

The Effect Of Instructional Strategies And Vocabulary Mastery On English Writing Skill

¹Yanti Sofiyanti, ²Moch. Sukardjo, ³Etin Solihatin

¹²³ Jakarta State University

sofiyanti_grt@yahoo.com, msoekarjo@unj.ac.id, dr.etinsolihatin@gmail.com

Accepted: Nov 14 th 2023	Reviewed: Jan 18 th 2023	Published: May 28 th 2024
--	--	---

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to know the effect of instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery on English writing skill. This study is a quantitative one. The research design is 2x2 treatment by level which consist of instructional strategies (A) and vocabulary mastery (B). Instructional strategies (A) consist of groups that are treated by collaborative writing strategy (A1) as an experimental class, and cooperative integrated reading and composition strategy (A2) as a control class. While vocabulary mastery (B) consists of two groups, they are the high vocabulary mastery group (B1) and the low vocabulary mastery group (B2). Based on the result of the research, it is shown that the mean score of collaborative writing is higher than the mean score of cooperative integrated reading and composition. Significance (Sig.) $.002 < 0.005$ which indicates that the variable has an interaction, the instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery have a significant effect on English writing skill. It can be concluded that instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery can promote English writing skill.

Keyword: Instructional Strategies, Vocabulary Mastery, English Writing Skill.



By Authors

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Introduction

Teaching writing in higher education is very crucial to the development of student's writing skills. University students need to be able to write essays, paper, report, thesis and dissertation in their study. In getting a job, they also need to acquire writing skills since they need to write application letter and job report. To be a good writer, students must have good knowledge and skills about how to write effectively and fluently. The ability to write effectively and fluently in English is very essential today because writing is known as an important skill for various reasons in education and profession. Writing plays a significant role in personal and professional life. Writing skills is not just a language skill. It has important role in the academic achievement of learners because writing skill is predictor for academic success.

Teaching and learning writing in English are considered a very difficult task for lecturers and students who use English as foreigner language in the field of English for specific purposes. Writing is a very demanding task because requires the students to have mastery of several skills such as topical knowledge, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The process of

teaching and learning writing is also time consuming because it requires activities from reading, outlining, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. Many students show low motivation when it comes to developing higher competencies in writing¹. Most of the students leave the writing task empty or copy the writing task from their friends because they do not know how to expand their ideas in writing. The complex task of writing makes it challenging². Writing activities in English as foreign language are regarded more recursive, multi-process, and dynamic. The difference between first language writing and writing in English as foreign language is that, in the first language context, the primary purpose of writing is to develop writing skills (learning-to-write), whereas in the foreign language context, students must also strive to obtain language knowledge (writing-to-learn-language) during the writing process³. Having more complicated cognitive processes, students have more struggles; hence, it is very necessary to facilitate the instruction and development of writing skills. Lecturers need to find the best way of teaching writing in the English as foreigner language. The right strategy in teaching writing skills has a tremendous impact on students' interest in writing which will have an impact on their performance in writing.

The traditional assumption that writing is an individual activity often refer to it is an individual task. Students seldom engage in extensive dialogue with their peers when writing. On the other hand, much writing in the workplace takes place in collaboration with others. Based on this condition, writing instruction in higher education should be adjusted to students' current and future needs. Many studies have investigated the effectiveness of collaborative writing to teach writing and it reveals the fact that collaborative writing is one the effective way not only to teach writing but also to improve students' writing skills⁴. By using collaborative writing, students can experience the better learning process in a student-centered learning. Students also have the same chance to participate actively in writing activity and construct their linguistic knowledge through interacting with other learners⁵. Some studies revealed that learning experiences are enhanced in

¹ R Bahous Bacha, N. N., & Nabhani, M., "Motivating Students in the EFL Classroom: A Case Study of Perspectives," *English Language Teaching* 4, no. 3 (2011).

² M Al-Gharabally, "The Writing Difficulties Faced by L2 Learners and How to Minimize Them," *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* 3, no. 5 (2015): 42–49; S A Annous Nicolas, M., & Townsend, M. A., "Territorial Borders and the Teaching of Writing in English: Lessons from Research at the University of Balamand" (2017); Mohd Shukri Hanapi, "The Wasatiyyah (Moderation) Concept in Islamic Epistemology: A Case Study of Its Implementation in Malaysia," *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 4, no. 9 (2014): 1; N Ghabool Mariadass, M. E. A., & Kashef, S. H., "Investigating Malaysian ESL Students' Writing Problems on Conventions, Punctuation, and Language Use at Secondary School Level," *Journal of Studies in Education* 2, no. 3 (2012): 130–143, <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i3.1892>.

³ Andrew Smith, "Reading Ghosts and Reading Texts," *The Ghost Story, 1840–1920* (Manchester University Press, 2013), <http://dx.doi.org/10.7765/9781847793454.00010>.

⁴ Dewi Zulaiha and Yunika Triana, "Students' Perception toward the Use of Open Educational Resources to Improve Writing Skills," *Studies in English Language and Education* (2023); Cuiping Song and Yanping Song, "Enhancing Academic Writing Skills and Motivation: Assessing the Efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-Assisted Language Learning for EFL Students," *Frontiers in psychology* 14 (December 15, 2023): 1260843, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38162975>; Amhar Amhar et al., "Student Critical Thinking Skills and Student Writing Ability: The Role of Teachers' Intellectual Skills and Student Learning," *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences* (2022); Valentina Sangeetha, "Inculcating Self-Editing Skills for Enhancing Writing Skills of the EFL Students," *International Journal of Instruction* (2020); Asnawi Muslem et al., "The Effects Of Using Blog-Assisted Language Learning (Ball) In Improving Non-Native Students' English Writing Skill In Higher Education; Does It Work?," *Journal of Technology and Science Education* (2022).

⁵ Tania Mikaela Garcia Roberto, "Corpus Linguistics in Language Teaching," *REVISTA FOCO* (2023); Dayu Jiang and Slava Kalyuga, "Learning English as a Foreign Language Writing Skills in Collaborative Settings: A Cognitive Load Perspective," *Frontiers in psychology* 13 (June 30, 2022): 932291, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35846619>; Franklin Chang, Marius Janciauskas, and Hartmut Fitz, "Language Adaptation and Learning: Getting Explicit about Implicit Learning," *Linguistics and Language Compass* (2012); Georgios Stampoulidis and Marianna Bolognesi, "Bringing

classrooms that use collaborative writing ⁶. Collaborative writing makes even passive members of a group become active learner ⁷.

Methods

The methodology of this study is quantitative research. The research design for this study is 2x2 treatment by level which consist of instructional strategies (A) and vocabulary mastery (B). The first Instructional strategy is collaborative writing (A1) as an experimental class. The second instructional strategy is cooperative integrated reading and composition (A2) as a control class. Vocabulary mastery (B) has two groups. The first is the high vocabulary mastery group (B1) and the second one is low vocabulary mastery group (B2). There are 32 samples in this research. They are students of the first year of Informatics Engineering program.

There are two data analysis techniques in this study, descriptive analysis, and inferential analysis. The descriptive analysis is data result with no intention to make conclusions, only description. The descriptive analysis will tell the differences in the mean scores between A1B1, A1B2, A2B1, and, A2B2. Descriptive analysis is done by presenting data through the table of average, median, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation . Inferential analysis refers to data result with intention to make conclusions or generalization to the population. The statistical calculation is using two ways Anava test by the means of spss application.

Result And Discussion

4.1 Results

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis

Vocabulary Mastery (B)	Statistic Data	Instructional Strategy	
		Writing skill <i>Collaborative Writing</i>	Writing skill <i>Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition</i>
Vocabulary Mastery High (B ₁)	n	(A ₁) 8	(A ₂) 8
	Mean \bar{Y}	88,13	75,00
	Median	87,50	75,00
	Minimum	80,00	65,00
	Maximum	95,00	85,00
	Standard Deviation	5,30	6,55
	Vocabulary Mastery Low (B ₂)	n	8
Mean \bar{Y}		73,13	74,38
Median		70,00	75,00
Minimum		65,00	70,00
Maximum		85,00	80,00
Standard Deviation		7,53	4,17

Metaphors Back to the Streets: A Corpus-Based Study for the Identification and Interpretation of Rhetorical Figures in Street Art,” *Visual Communication* (2023).

⁶ A F Dobao & Blum, A., “Collaborative Writing in Pairs and Small Groups: Learners’ Attitudes and Perceptions,” *System* 41 (2013): 365–378.

⁷ M P Baldwin Fanguy, M., & Costley, J. H., “The Effects of Collaborative Note-Taking in Flipped Learning Contexts,” *Journal of Language and Education* 5, no. 4 (2019): 25–35, <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9726>.

Deviation		
n	16	16
Mean \bar{Y}	80,63	74,69
Median	82,50	75,00
Minimum	65,00	65,00
Maximum	95,00	85,00
Standard Deviation	9,98	5,31

Based on table 1, we can see that the mean score of collaborative writing strategy with high vocabulary mastery (A1B1) is 88.33 and the mean score of cooperative integrated reading and composition strategy with high vocabulary mastery (A2B1) is 75.00. It is said that the mean score of collaborative writing strategy with high vocabulary mastery is higher than cooperative integrated reading and composition strategy with high vocabulary mastery. According to table 1, we know that the mean score of collaborative writing strategy with low vocabulary mastery (A1B2) is 73.13 and the mean score of cooperative integrated reading and composition strategy with low vocabulary mastery (A2B2) is 74.38. It is said that the mean score of collaborative writing strategy with low vocabulary mastery is lower than cooperative integrated reading and composition strategy with low vocabulary mastery. From table 1, we see that the mean score of collaborative writing strategy with high and low vocabulary mastery is 80.63 and the mean score of cooperative integrated reading and composition strategy with high and low vocabulary mastery is 74.69.

Before making inferential analysis, there should be some calculations on normality and homogeneity. The result of normality test can be seen on the next table.

Table 2. Normality Test on English Writing Skill

No.	Group	N	Statistic	p-value	Conclusion
1.	A1	16	0.918	0.156	Normal distribution
2.	A2	16	0.927	0.218	Normal distribution
3.	B1	16	0.957	0.607	Normal distribution
4.	B2	16	0.910	0.115	Normal distribution
5.	A1B1	8	0.912	0.366	Normal distribution
6.	A1B2	8	0.871	0.156	Normal distribution
7.	A2B1	8	0.965	0.857	Normal distribution
8.	A2B2	8	0.835	0.067	Normal distribution

After all the results of normality test are in normal distribution, then it will be continued by homogeneity test. The results of homogeneity test will shown in the next table.

Table 3. Summary of Homogeneity Test

No.	Group	Fcount	F _{tabel}	p-Value	Conclusion
1.	A1 and A2	6,495	2.69	0,015	Homogenous
2.	B1 and B2	6,495	2.69	0.016	Homogenous
3.	Four cells	10,877	2.69	0.001	Homogenous

The result of normality test show that all the data are in normal distribution. The result of homogeneity test show that all the data are homogenous. When these two conditions happen, the anava two ways test can be done. The result can be seen below.

Table 4. Anava Two Ways Test

Source	Variant	JK	db	RJK	F-value	p-Value
Between A	282.031	1	282.031	7.775	.009	
Between B	488.281	1	488.281	13.462	.001	
Interaction AB	413.281	1	413.281	11.394	.002	
Within	1015.625	28	36.272			
Total	195175.000					

After the anava two ways test is done, then it is continued by Tuckey test. The result of Tuckey test can be found in the next table.

Table 5. The Result of Tuckey Test

(I) Kel_sel	(J) Kel_sel	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
A1B1	A2B1	13.125*	3.011	.001
A1B2	A2B2	-1.250	3.011	.975

Based on the result of the anava two ways test and Tuckey test, we can make conclusion that :

- a. The result of two ways ANAVA shows $F_{count} = 7,775$ with $p-value = 0,009 < 0,05$. It shows that : there is a difference between English writing skill of students who use *Collaborative Writing* and students who use *Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition*.
- b. There is interaction between instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery toward English writing skill by looking at the result of two ways ANAVA shows $F_{count} = 11,394$ with $p-value = 0,002 < 0,05$
- c. The result of Tuckey test shows $p-value = 0,002 < 0,05$, it means there is a difference in English writing skill between students with high vocabulary mastery who are treated by *Collaborative Writing* and *Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition*.
- d. Tuckey test shows $p-value = 0,975 > 0,05$, it means there is a difference in English writing skill between students with low vocabulary mastery who are treated by *Collaborative Writing* and *Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition*.

Discussion

This study investigated the effectiveness of collaborative writing and cooperative integrated reading and composition strategies in enhancing English writing skills, with a focus on the role of vocabulary mastery. The results of the two-way ANOVA and Tukey tests demonstrated significant differences in English writing skills based on the instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery levels. The findings contribute to the growing body of research on teaching writing in higher education and provide valuable insights into the impact of collaborative learning approaches on writing development.

The results of this study align with previous research on the effectiveness of collaborative writing in improving students' writing skills. For instance, studies by Shehadeh ⁸(2011) have

⁸ M Shehadeh et al., "Digital Transformation and Its Impact on Operational Efficiency and Competitive Advantage in Islamic Banks," in *2nd International Conference on Business Analytics for Technology and Security, ICBATS 2023* (Applied Science Private University, Finance and Banking Science Department, Amman, Jordan: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2023), <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0->

demonstrated that collaborative writing fosters active engagement and enhances language proficiency by promoting peer interaction and feedback. These findings are consistent with the present study's results, where students using the collaborative writing strategy with high vocabulary mastery (A1B1) outperformed those using cooperative integrated reading and composition (A2B1). The higher mean score of the collaborative writing strategy (88.33) compared to cooperative integrated reading and composition (75.00) highlights the advantages of collaborative learning in enhancing writing proficiency.

On the other hand, the study also found that students with low vocabulary mastery (A1B2) had a lower mean score (73.13) compared to those using cooperative integrated reading and composition (74.38). This finding suggests that while collaborative writing can be beneficial for improving writing skills, students' vocabulary mastery plays a significant role in determining the effectiveness of the strategy. Similar findings have been reported by Khodabakhshzadeh and Samadi ⁹, who emphasized the importance of vocabulary knowledge in enhancing writing performance.

The interaction effect between instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery, as revealed by the two-way ANOVA ($F_{count} = 11.394$, $p\text{-value} = 0.002$), further supports the idea that the effectiveness of instructional strategies in improving writing skills is moderated by students' vocabulary knowledge. This interaction effect is consistent with the work of Harks et al. ¹⁰, who found that the impact of feedback (a key component of collaborative writing) varies depending on students' prior knowledge and language proficiency.

The findings of this study contribute to the existing research on writing instruction by providing empirical evidence of the differential effects of collaborative writing and cooperative integrated reading and composition strategies. Specifically, the study highlights the significance of vocabulary mastery in shaping the outcomes of collaborative writing activities. While collaborative writing has been shown to be effective in promoting active engagement and peer learning, the present study emphasizes that vocabulary proficiency is a crucial factor in determining how much students benefit from such collaborative activities.

Additionally, the study's use of two-way ANOVA and Tukey tests adds to the methodological approaches employed in writing research. The normality and homogeneity tests conducted in this study ensured the robustness of the results, allowing for a more reliable interpretation of the effects of instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery on writing skills. This methodological rigor contributes to the reliability of the findings and provides a foundation for future studies exploring similar research questions.

The results of this study have important implications for teaching writing in higher education, particularly in English as a foreign language contexts. First, the study underscores the effectiveness of collaborative writing as an instructional strategy for enhancing writing skills, especially when combined with a focus on vocabulary mastery. Educators should consider incorporating more collaborative writing tasks in their curricula to encourage active student

85160769971&doi=10.1109%2FICBATS57792.2023.10111266&partnerID=40&md5=83ac0324f1e50c5cb9ada2bf7771505d.

⁹ Hossein Khodabakhshzadeh, Zahra Kafi, and Mansoor Hosseinnia, "Investigating EFL Teachers' Conceptions and Literacy of Formative Assessment: Constructing and Validating an Inventory," *International Journal of Instruction* 11, no. 1 (2018).

¹⁰ B Harks Rakoczy, K., Hattie, J., Besser, M. & Klieme, E., "The Effects of Feedback on Achievement, Interest and Self-Evaluation: The Role of Feedback's Perceived Usefulness," *Educational Psychology* 34, no. 3 (2014): 269–290.

participation and peer interaction, which can facilitate the construction of linguistic knowledge.

Moreover, the study suggests that vocabulary instruction should be integrated into writing courses, as students' vocabulary mastery significantly influences their writing performance. By helping students build a strong vocabulary foundation, educators can enhance their writing fluency and confidence. This approach aligns with the findings of Langan¹¹, who argued that vocabulary knowledge is a key predictor of writing success.

The findings of this study contribute to the growing body of research on writing instruction by highlighting the importance of vocabulary mastery in collaborative writing activities. The study also provides valuable insights into the impact of instructional strategies on students' writing skills and offers practical recommendations for educators seeking to improve writing instruction in higher education. By understanding the interaction between vocabulary mastery and instructional strategies, educators can tailor their teaching approaches to better meet the needs of their students and promote greater success in writing tasks.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the mean score of collaborative writing is 80.63 and the mean score of cooperative integrated reading and composition is 74.69. It is clear that collaborative writing instructional strategy is better than cooperative integrated reading and composition instructional strategy. There is interaction between instructional strategies and vocabulary mastery toward English writing skill by looking at the result of two ways Anava with $p\text{-value} = 0,002 < 0.05$. The usage of collaborative writing contributes significant improvement not only to students writing skills but also to students' 21 century skills such as communication, collaboration, critical thinking, creativity and digital literacy. Collaborative writing strategy is also able to improve students' motivation, vocabulary, and comprehension of the topic and to change some of the students' ineffective writing habits (Shehadeh, 2011; Dobao & Blum, 2013; and Khodabakhshzadeh & Samadi, 2017). Writing in small groups helps students to learn from each other's writing, stimulates conceptual learning, and encourages critical reflection and a sense of audience awareness (Klein, 2014; Nykopp, Marttunen, & Laurinen, 2014; Van Steendam, 2016).

References

- Al-Gharabally, M. "The Writing Difficulties Faced by L2 Learners and How to Minimize Them." *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* 3, no. 5 (2015): 42–49.
- Amhar, Amhar, R. Sabrina, Emilda Sulasmi, and Mandra Saragih. "Student Critical Thinking Skills and Student Writing Ability: The Role of Teachers' Intellectual Skills and Student Learning." *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences* (2022).
- Annous Nicolas, M., & Townsend, M. A., S A. "Territorial Borders and the Teaching of Writing in English: Lessons from Research at the University of Balamand" (2017).
- Bahous Bacha, N. N., & Nabhani, M., R. "Motivating Students in the EFL Classroom: A Case Study of Perspectives." *English Language Teaching* 4, no. 3 (2011).
- Baldwin Fanguy, M., & Costley, J. H., M P. "The Effects of Collaborative Note-Taking in Flipped Learning Contexts." *Journal of Language and Education* 5, no. 4 (2019): 25–35, <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9726>.
- Chang, Franklin, Marius Janciauskas, and Hartmut Fitz. "Language Adaptation and Learning:

¹¹ Pirjo Kulju et al., "A Review of Multiliteracies Pedagogy in Primary Classrooms," *Language and Literacy* 20, no. 2 (2018): 80–101, <http://dx.doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29333>.

- Getting Explicit about Implicit Learning.” *Linguistics and Language Compass* (2012).
- Dobao & Blum, A., A F. “Collaborative Writing in Pairs and Small Groups: Learners’ Attitudes and Perceptions.” *System* 41 (2013): 365–378.
- Ghabool Mariadass, M. E. A., & Kashef, S. H., N. “Investigating Malaysian ESL Students’ Writing Problems on Conventions, Punctuation, and Language Use at Secondary School Level.” *Journal of Studies in Education* 2, no. 3 (2012): 130–143, <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i3.1892>.
- Hanapi, Mohd Shukri. “The Wasatiyyah (Moderation) Concept in Islamic Epistemology: A Case Study of Its Implementation in Malaysia.” *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 4, no. 9 (2014): 1.
- Harks Rakoczy, K., Hattie, J., Besser, M. & Klieme, E., B. “The Effects of Feedback on Achievement, Interest and Self-Evaluation: The Role of Feedback’s Perceived Usefulness.” *Educational Psychology* 34, no. 3 (2014): 269–290.
- Jiang, Dayu, and Slava Kalyuga. “Learning English as a Foreign Language Writing Skills in Collaborative Settings: A Cognitive Load Perspective.” *Frontiers in psychology* 13 (June 30, 2022): 932291. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35846619>.
- Khodabakhshzadeh, Hossein, Zahra Kafi, and Mansooreh Hosseinnia. “Investigating EFL Teachers’ Conceptions and Literacy of Formative Assessment: Constructing and Validating an Inventory.” *International Journal of Instruction* 11, no. 1 (2018).
- Kulju, Pirjo, Reijo Kupiainen, Angela M Wiseman, Anne Jyrkiäinen, Kirsi-Liisa Koskinen-Sinisalo, and Marita Mäkinen. “A Review of Multiliteracies Pedagogy in Primary Classrooms.” *Language and Literacy* 20, no. 2 (2018): 80–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29333>.
- Muslem, Asnawi, Saiful Marhaban, Hendra Heriansyah, and Rizki Putra Utama. “The Effects Of Using Blog-Assisted Language Learning (Ball) In Improving Non-Native Students’ English Writing Skill In Higher Education; Does It Work?” *Journal of Technology and Science Education* (2022).
- Roberto, Tania Mikaela Garcia. “Corpus Linguistics in Language Teaching.” *REVISTA FOCO* (2023).
- Sangeetha, Valentina. “Inculcating Self-Editing Skills for Enhancing Writing Skills of the EFL Students.” *International Journal of Instruction* (2020).
- Shehadeh, M, D Almajali, I A Abu-Alsondos, A F Alkhwaldi, and A S Al-Gasaymeh. “Digital Transformation and Its Impact on Operational Efficiency and Competitive Advantage in Islamic Banks.” In *2nd International Conference on Business Analytics for Technology and Security, ICBATS 2023*. Applied Science Private University, Finance and Banking Science Department, Amman, Jordan: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2023. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85160769971&doi=10.1109%2FICBATS57792.2023.10111266&partnerID=40&md5=83ac0324f1e50c5cb9ada2bf7771505d>.
- Smith, Andrew. “Reading Ghosts and Reading Texts.” *The Ghost Story, 1840–1920*. Manchester University Press, 2013. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7765/9781847793454.00010>.
- Song, Cuiping, and Yanping Song. “Enhancing Academic Writing Skills and Motivation: Assessing the Efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-Assisted Language Learning for EFL Students.” *Frontiers in psychology* 14 (December 15, 2023): 1260843. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38162975>.
- Stampoulidis, Georgios, and Marianna Bolognesi. “Bringing Metaphors Back to the Streets: A Corpus-Based Study for the Identification and Interpretation of Rhetorical Figures in Street Art.” *Visual Communication* (2023).
- Zulaiha, Dewi, and Yunika Triana. “Students’ Perception toward the Use of Open Educational Resources to Improve Writing Skills.” *Studies in English Language and Education* (2023).