

Original Research

Effects of the Sequential Use of Input-and Output-Based Consciousness-Raising Grammar-Focused Instructional Mediations on Students' Writing Performance and Attitudes

Bifa Telila¹, Tamiru Olana*² & Mekuria Zewudie²

¹Language and Literature Department, Salale University, Fiche, Ethiopia

²Language and Literature Department, Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia

Abstract

Using input-and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional mediations sequentially, this study sought to explore the effects on students' attitudes and writing performance. In order to achieve its objectives, the study employed a non-equivalent group research design that involved pretests and posttests. In a completely random manner, two intact learning sections were distributed to both the experimental group (n = 47) and the control group (n = 47). A Likert scale survey and written evaluations were used to collect data. Both a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and an independent sample t-test were used as inferential tests to examine the data. According to the results of the writing posttest, the intervention significantly improved students' writing performance on the evaluated elements. Likewise, the post-intervention questionnaire showed a statistically significant difference ($t(92) = 6.768, p = .000$), showing that the experimental group's writing attitudes changed significantly as a result of the intervention.

Article Information

Article History:

Received: 16-01-2024

Revised: 22-02-2024

Accepted: 30-03-2024

Keywords:

Dictogloss, Direct

Intervention, Explicit, Input

Enhancement, Input flooding

*Corresponding

Author:

Tamiru Olana

E-mail:

olanatamiru58@gmail.com

Copyright©2024 STAR Journal, Wollega University. All Rights Reserved.

INTRODUCTION

It is critical to assist students' writing performance in language learning and teaching processes because writing allows students to convey and exchange ideas, thoughts, and sentiments during real-life communications (De Smedt et al., 2019). Therefore, in order for pupils to communicate meaningfully in natural contexts, they must develop the writing abilities necessary for self-expression. This is also the belief held by Kellogg (2008), who maintains that when students complete writing projects in the classroom, writing is an essential ability that helps them reinforce the lexical resources and

grammatical structures of a target language. Writing is, therefore, an important skill that L2 learners must develop in order to properly express their thoughts and feelings through language (Brown, 2001; Hyland, 2003). Indeed, students need to have a wide vocabulary of concepts and ideas in addition to being able to control the language aspects that must be included in a written work (Jabali, 2018). Thus, all components of writing, including organisation, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics, must be included in learners' writing (Jahin & Idrees, 2012). Students can create

written compositions with more impact when these writing elements are placed correctly.

Despite its significance, writing is a difficult and demanding skill for many L2 learners. Language second-language learners frequently struggle to apply the necessary language components which formal written texts must have to create readable written texts for meaningful interactions. This claim is supported by Hyland (2003), who notes that the hardest language the skill for second language learners to master is writing. This makes it difficult for them to come up with and organise ideas during conversations in a way that satisfies the requirements. In support of this argument, Pertiwi, Ngadiso, and Drajadi (2018) elaborate on how challenging writing is and how it is worrisome when second language learners are unable to generate ideas and organise them into a coherent essay due to a lack of lexical resources and grammatical understanding of the English language. For all foreign language learners, writing has long been considered the most difficult and demanding language component (Jabali, 2018).

The majority of Ethiopian students' writing did not satisfy the required criteria, according to Fente, Demissie, and Negash's (2018) research, since they were unable to utilise suitable syntax, vocabulary, coherent devices, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Ethiopia served as the research setting for the study. Consequently, in recent years, academics and educators have directed increasing attention towards the problem of Ethiopian secondary school students' poor writing skills. Teachers and academics often bemoan the fact that the majority of Ethiopian secondary school pupils lack the writing skills necessary to produce meaningful communications (Solomon, 2001; Yigzaw, 2013; Tefera, Berkessa, & Ali, 2019).

According to a study by Dar and Khan (2015), most foreign language learners usually have a very difficult time controlling language elements like grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics to produce a cohesive written text for communications. Put another way, a lot of foreign students have trouble with and/or are unable to write well because they are unable to control aspects like organisation, syntax, word choice, and mechanics that are necessary for a written piece (Paker & Erarslan, 2015).

Accordingly, it has been shown that pupils who are not proficient in the language generally have negative attitudes when it comes to finishing writing assignments in L2 schools (Harmer, 2007). Put another way, students' perceptions of writing's difficulty sometimes lead to negative attitudes towards it. According to Pertiwi, Ngadiso, and Drajadi (2018), students with language difficulties often feel less confident. Jabali (2018) confirms that students who experience language difficulties frequently develop a hatred for writing. Thus, expanding students' linguistic vocabulary through efficient teaching techniques is crucial to improving their writing attitudes in foreign contexts where language input is limited to learning classrooms. Consequently, a multitude of studies have evinced the potential impact of students' attitudes on their writing skills as well as potential correlations between the two (Graham & Fan, 2007). This demonstrates the strong relationship between students' attitudes and writing abilities. The connection between students' attitudes and writing skills in Ethiopian schools, however, hasn't received much attention. Consequently, it is concluded that in order to change students' attitudes regarding writing assignments, Ethiopian secondary schools need to use a new teaching strategy. While Hyland (2003) and Genç-Ersoy and Göl-

Dede (2022) have identified several other obstacles, such as pedagogical and cognitive challenges, the goal of this study is to enhance learners' language knowledge and attitudes in relation to students' writing proficiency.

Focus on form (FonF) emerged in the 1990s as a response to the substantial challenges second language learners had when attempting to apply appropriate linguistic components of the English language (Spada & Lightbown, 2008; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). The communicative language teaching (CLT) approach, which prioritises fluency above linguistic accuracy in everyday interactions, has served as the movement's primary source of inspiration (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Thus, as they necessitate the incorporation of formal grammar instruction and communication in L2 teaching situations, form-focused instructional choices have been promoted (VanPatten & Benati, 2010). Therefore, formal instruction on grammatical forms is required to enable high levels of targeted feature acquisition and accuracy for L2 learners (Doughty & Long, 2003; Robinson, 2001; Williams, 2005). Thus, students' attention to language forms can be successfully drawn by form-focused instruction that alternates between input- and collaborative output-based methods (Swain, 2005; Spada & Lightbown, 2008; VanPatten & Benati, 2010; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). When the two form-focused instructional options are employed in order, learners will have plenty of opportunity to understand and find a balance between the relevance of linguistic form and its connected meanings (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011).

In particular, according to Swain (2005), unless output-based activities such as text-editing and dictogloss are used sequentially following input-based instructional alternatives, students' writing performance will not

demonstrate linguistic accuracy. The collaborative output tasks help students write more precisely and motivatedly, which influences their attitudes towards viewing writing assignments (Mehdiabadi & Arabmofrad, 2015). Lee (2001) provides evidence to support this theory by stating that students get excited and enthusiastic about working together on collaborative output tasks such as dictogloss and when they receive assistance from others in identifying linguistic errors in their works. This is why the current researchers have chosen to employ input- and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional mediations in turn, since they are convinced that enhancing students' language proficiency will enhance their writing prowess and attitudes. To the knowledge of the current researchers, no such study has been conducted in Ethiopian secondary schools, where the goal is to raise students' consciousness through a sequential application of input-and output-based instructional mediations while simultaneously improving students' writing performance and attitudes. Thus, the goal of our endeavour is to close this disparity. Accordingly, the research was designed to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1: Does the experimental group's writing performance differ statistically significantly from that of the control groups in terms of word choice, coherence, mechanics, concept development and organisation, and grammatical usage?
- RQ2: Does the experimental group's attitude towards writing differ statistically significantly from that of the control groups?

By providing answers to these research questions, it is expected that the study would significantly improve the field of teaching and studying second languages in Ethiopian secondary schools. In particular, research on the sequential application of grammar-focused instructions that focus on both input and output and raise consciousness to improve learners' writing performance and attitudes will be made possible.

Input-Based Consciousness-Raising Grammar Focused Instructional Mediations

The first phase of the mediation in the current study includes input-based grammar-focused instructional tactics like textual augmentation, input flooding, direct interventions, and indirect interventions. The direct and indirect instructional interventions are two separate but complementary input-based teaching approaches that were given by psycholinguists Ellis et al. (2009). The successive application of both explicit and implicit teaching tactics is referred to as direct instructional intervention. Before engaging students in a communicative environment, teachers should provide them with ample verbal input and a detailed explanation of each activity. Some language teaching experts, like Doughty (2003) and Norris and Ortega (2000), argue that grammar and other related linguistic features should be taught in an explicit instructional technique to help students develop declarative knowledge of the target linguistic features before encouraging students to complete tasks in an implicit manner in communicative classrooms. Students can use grammar consciousness-raising or noticing exercises to solve grammatical issues (Ellis, 2005). Additionally, Ellis claims that specific instruction expedites learning. Furthermore,

explicit instruction outperforms implicit instruction, and implicit grammar training is insufficient to encourage competent use of the target language (Norris & Ortega, 2000).

On the other hand, Ellis (2008) contends that a combination of explicit and implicit teaching strategies can successfully accomplish the acquisition of a target grammatical form in second language classrooms. To support this assumption, Spada and Lightbown (2008) emphasise that language learning cannot occur until learners are initially aware of the structure of the target language. Ellis (2005) states that teachers should support their students' overt acquisition of grammatical patterns before using implicit learning to help them become more proficient and integrated into their language system. Consequently, increasing students' language competency through the sequential use of explicit and implicit teaching methodologies helps them to utilise language features in L2 classroom writing projects. After taking these factors into account, it can be concluded that using explicit and implicit instructional tactics in L2 classrooms in the order listed above may improve students' language competency. It is believed that doing this will enhance kids' attitudes and writing abilities.

The third input-based teaching method utilised in L2 classrooms to improve students' grammatical understanding is textual enhancement (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; VanPatten & Benati, 2010). One way to implement the instructional option in written texts is to use different textual changes, including underlining, italicising, bolding, capitalising, and colour coding, to typographically highlight specific target words embedded in the text (Schmidt, 2001). Schmidt states that the pedagogical alternative is recommended because it can help students recognise and become more conscious

of specific grammatical input components that are difficult to notice in normal settings. One way to accomplish this is to provide students an actual reading comprehension book that contains enough examples of the targeted forms indicated by one or more of the devices discussed above (Wong, 2005). The text that follows is an example of an enhanced text that raises learners' awareness of the third-person singular forms in English by using a bolding device with trust.

The man visits the park with his dog. He carries a ball that he will toss to the dog. He throws the ball a great distance when he gets to the park and the dog runs after it. The dog reappears with the ball between his lips. When the dog returns with the ball, the man is overjoyed. He throws the ball for his dog to chase for the remainder of the day. (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011, p. 41)

Another method of input-based, grammar-focused, consciousness-raising training is called "input-flooding," in which teachers are supposed to show students multiple written texts containing a particular target grammatical feature (Gass & Selinker, 2008). The foundation of this teaching strategy is the idea that shape in written texts captures students' attention since it is perceptually noticeable when it occurs frequently (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). To this end, studies have demonstrated that input frequency plays a major role in boosting the salience of the desired form (Ellis, 2002).

The following paragraph demonstrates the input flood challenge, which demands students to focus on the definite and indefinite articles in the English language. This line should clarify that target items in input flooding jobs should be shown frequently instead of being underlined or having their font altered.

Perched on a couple huge tree limbs, a chipmunk balanced. It made the decision to leave the tree and search for food because it was so hungry. It ascended through the tree's branches to its trunk before dropping to the earth beneath. The chipmunk noticed that there was a plenty of acorns and grass! The chipmunk was excited and scurried back up the tree trunk to its nest after gathering as many acorns as it could. The chipmunk had a delicious dinner there (Ellis, 2002)

The second half of the intervention is more likely to be successful if it incorporates collaborative output-based grammar-focused consciousness-raising instructional alternatives and interactional feedback, in addition to these input-based grammar -focused instructional activities. This is due to the fact that the output-based instructional options are better at fostering declarative knowledge and comprehension skills related to the targeted linguistic features, while the input-based instructional options covered above are better at fostering production skills to develop procedural knowledge on the grammatical aspects.

Interactional Feedback on Students' Written Errors

This is an additional educational intervention with a grammar-focused focus that aims to increase students' awareness of grammatical forms in communicative contexts (Gass, 2003). The pedagogy depends on interactionist theoretical perspectives on second language acquisition (SLA) since it bases its theory on the notion that negotiated contact is necessary to pay closer attention to the targeted forms in written texts (Ellis, 2001). Teachers can draw students' attention to errors in their writing assignments by implementing interactional bargaining as soon as a task is finished (Nassaji,

2007). A large body of research in the area suggests that students may benefit most from interactional feedback on their writing errors when it is combined with other form-focused learning opportunities, such explicit teaching (Lyster, 2004).

The interactional feedback that students frequently receive from professors and classmates has a significant impact on their attitudes towards writing (Silva & Brice, 2004; Hedgcock, 2005; Lee, 2008).

The aim of the current study is to raise learners' awareness of specific linguistic input for their future usage of written texts by integrating interactional feedback into output-based educational mediations. This is based on the theory that, while input-based instructional options have their value, it will be more beneficial and necessary to use output-based instructional mediations in the future to greatly enhance L2 learners' accuracy, fluency, and automatization of a range of language-related tasks (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). This suggests that for grammar instruction to be fully beneficial in language production—for instance, in writing performance—it needs to offer students a multitude of opportunities for the input- and output-based pedagogical choices.

Consequently, to improve students' writing performance and attitudes towards writing, teachers should combine collaborative output-based pedagogical options like interactional feedback and dictogloss with input-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional options like textual enhancement, input flooding, and direct intervention (explicit and implicit instructions).

Dictogloss of Collaborative Output Task

Nassaji and Fotos (2011) characterise Dictogloss of Collaborative Output as a

grammar-focused consciousness-raising effort that requires students to give attention to meaning and grammatical forms to help them generate written output responsibly. Using the collaborative output task, the dictogloss, is essential to enhancing students' writing skills and attitudes because it offers appropriate teaching opportunities, according to Vygotsky's social constructivist theory (1978). Thus, two theoretical positions—Vygotsky's (1978) social construction and Swain's (1995) comprehensive output—have a direct bearing on how this part of the intervention is implemented. Actually, language production is what language learners seek to achieve in order to increase their L2 competency, according to Swain's premise, whereas the social construction theory asserts that learning is fundamentally social. A growing body of research supports the collaborative output task, especially the dictogloss, contending that even though students are exposed to comprehensible input, their writing performance falls short of certain L2 requirements that must be included in a written text (Swain, 2005; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Therefore, in order to help children in such impoverished circumstances surpass their existing level of inter-language proficiency, Swain continues to propose that they be given suitable chances for language production.

The dictogloss is a cooperative output task that encourages students to work together to rebuild an oral written text and produce language forms (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). On the other hand, Swain and Lapkin (2001) underlined that students are motivated to pay special attention to linguistic intricacies when they actively participate in written texts supplied by their teacher through a collaborative dictogloss exercise. Students who successfully complete the collaborative dictogloss task report feeling

satisfied and developing positive attitudes towards writing assignments because they are able to collaborate with one another and effectively use the target linguistic features, according to Lee (2001), a different expert in language instruction.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

To accomplish the goal of the intervention, the study employed pre-posttest non-equivalent group quasi-experimental research design. The study's participants were 10th graders from Shager City, Ethiopia's Sadamo Ifa Boru Secondary School. 94 pupils in all participated in the study. Two undamaged learning parts were selected using a random sampling approach, and the experimental group (n = 47) and control group (n = 47) were given the samples.

Data Gathering instruments

Data from the students was gathered using a Likert scale questionnaire and written assessments (pre-post-tests). The writing assessments for the pretest and posttest underwent several stages of preparation, including creation, validation, testing, and revision. For the pretest, students were to write a 100–150 word essay on the subject "My reasons why Ethiopia should be very economical in the use of electric power." In the posttest, under the subject "How to increase the production of coffee for daily consumption and the market," students were required to write a paragraph with the same word count. The pretest was designed to find out if there were any prior differences between the experimental and control groups. It was administered to both research groups before the trial classroom intervention was

implemented. However, the posttest was administered to both groups immediately after the intervention ended to ascertain whether the experimental group's unique intervention had a substantial impact on the students' writing skills.

To be objective in evaluating students' writing abilities, five evaluation rubrics covering areas including word choice, coherence, mechanics, concept development and organisation, and grammatical usage were clearly laid out. Similar to this, a Likert scale-based questionnaire from past research in the sector was utilised to ascertain students' opinions regarding writing assignments. Thirteen statements, each with a different form, were supposed to address the same subject—students' perceptions of their writing ability. Then, it was distributed to the two study groups to ascertain their opinions regarding writing tasks prior to and following the intervention.

Procedure of the Intervention

In order to mitigate the possibility of confounding variables impairing the internal validity of the study, the intervention was conducted under the guidance of a lone educator. Actually, the intervention went through three stages in quick succession, each of which contributed to achieving the primary goal of the study.

The intervention material was initially developed by the present researchers by going over a variety of reading materials and past studies conducted in the field. After that, grammatical elements like definite and indefinite articles, English language tenses, active and passive voices, relative clauses, reported speech, conditional phrases, and modals were incorporated into the design of the intervention material. A few lexical resources,

mechanics, and coherence devices were also included in the intervention material. After the intervention materials were prepared, two different writing evaluations were developed with similar content and difficulty levels in cooperation with a range of support reading materials. Grading rubrics encompassing cohesive devices (coherence), word choice, mechanics, and grammatical usage were identified in order to objectively assess students' writing abilities. Furthermore, the content was prepared with the intention of eliciting learners' opinions about writing tasks. In the meantime, the credentials, experience, and desire to assist were taken into consideration when selecting the instructor who led the intervention. He received three days of nonstop instruction on how to administer the treatment in the treatment classroom. As a result, the instructor got instruction on how to use different teaching techniques to cover the same grammar issues with separate study groups. Since only one teacher is involved in both learning components, the possibility of confounding factors endangering the study's internal validity is reduced.

The pretest was completed by both research groups before the new condition was implemented. It was given to both research groups on the same day at the same time in order to ascertain whether there were any initial group differences in writing performance between the two groups with relation to the five writing elements identified for evaluation. The same students in the study groups were given a pre-intervention questionnaire on the same day in order to determine whether or not there was a pre-existing difference in the students' attitudes towards writing.

When the experimental group's students complete these warm-up activities, they start a

new eight-week course of treatment. While the control group received the same language instruction using the conventional method, the CLT, which downplays the importance of emphasising linguistic forms in learning environments and only focuses on language use, the experimental group was exposed to sequential input-and-output based grammar-focused consciousness-raising instructional mediations. Immediately after the first phase of the intervention, students were given significant open-ended activities to expand their understanding of the target linguistic features. This increased their awareness and enabled them to recognise the required linguistic aspects. Since knowing about the new therapy could taint the study's ultimate findings and render its internal fidelity useless, students in both study groups were kept in the dark about the intervention during it.

Following the conclusion of therapy, both research groups took writing post-test at the same time on the same day to assess if the intervention had improved the students' writing skills. Actually, the pre- and post-tests were assessed by two different raters using those five interconnected writing criteria. Upon the conclusion of the session, both research groups received the post-intervention questionnaire. The new intervention was given to students in both research groups to examine if it affected their attitudes towards writing.

Methods of Data Analysis

The data was analysed using inferential tests such the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and independent sample t-test. Based on exam results and questionnaire responses completed before and after the intervention, the means of the experimental and

control groups were compared using the independent sample t-test. This was achieved by first using an Excel spreadsheet to transform the questionnaire data into a continuous form so that the t-test, an inferential statistical technique, could use it.

To increase the power of the statistical study, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used in an extra analysis. The sequential application of input- and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional mediations facilitates the exploration of the impacts of the independent variable, or the effects of the intervention, on the composite measuring qualities through the use of MANOVA. A MANOVA is commonly used, according to Hinton, Charlotte, McMurray, and Cozens (2004), to determine the impact of an independent variable—the intervention, in this case—on a group of dependent variables. The study's combined dependent variables for evaluation include mechanics (spelling, punctuation, and capitalization), word choice, coherence, organisation, and grammar usage. To further investigate the potential impacts of sequential application of input- and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused

educational mediations on students' writing performance, the researchers employed a one-way MANOVA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

In Table 1, the first research question looked into the possible effects of using input-and output-based, consciousness-raising grammar-focused pedagogical mediations in a sequential manner on students' writing performance in terms of writing mechanics (spelling, punctuation, and capitalization), coherence, organisation, and grammar usage. The sequence in which the research questions were asked guided the analysis of the data.

Prior to conducting the main statistical analysis, the normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance were checked using the t-test and preliminary assumption testing; no significant violations were discovered. Table 1 displays the findings of an independent sample t-test that was computed for each of the five dependent variables.

Table 1

Results of independent samples t-test (pre-test)

<i>Dependent Variables</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>
Grammar Usage	Contr.	1.87	0.65	0.330	92	.742
	Exper.	1.83	0.60			
Coherence	Contr.	2.13	0.99	1.222	92	.225
	Exper.	2.38	1.03			
Word Choice	Contr.	2.38	1.09	0.103	92	.918
	Exper.	2.40	0.90			
Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	Contr.	2.94	0.70	1.333	92	.186
	Exper.	2.70	0.98			
Idea generation and organization	Contr.	1.98	0.49	1.658	92	.101
	Exper.	1.79	0.63			

The findings of the independent sample t-test ($p > 0.05$) in Table 1 show that not all writing-related characteristics show statistically significant differences. Put another way, it was discovered that, prior to the intervention, students in both research groups performed writing tasks similarly in terms of the writing components that were meant to be evaluated. Furthermore, no appreciable variations in the research groups' mean scores for any of the examined dependent variables were discovered. There were frequently no pre-existing differences in writing performance

between the experimental and control groups with regard to the writing components that were intended for examination.

Post-test results

This part computed an independent sample t-test in order to address the identical research question (RQ1). The accompanying Table (Table 2) displays the effect sizes for each dependent variable as well as the post-intervention results of an independent sample t-test.

Table 2

Independent sample t-test results (post-test)

<i>Dependent variables</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>	<i>Effect size (d)</i>
Grammar Usage	Contr.	2.17	1.00	3.324	92	.001	0.70
	Exper.	2.79	0.78				
Coherence	Contr.	1.21	0.83	3.194	92	.002	0.77
	Exper.	1.71	0.71				
Word Choice	Contr.	1.70	1.08	6.299	92	.000	1.00
	Exper.	3.02	0.94				
Spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	Contr.	1.45	0.99	4.455	92	.000	0.90
	Exper.	2.28	0.80				
Idea generation and organization	Contr.	1.34	0.98	3.704	92	.000	0.81
	Exper.	2.04	0.72				

**Significant at 0.05 alpha level (2-tailed)*

The results shown in Table 2 indicate there are statistically significant variations in writing performance between the experimental and control groups for the writing components that were chosen for assessment.

In Table 2, an independent sample t-test result indicates that there is a statistically significant difference ($t(92) = 3.324$, $p = .001$) when taking into account the variable "grammar usage" in terms of Univariate

analysis. When comparing the means of this dependent variable between the experimental group ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 0.78$) and the control group ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 1.00$), there was a significant shift in favour of the experimental group. Comparing the students in the control group to the students exposed to the intervention—input- and output-based grammar-focused consciousness-raising instructional mediations—reveals that the

former group's students changed their participation in learning grammatical features at a rate that was higher than chance. The intervention that was used in the experimental classroom may have had an impact on the shift that was seen.

The significant effect size of 0.70 for the variable indicates support for Cohen's (1988) recommendations. This figure shows that the intervention, which included of grammar-focused, output-and input-based educational mediations that raised awareness, explained a significant portion of the variation in students' writing performance with regard to proper grammar usage. Overall, these findings indicate that the intervention in the experimental group significantly improved the students' writing skills with regard to grammatical usage.

Similarly, Table 2's "coherence" t-test result shows that there is a statistically significant difference ($t(92) = 3.194, p = .002$) between the study groups. The descriptive mean scores showed a significant shift in the dependent variable favouring the experimental group ($M = 1.71, SD = 0.71$) compared to the control group ($M = 1.21, SD = 0.83$). The data showed that students who received the intervention outperformed those in the control group in their writing in terms of demonstrating a seamless transfer of ideas across sentences. The eight-week intervention that was used in the experimental classroom may have had an impact on this improvement. With an impact size of 0.77, the variable "coherence" has a large effect size. It follows that the intervention caused the variable to alter significantly. The combined findings show that the writing intervention used in the

trial classroom was very successful in improving students' writing skills for creating coherent texts.

To determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in word choice between study groups' writing performances, the same procedure was applied to compute an independent sample t-test. Consequently, Table 2's t-test result ($t(92) = 6.299, p = .000$) indicates that there is a statistically significant difference. The dependent variable significantly improved for the experimental group ($M = 3.02, SD = 0.94$) as compared to the control group ($M = 1.70, SD = 1.08$), according to the calculated means.

This study demonstrates how students' writing skills were impacted by exposure to input- and output-based educational mediations that emphasised using a diversity of words and raising consciousness through grammar. The intervention might have been the reason for this improvement. As per Cohen's (1988) standards, the variable's impact size is found to be 1.00, indicating a significant effect size. According to the dependent variable, the number shows that students' writing performance improved significantly as a result of the intervention.

The results of Table 2's t-test ($t(92) = 4.455, p = .000$) show that writing components including capitalization, punctuation, and spelling differ statistically significantly. A positive change may be seen when comparing the mean scores of the experimental group ($M = 2.28, SD = 0.80$) to those of the control group ($M = 1.45, SD = 0.99$).

The results show that when it came to grammar, spelling, and capitalization when needed, pupils in the control group did not

write as well as kids exposed to the new intervention.

The intervention that was provided to the experimental group may have had an impact on this improvement. The variable's significant impact size of 0.90 is discovered. Overall, the statistics demonstrate that by having the students use proper mechanics, the intervention greatly enhanced the writing abilities of the experimental group.

Lastly, an independent sample t-test was used to evaluate how well the students organised their writing and generated ideas. Table 2's result ($t(92) = 3.704, p = .000$) suggests that the dependent variable differs in a way that is statistically significant. Comparing the means of the experimental group ($M = 2.04, SD = 0.72$) and control group ($M = 1.34, SD = 0.98$) revealed a substantial improvement in the dependent variable.

The findings demonstrate that when it came to organisation and idea generation during the writing process, students who got the new intervention fared better than their counterparts in the control group. According to Cohen's (1988) recommendations, the variable's effect size is found to be 0.81,

indicating a large effect size. Overall, the results demonstrate that, in relation to the dependent variable, students' writing performance was significantly enhanced by the intervention in the experimental group.

The potential effects that the sequential use of input-and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional meditations could have on students' writing performance in terms of writing aspects like grammar usage, coherence, word choice, mechanics, idea generation, and organisation were further analysed in the following section using a one-way MANOVA. Thus, our goal was to determine whether the additional circumstances that the experimental group experienced had an impact on those conceptually connected dependent variables.

To determine whether our data agreed with the MANOVA assumptions, safety checks and preliminary assumptions were examined before to performing the main MANOVA analysis. Consequently, using preliminary assumption testing, the multicollinearity, normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variances were examined; no significant violations were found. Table 3 displays the outcomes of the MANOVA.

Table 3

Multivariate tests on students' writing performance (post-test)

<i>Effect</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Hypothesis df</i>	<i>Error df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared</i>	
Pillai's Trace	.317	8.155	5.000	88.000	.000	.317	
Levels	Wilks' Lambda	.683	8.155	5.000	88.000	.000	.317
	Hotelling's Trace	.463	8.155	5.000	88.000	.000	.317
	Roy's Largest Root	.463	8.155	5.000	88.000	.000	.317

**Significant at 0.05 alpha level (2-tailed).*

The results of Table 3's MANOVA test show that there is a statistically significant difference in writing ability between the experimental and control groups on the combined dependent variables ($F(5, 88) = 8.16, p = .000$; Wilks' Lambda = 0.66, partial eta squared = .32).

The impact of the intervention on students' writing performance in relation to those conceptually related dependent variables was evaluated using the effect size statistic. Partial eta squared is the measure of the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable (writing performance in relation to the composite dependent variable) that can be explained by the independent variable (the new intervention). The result in this case is 0.32, which suggests a medium effect size. 32 percent is the outcome of multiplying 0.32 by 100 to convert it to a percentage in accordance with Cohen's (1988) recommendations. This suggests a medium-sized influence. Regarding the composite dependent variable, the MANOVA findings generally suggest that the students' writing performance was enhanced by the intervention in the experimental group.

Students' writing attitudes are covered in the next section. To prepare the original categorical data for analysis using the planned statistical test, they were first transformed into continuous form using an Excel spreadsheet. An independent sample t-test was employed to evaluate the data. The principal t-test data analysis was conducted after taking into account the first set of safety requirements. Consequently, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were used to assess the data set's internal consistency. According to DeVellis's (2003) advice, the experimental group's Cronbach's alpha value (0.762) and the control group's (0.780) values were both found to be closer to +1, indicating that all of the items had strong internal consistency. In accordance with safety rules, additional testing was conducted to verify the normalcy and homogeneity of variance; no significant infractions were found.

Is there a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of writing attitudes?

Table 4

Results of an independent sample t-test on students' writing attitude (pre-intervention)

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>
Attitude	Contr.	3.88	0.459	0.896	92	.373
	Exper.	3.96	0.415			

According to the results of Table 4's independent sample t-test, there was no statistically significant difference in writing attitudes between the experimental and control groups before the intervention ($t(92) = 0.896,$

$p = .373$). The means of the control group ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.46$) and experimental group ($M = 3.96, SD = 0.42$) do not significantly differ from one another.

This finding indicates that, prior to the intervention, the attitudes of the students in both research groups regarding writing were found to be uniform. Stated differently, prior to implementing the new intervention, no pre-existing disparities were found between the study groups. To determine if the intervention

may alter students' attitudes about writing, the identical questionnaire was given to both research groups once the intervention was finished. The findings of an independent sample t-test on students' attitudes towards writing following intervention are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Results of an independent sample t-test on students' writing attitude (post-intervention)

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>	<i>Effect size(d)</i>
Writing attitude	Contr.	3.53	0.33	6.768	92	.000	1.00
	Exper.	4.01	0.36				

There is a statistically significant difference in writing attitudes between the experimental and control groups, according to a t-test result in Table 5 ($t(92) = 6.768, p = .000$). Comparably, the experimental group's mean ($M = 4.01, SD = 0.36$) is higher than the control group's mean ($M = 3.53, SD = 0.33$), indicating that students' attitudes towards writing have improved.

The findings demonstrate that students' writing attitudes improved when they were exposed to the input-and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional mediations. The intervention that was implemented in the experimental classroom may have contributed to this improvement.

It is discovered that the variable has an effect size of 1.00, which denotes a significant effect size. This number represents the proportion of the overall variation in the dependent variable (students' writing attitudes) that can be predicted based on knowledge of the levels of the independent variables (i.e., the new

interventions), or the proportional relevance of the difference between means. When considered collectively, these findings indicate that the intervention in the experimental group caused a notable change in the students' views towards writing.

Discussion

The first finding states that the novel intervention that was applied in the experimental group had a substantial impact on students' writing ability in terms of the linguistic components that were being evaluated. Grammar-focused instruction works best when it offers a range of opportunities for L2 input, output, interactional feedback, and practices in a sequential manner, according to Nassaji & Fotos (2011) and VanPatten (2002). Their theory is supported by this finding. This kind of teaching is crucial in foreign contexts where there is little exposure to the target language outside of the classroom. A research by Moges (2021) found that

boosting students' writing proficiency to a required level is another reason to support the teaching strategy that prioritises consciousness-raising grammar-focused assignments. More specifically, a research by Swain (2005) found that for grammar training to be truly helpful in improving writing skill, children must have opportunities for sequential input and output. The results thus showed how important it was to use the independent variables in the experimental classroom in the proper order in order to improve students' writing skills.

The students' writing attitudes clearly changed after the intervention was put into practice. Put differently, following their exposure to the intervention—which consisted of input- and output-based, consciousness-raising, grammar-focused instructional mediations—students' attitudes towards writing assignments had changed. This illustrated how it has been shown that employing the independent variables in a sequential fashion is advantageous and significantly affects students' attitudes towards finishing writing projects. This is in line with the generally acknowledged empirical conclusion that instructional techniques to grammar, such as collaborative output dictogloss activities, can enhance students' attitudes towards working in groups while writing (Lim & Jackobs, 2001).

A further empirical study by Harlena, Mukhaiyar, and Hamzah (2019) found that the collaborative output task of grammar-focused instruction improved secondary school students' writing ability and increased their involvement and willingness to respond favourably to writing tasks. On the other

hand, the sequential application of the independent variables may enhance students' motivation, which in turn affects their writing-related attitudes. These independent variables are grammar-focused learning opportunities that are input-and output-based. This implies that the grammar-focused educational approach needs to incorporate these independent variables in order to enhance learners' writing attitudes and allow them to utilise the characteristics of the target language in their writing.

CONCLUSIONS

The researchers come to the conclusion that students' writing performance and attitudes can be improved by sequentially implementing input- and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional mediations. This research shows that although input-based instructional options are helpful in helping students improve their comprehension skills, they are insufficient to significantly raise their writing performance and attitudes. Thus, it has been found that it is more productive to combine interactional feedback with collaborative output tasks like dictogloss in order to be more effective, particularly in enhancing learners' writing attitudes. Collaborative output activities that support input-based, grammar-focused instruction not only help students write better, but they also improve students' attitudes towards writing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In foreign environments, it is essential to implement input- and output-based consciousness-raising grammar-focused instructional alternatives sequentially if

students are to write well and develop positive attitudes towards writing tasks.

Since they will have many opportunities to choose and combine helpful concepts and activities from many instructional philosophies for teaching L2 grammar, English language instructors should take a broad approach to teaching grammar in order to help students succeed in writing. Teachers need to be sufficiently trained in a number of instructional choices to maximise the likelihood that their students will encounter major target forms in a range of flexible contexts for it to be effective.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express sincere gratitude to Wollega University for generously providing the funds necessary to successfully conduct and complete this research.

DECLARATION

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENTS

The data of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

REFERENCES

- Brown, J.D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, J.W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dar, M.F., & Khan, I. (2015). Writing anxiety among public and private sectors

- Pakistani undergraduate university students. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*, 10 (1), 121-136.
- DeSmedt, F., Emmelien, M., Barendse, M., Rosseel, Y., VanKeer, H., & DeNaeghel, J. (2019). *Cognitive and motivational challenges in writing: The impact of explicit instruction and peer-assisted writing in upper- elementary grades* (pp. 1–455). Ghent University.
- DeVellis, R.F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Doughty, C.J. (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, Compensation, and Enhancement. In C. J. Doughty, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 256-310). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Doughty, C., & Long, M. (2003). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7(3), 50-80.
- Ellis, R. (2001). *Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction*. *Language Learning*, 51, 1–46.
- Ellis, R. (2002). *Grammar teaching—practice or consciousness-raising?* In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 167–74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, N. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit knowledge. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 27, 305-352.
- Ellis, R. (2008). Methodological options in grammar teaching materials. In E.

- Bifa, T. et al., Hinkel, & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 155-179). New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J., & Reinders, H. (2009). *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Fenta M., Demissie A., & Negash A. (2018). Investigation of University Students' Writing Problems: Two Public Universities in South West Ethiopia in Focus. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 42(4), 83-95.
- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty, & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224–55). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd edition.). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Genç-Ersoy, B., & Göl-Dede, D. (2022). Developing Writing Skills, Writing Attitudes and Motivation through Educational Games: Action Research. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 9 (3), 569-589
- Graham, S., Berninger, V., & Fan, W. (2007). The structural relationship between writing attitude and writing achievement in first and third grade students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32(3), 516–536.
- Graham, S.V., & Fan, W. (2007). The Structural Relationship between Writing Attitude and Writing Achievement in First and Third Grade Students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32, 516-536.
- Harlena, D., & Mukhaiyar, H. (2019). Collaborative writing strategy for teaching writing descriptive text. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(10), 3316–3318.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.), Harlow, England: Pearson education.
- Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Taking stock of research and pedagogy in L2 writing*. In: Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 597- 613). Lawrence Erlbaum: Associates, Mahwah.
- Hinton, P.R., Brownlow, C.H., McMurray, I., & Cozens, B. (2004). *SPSS explained*. New York: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jabali, O. (2018). Students' attitudes towards EFL University writing: A case Study at An-Najah National University, Palestine. *Heliyon*, 4, 1-25.
- Jahin, H., & Idrees, W. (2012). EFL major student teachers' writing proficiency and attitudes towards learning English. *Journal of Taibah*, 9-72.
- Kellogg, R.T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of writing research*, 1(1), 1-26.
- Lee, L. (2001). Online interaction: negotiation of meaning and strategies used among learners of Spanish. *ReCALL*, 13(2), 232-244.

- Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17 (3), 144-164.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Research on form-focused instruction in immersion classrooms: Implications for theory and practice. *French Language Studies*, 14, 321-341.
- Mehdiabadi, F., & Arabmofrad, A. (2015). Form-focused instruction and EFL learners' writing performance: The case of collaborative output task of dictogloss. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 8 (1), 58-70.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moges, A. (2021). The effects of consciousness raising grammar tasks on EFL students' writing performance: University of Gondar in Focus. *ERJSSH*, 8(1), 44-58.
- Solomon, M. (2001). *Assessment of relevance of business English course at commercial college of Addis Ababa to the needs of employing organizations* (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa.
- Nassaji, H. (2007). *Reactive focus on form through negotiation on learners' written errors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. New York: Routledge.
- Norris, J.M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language learning*, 50 (3), 417-528.
- Paker, T., & Erarslan, A. (2015). Attitudes of the preparatory class students towards the writing course and their attitude-success relationship in writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 11(2), 1-11.
- Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS program* (4th edition), Allen & Unwin, Berkshire.
- Pertiwi, D., Ngadiso, B., & Drajadi, N.A. (2018). The effect of dictogloss technique on the students' writing skill. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 279-293.
- Robinson, P. (2001). *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T., & Brice, C. (2004). Research in teaching writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 70-106.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P.M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: isolated or integrated? *TESOL quarterly: A journal for teachers of English to speakers of other languages and of Standard English as a second dialect*, 42(2), 181-207.
- Swain, M. (1995). *Three functions of output in second language learning*. In H.

- Bifa, T. et al., *Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., Jan. – March 2024, 13(1), 168-186*
- G.Widdowson. Cook, B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99-118). Harlow: Longman.
- Swain, M. (2005). *The output hypothesis: Theory and research*. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning*. New Jersey.
- Tefera T., Berkessa M., & Ali S. (2019). The Effects of Teacher Scaffolding Techniques on High School Students' EFL Writing: East Wollega Zone in Focus. *International Journal of Management, Technology and Engineering*, 1501-1517.
- VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52, 755–803.
- VanPatten, B., & Benati, A.G. (2010). *Key terms in second language acquisition*. New: NY.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 673–91). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wong, W. (2005). *Input enhancement: From theory and research to the classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Yigzaw A. (2013). Students' first language writing skills and their English language proficiency as predictors of their English language writing performance. *Journal of Languages and Culture*, 3(6), 109-114.