables. The partial modelling shows that 10 models have an R-squared value of up to 75%,

indicating that the variable group can explain 75% of the variation in the dependent variables, while the remaining 25% is explained by variables that are not included in this study.

Dummy Regression on MANOVA

A dummy variable was used to quantify quantitative variables (ex: gender, race, religion, changes in government policy, situation change, etc.). A dummy variable is a categorical variable that is suspected of influencing continuous variables. Dummy variables are often called doll variable, binary, category, or dichotomy. Dummy variables have only two scores, 1 and 0, and are denoted by the symbol D. Dummy have a score of 1 (D=1) for one of the categories and a score of 0 (D=0) for the others. In MANOVA analysis, display the results of regression analysis with dummy variables to evaluate if there is a significant difference between dummy variables that have at least one independent variable.

Table 6. Estimation of Manova parameters in post-test scores

Dependent Variable	Parameter	B	Std. Error	T	Sig.
Planning	Intercept	1.254	.101	12.438	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.713	.143	19.018	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
Text-generating	Intercept	1.321	.096	13.808	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.568	.135	18.975	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
Feedback handling	Intercept	1.196	.102	11.679	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.724	.145	18.809	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
Revising	Intercept	1.320	.094	14.095	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.624	.132	19.812	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
Translating	Intercept	1.578	.064	24.629	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.549	.091	17.088	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
Reviewing	Intercept	1.875	.055	33.823	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.568	.078	19.991	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.

Organizing	Intercept	1.205	.105	11.457	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.706	.149	18.189	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
citation creativity	Intercept	.927	.053	17.474	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.436	.075	19.137	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
Content	Intercept	1.339	.102	13.071	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.788	.145	19.244	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
language use	Intercept	1.280	.099	12.945	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.542	.140	18.178	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.

Table 6 presents the differences between experiment group indicated by a dummy at variable group in score 1 toward control group indicated by a dummy at variable control in score 2 after post-test that are higher than 2.788. Furthermore, the least difference was found in the citation creativity variable of around 1.436.

Table 7. Manova comparison on each variable

Dependent Variable	Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
text-generating Pre-test	Intercept	1.232	.095	12.984	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.571	.134	19.168	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
text-generating Post-test	Intercept	1.321	.096	13.808	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.568	.135	18.975	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
feedback handling Pre-test	Intercept	1.099	.103	10.698	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.721	.145	18.722	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
feedback handling Post-test	Intercept	1.196	.102	11.679	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.724	.145	18.809	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
revising Pre-test	Intercept	1.225	.093	13.111	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.626	.132	19.876	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
revising Post-test	Intercept	1.320	.094	14.095	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.624	.132	19.812	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
translating Pre-test	Intercept	1.480	.067	21.958	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.480	.095	15.527	.000

	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
translating Post-test	Intercept	1.608	.065	24.709	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.547	.092	16.803	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
reviewing Pre-test	Intercept	1.828	.057	32.145	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.549	.080	19.257	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
reviewing Post-test	Intercept	1.875	.055	33.823	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.568	.078	19.991	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
organizing Pre-test	Intercept	1.120	.104	10.780	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.714	.147	18.481	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
organizing Post-test	Intercept	1.206	.105	11.466	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.706	.149	18.194	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
citation creativity Pre-test	Intercept	.894	.053	16.788	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.409	.075	18.700	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
citation creativity Post-test	Intercept	.927	.053	17.474	.000
	[Group=1,00]	1.436	.075	19.137	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
content Pre-test	Intercept	1.247	.103	12.061	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.800	.146	19.144	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
content Post-test	Intercept	1.339	.102	13.071	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.788	.145	19.244	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
language use Pre-test	Intercept	1.176	.099	11.859	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.554	.140	18.220	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
language use Post-test	Intercept	1.280	.099	12.896	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.539	.140	18.090	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
planning Pre-test	Intercept	1.202	.101	11.892	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.727	.143	19.086	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.
planning Post-test	Intercept	1.254	.101	12.438	.000
	[Group=1,00]	2.713	.143	19.018	.000
	[Group=2,00]	0[a]	.	.	.

The results of the MANOVA analysis indicate a significant difference between the experimental group (group 1) and the control group (group 2) in both pre-test and post-test conditions. This difference can be seen in all variables with a significant value less than 0.05.

However, it should be noted that the differences in scores between the experimental and control groups are not always greater in the post-test compared to the pre-test.

Discussion

There were 100 participants in this study who assigned into the control group and the experimental group. Pre-test scores were compared to the post test scores. The result indicated higher mean scores for content, while the lowest mean scores were found for citation creativity variables. Overall, post-test scores were always higher than pre-test scores, and scores in the control group were always lower than those in the experimental group. The results of the study suggest a close relationship between the dependent variables in the post-test condition, as indicated by correlation values above 0.9 or close to 1. The correlation matrix for the independent variables towards the dependent variables showed that the relationship between the variable groups and all of the dependent variables was negative. Therefore, increases in the independent variables will be followed by decreases in 10 dependent variables. MANOVA simultaneous testing in the post-test condition showed significant results, where there is at least one variable that has a significant effect on the 10 dependent variables. The partial modelling shows that the 10 models have an overall R-squared value of up to 75%, which means that the variable group can represent each dependent variable to a great extent (75%). The remaining 25% is represented by other variables outside this study. The MANOVA analysis also revealed the results of regression analysis with dummy variables to examine the significant difference between the dummy independent variables.

In conclusion, the results of the study suggest that writing instruction has a significant impact on students' writing assessment. The close relationship between the dependent variables in the post-test condition is also noteworthy. These findings support previous research (Finlayson & Mccrudden, 2019) who revealed that teacher-implemented writing instruction could improve student writing results. However, this study was conducted in a school district which students were from middle-class. Hence, factors other than writing instruction may have contributed to writing performance. Additionally, the study did not account for how well the intervention was administered across teachers, hence the study lacks generalizability.

Jones et al., (2010) has found significant student progress in phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, and word reading skills over time. Both interactive writing and writing workshop approaches are effective in supporting the development of early reading abilities. (Grisham & Wolsey, 2016) discovered that there was little writing instruction in the schools where teacher candidates were assigned to perform reading. In a recent study, Brown et al. (2020) examined the use of writing instruction. In their first experiment, half of the students received explicit writing training, while the other half did not. In the second trial, all students were given standard writing instruction, but the control groups also received specific instruction related to the implementation of a writing-skills rubric. The post-treatment difference between groups was minor in both cases, but it demonstrated an improvement in the specific abilities taught while demonstrating no change or slightly lower performance in related skills that were

not expressly taught. Specific aspects of process writing were valued by teacher candidates (focus on student needs, choice, scaffolding, student interest and engagement, and literacy skills).

Previous research of (Jones et al., 2010) has established that Significant student progress in phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, and word reading skills over time. Students in both the interactive writing group and the writing workshop group showed comparable growth over time for each of the three outcome measures, with no statistically significant difference between the groups for any of the outcome measures at any of the time points. Although these two styles of writing teaching are frequently presented as diametrically opposed instructional approaches, both appear to be equally efficient at supporting the development of early reading abilities. (Grisham & Wolsey, 2016) The researchers discovered that there was little writing training in the schools where the teacher candidates were assigned, and that reading and reading skills dominated observed literacy instruction. Specific aspects of process writing were valued by teacher candidates (focuses were on student needs, choice, scaffolding, student interest and engagement, and literacy skills).

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In conclusion, writing instruction should be used to help students not only acquire writing abilities, but also to help them think critically and work through challenges through writing. This study investigated the correlation between group with planning, text-generating, feedback handling, revising, translating, reviewing, organizing, citation creativity, content, and language use, either simultaneously or partially, and to determine the significant differences between groups towards each dependent variable. The results of the study show that there is at least one variable that has a significant effect on the 10 dependent variables and that the variable group significantly affects all the dependent variables as shown by the significant values lesser than 0.05. Additionally, the partial modeling shows that the 10 models have an overall R-squared value of up to 75%, which means that the variable group can largely represent each dependent variable (75%). The remaining 25% is represented by other variables that were not discussed in this study.

REFERENCES

Boscolo, P., & Cisotto, L. (1999). Instructional strategies for teaching to write : A Q-sort analysis. *Learning and Instruction 9*(2), 209–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(98)00042-5

Brown, C. M., James, S. E., Soroka, G., Brown, C. M., James, S. E., Soroka, G., & Content, E. (2021). Explicit content : Two experiments on bringing writing instruction into the political science classroom. *Journal of Political Science Education*, *17*(1), 835861. https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2020.1716239

Chamot, A. U. H. L., George, T., & El-dinary, P. B. (1992). Children's learning strategies in language immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal, 83*(3), 319–

338. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00025

Cutler, L., & Graham, S. (2008). Primary grade writing instruction : A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*(4), 907–919. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012656

Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue : Power and pedagogy in educating other people ' s children. *Harvard Educational Review 58*(3), 280–299.

Finlayson, K., & Mccrudden, M. T. (2019). Teacher-implemented writing instruction for elementary students : a literature review. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *35*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1604278

Grisham, D. L., & Wolsey, T. D. (2011). Writing instruction for teacher candidates : Strengthening a weak curricular area. *Literacy Research and Instruction* 50(4): 348-364). https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2010.532581

Hall, A. H., Simpson, A., Guo, Y., & Wang, S. (2015). Literacy research and instruction examining the effects of preschool writing instruction on emergent literacy skills : a systematic review of the literature. *Literacy Research and Instruction 54(2)*, 115–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2014.991883

Hillocks, G. (2001). *Written composition new directions for teaching*. National Conference on Research in English.

Jones, C. D. O., Reutzel, D. R., Fargo, J. D., & Fargo, J. D. (2010). Comparing two methods of writing instruction : effects on kindergarten students ' reading skills. *The Journal of Educational Research 103(5)*, 327–341. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670903383119

Jones, C. D. (2015). Effects of writing instruction on kindergarten students ' writing achievement : an experimental study. *Journal of Educational Research 108(1),* 35–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2013.836466

Lensmire, T. J. (1993). Following the child , socioanalysis , and threats to community : Teacher response to children ' s texts. *Curriculum Inquiry* 23(3), 265-299. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1993.11076126

Machili, I., Papadopoulou, I., & Kantaridou, Z. (2019). Effect of strategy instruction on EFL students ' video-mediated integrated writing performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing 48,* . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100708

Mccarthey, S. J. (1994). Authors, talk, and text: The internalization of dialogue from social interaction during writing. *Reading Research Quarterly 29*(3), 200–231. https://doi.org/10.2307/747871

Mccarthey, S. J., Sun, Y., & Ro, E. (2011). Approaches to writing instruction. *Pedagogis 6*(4), 273–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2011.604902

Pollington, M. F., & Wilcox, B. (2001). Self-perception in writing : The effects of writing workshop and traditional instruction on intermediate grade. *Reading Psychology 22(4)*, 249–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710127640

Reed, W. M. (2014). Computing in education assessing the impact of computer-based writing instruction. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education 28(4) 418-437.*

https://doi.org/10.1080/08886504.1996.10782176
Roitsch, J., Gumpert, M., Springle, A., Raymer, A. M., (2020). Writing instruction for students with learning disabilities : A quality appraisal of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *37*(1), 32–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1708221
Shanahan, T. (1980). The impact of writing instruction on learning to read. *Reading World 19: 4,* 357–368. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388078009557556
Stein, M., Isaacson, S., Dixon, R. C., Stein, M., Isaacson, S., & Dixon, R. C. (1994). Effective writing instruction for diverse learner*s*. *School Psychology Review* 23(3), 392-405. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.1994.12085720
Sullivan, R. M., & Sullivan, R. M. (2013). The tablet inscribed : Inclusive writing instruction with the iPad. *College Training 61(1)1-2*. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2012.700339
Troia, G. A., & Maddox, M. E. (2010). Writing instruction in middle schools : Special and general education teachers share their views and voice their concerns. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal 12(1)*,19- 37. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327035ex1201_3

The effectiveness of writing instruction in the writing assessment among EFL Students

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%	10%	10%	5%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	4%
2	jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id Internet Source	2%
3	Bai, Barry. "The effects of strategy-based writing instruction in Singapore primary schools", System, 2015. Publication	2%
4	gsoroka.org Internet Source	1%
5	Submitted to University of Central Oklahoma Student Paper	1%
6	research.bangor.ac.uk Internet Source	1%
7	doczz.net Internet Source	1%
8	Jane Roitsch, Mindy Gumpert, Alisha Springle, Anastasia M. Raymer. "Writing Instruction for	1%

Students with Learning Disabilities: Quality Appraisal of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses", Reading & Writing Quarterly, 2020
Publication

9	Ika Permatasari. "Corporate governance in relationship with bank risk management", International Journal of Financial Engineering, 2021 Publication	1 %
10	facultyweb.cortland.edu Internet Source	1 %

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	< 1%
Exclude bibliography	On		