



ISSN 2278 – 0211 (Online)

Effects of Teaching Writing through Integrated Skills on Students Writing Performance: At Sekela Secondary School Grade Eleven in Focus

Fantahun Kitila

Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature,
Wollega University Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Ethiopia

Dr. Sherif Ali

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature,
Wollega University Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Ethiopia

Dr. Ebissa Bekele

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature,
Wollega University Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Ethiopia

Abstract:

Currently the purpose of teaching writing through integrated skills in rising writing ability needs attention. Teaching writing through integrated skills need not only the writer a feel for look at the integrated skills based learning but also the basis for writing. Therefore it was an endeavor to study the effects of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing performance. To this end, two grade eleven intact sections of Sekela secondary school students took part in the study based on a quasi-experimental pre-posttest design. Pre and posttest were administered before and after the treatments. Independent and paired sample t-tests were used to analyze the students' pre-test and the posttest scores using SPSS version 20. The results showed that teaching writing through integrated skills practiced in the classroom increased students writing performance. Thus, teaching writing through integrated skills affects positively the students' writing performance. The significant improvement of the experimental group students' writing performance due to teaching writing through integrated skills proved the value of the intervention. It is understood that teaching writing through conventional needed be replaced by teaching writing through integrated skills to enhance students writing performance.

Keywords: *Integrated skills, writing performance, control and experimental group, pre-test and posttest, Independent and paired sample t-test*

1. Introduction

One innovative way needs focus to enhance students' composition skills is an integrated skills base to address writing lessons. Brown (2001) stated that to improve students' writing performances require other skills. That is, writing calls other skills to create words and generate ideas; it also calls other skills such as appropriate content, organization, mechanics and style; it also calls other skills to evaluate and report. This shows that solid writing does not yield appropriate writing performance. Brewer (1999) maintains that research on teaching writing through integrated skills could play a notable role in students' writing performance. Furthermore, Brewer also states that the theory of teaching writing through integrated skills in line with their actual practice can be rooted to improve students' writing performance. Besides, teaching writing skills through integrated skills need to be practiced on expected, especially in the local context, to provide an optimal environment for students' writing performance. Hence, teachers provide different type of teaching writing to help their students.

The issues emerging this research study was as a result of students' disappointing English performance specifically writing skills. However, whether teaching writing through integrated skills can have influence on students' writing performance or not is not studied in the context of Ethiopia in general and the study area in particular. This study was designed on the way to fill the research breach in secondary schools by providing useful awareness into the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills in secondary schools on students' writing performance. Researchers also attempted to see whether teachers' practice teaching writing through integrated skills in secondary schools based on the intention to improve students' writing performance or not was the focus of this paper. So the researcher intended was to study the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing performance of the English language in secondary school grade 11 in focus.

2. Literature Review

It is not surprising to find people who can speak well and perhaps read fairly well but cannot write well. Foreign language writing requires effort to write well so it should merge listening, speaking, and reading to establishment of a basic knowledge of the writing system, and writing performance (Barnard, 2010). Amalgamating the teaching of writing to other language skills, such as reading, listening and speaking might ultimately support students practice the writing lessons to enhance their writing performance. In support of this sight, Richards and Schmidt (2013) confirm that the four macro skills need lion share to each other to address a lesson to improve students' skill in English class. This addressing the lesson by integrated skills encourages to link oral and written skills in order to help each other. According to Richards & Rogers (2001) in every day English class, skills need interwoven to each other to address every lesson specifically writing.

This research attempts to consider and contribute on the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on students' writing performance. This study will bridge that gap and contribute on the existing literature. To solve the problem of EFL writing, the study considers the effect of teaching writing through integrated and uncovers benefit and its change due to treatment in the secondary school in the Sekela EFL students' context.

2.1. Objectives

This training aimed to address the following intents:

- To see significant differences between the students' performance in the experimental and control group students on the writing test.
- To find out the extent of teaching writing through integrated skills improves students writing performance after intervention in favor of the experimental group.
- To find out the significant difference between the content, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after the intervention of the experimental group students who were taught writing through integrated skills.

2.2. Research Hypotheses

Based on the research questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated to be checked in this study

- Ho1 There is no statistically significant differences between students' scores of the control group and the experimental group in the writing test.
- Ho2 There is no statistically significant differences between students' scores of pre and posttest of writing performance the experimental group in favor of posttest.
- HO3 There is no statistically significant difference between students test score between experimental and control group in line of content, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after intervention.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Design

To study this research, a quasi-experiment design was applied for the following three reasons: First, the design allowed the researcher to investigate and measure the change students might bring to their writing performance in developing their writing skills because of the intervention. Second, the quasi-experimental design provides the researcher with suitable conditions how to conduct the intervention that has a problem cause and effect (Creswell, 2011). Lastly, the design is characterized as classroom-based research, conducted in the natural setting rather than in the artificial laboratory. Consequently, the researcher used two intact classes for his investigation purpose during writing classes (Creswell, 2003).

3.2. Participants

In Horo Guduru Wollega zone, there were fifty six (56) government Secondary schools in 2021/2022 G.C. Out of these Secondary schools, one Secondary school (Sekela high school) was selected through a simple random sampling lottery method. There were fifteen (15) grade 11 sections (section A-O) in 2021/2022 G.C. Out of these sections, two intact sections, section A was assigned as experimental and section B was assigned as control group randomly. The experimental group section has 35 actual students and the control group section has 35 actual students in the study. The treatment was applied to the experimental group and the conventional method was applied to the control group.

3.3. Instruments of Data Collection

In order to obtain data for this study, tests (pre & post) were used. The Pre-test was used to check the similarity between the two groups. The posttest was used to test the effects of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing performance. The tests were adapted from former literature based on the minimum writing skills required for grade eleven (11).

3.4. Procedures

In the beginning, the study participants were identified. Pre- and post-tests were administered. During the process, an attempt was made to encourage the respondents to ask questions in case there was any ambiguity with regard to the content, language and ways of allocating the test. After collecting the data, the researcher put the data into categories and arranged them for interpretation. Finally, the interpretation was made to draw out of the data analysis.

4. Results

4.1. Estimating the Reliability

According to Creswell (2003), the pretest and the posttest of their writing skills administered to calculate the inter-raters reliability of pre-and posttest of writing result range from a low to .95 to high of .98.

4.2. The Normality Test

The assumption of normality was examined through both the graphic of the histogram and also some numerical ways as recommended by Creswell (2011). Regarding the numerical methods of assessing normality, two measures were considered: 1 the values of Skewness and Kurtosis statistics, which must be within ± 1 , based on Dorneyi (2007), and 2 the outcomes of the ratio of Skewedness and Kurtosis over their respective standard errors, which must fall within the ranges of ± 1.96 , based on Creswell (2003). In this study, all the tests provide to be normally distributed.

4.3. Pre-test Scores

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental group	35	12.485	4.31783	0.72985
Pretest score				
Control group	35	12.45	3.68696	0.62321

Table 1: Descriptive Group Statistics of the Pre-Test Score

As can be realized from table 1 above, the mean score of the experimental group and the control group were found to be a like 12.485 and 12.457 respectively. However, no one can say that there was significant difference between the language performances of the two groups by simply looking at their mean scores. To know whether this difference is significant or not and to determine the similarity of the control and the experimental group students, an independent samples t-test was sought. Table 2 below shows the results.

	Levene's Test for Equality for Variance		t-test for Equality of Means											
	F	Sig	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. error Difference	95% confidence interval of the difference						
								Lower	Upper					
Equal variances assumed	2.051	.161	1.086	34	.285	.404	1.91071	1.91071	1.75860	2.15997	-1.66719	-3.11686	5.48861	6.93829

Table 2: Independent Sample T-Test of the Pre-Test Results

As revealed in table-2, the P- value (level of significance) of the Levene's test for equality of variances is greater than 0.05 (sig=.161). This indicates that we consider the above row for analysis. At the same time, if the value of t calculated is greater or equal to the value of the t-table with a given degree of freedom (df), it is said that there is a significant difference between the performance of the groups being compared. Moreover, if the t-calculated is less than the value of the t-table, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the performances of the groups. Similarly if the p-value is less than 0.05 (the standard limits of significance), it can be said there is a significant difference between the average scores of the groups. However, if the p-value is greater than 0.05, the difference is insignificant.

Based on this notion, the t-calculated of the pretest was found less than the value of t-table with 34 degree of freedom (t-calculated = 1.086, df = 34, P=0.285, mean difference= 1.91071). Thus, we can determine that there was no significant difference between the language performance level of the experimental group and the control group (p=0.285). Therefore, the hypothesis null (Ho1) was accepted.

4.4. Posttest Scores

The experimental teaching which lasted for twelve successive weeks was conducted style suggestion available the teaching writing through integrated skills and structural approach to the experimental group and the control group respectively. Later, to measure the performances of the two groups following the treatment, the posttest was given and a t-

test was chosen for the statistical computation of the result. Below are the group statistics of the posttest results of the groups.

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental group Posttest	35	19.955	3.55598	0.60107
Control group	35	13.192	4.17264	0.72985

Table 3: Descriptive Group Statistics of the Posttest Score

As shown in table-3, the mean scores of the posttest of the experimental group and the control group are 19.955 and 13.192 respectively. This implies that the experimental group performed better than the control group. However, as indicated earlier, taking the mean score differences, one cannot say there is a significant difference or no significant difference between the subjects of the study. We have to refer to the result of the independent sample t-test. Table-4 presents the result of the posttest of the independent sample t-test.

As shown in table-3, the mean scores of the posttest of the experimental group and the control group are 19.955 and 13.192 respectively. This implies that the experimental group performed better than the control group. However, as indicated earlier, taking the mean score differences, one cannot say there is a significant difference or no significant difference between the subjects of the study. We have to refer to the result of the independent sample t-test. Table-4 presents the result of the posttest of the independent sample t-test.

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test Equality of Means						
		F	Sig	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.error	95% confidence	
									lower	Upper
Posttest Score	Equal variance assumed	-4.29	.517	-2.908	34	.006	-3.85855	1.32679	-6.55792	-1.15919
	Equal variance not assumed				33.966	.006	-3.85855	1.30487	-6.51335	-1.20376

Table 4: Posttest Independent Sample T-Test

It is shown in table-4 that the value of t-calculated was found 2.908, with 34 degree of freedom. The mean difference between the posttest results of the two groups was found -3.85855. At this point the mean score of the study group exceeds the control group by the listed average. And the P-value is 0.006 which is below 0.05 (the level of significance). All these statistical data of the posttest results confirmed that there is a statistically significant difference between the post treatment performances of the two groups. Hence, the experimental group, which was taught writing through integrated skills, performed significantly higher than the control group. So, the hypothesis (H01) was rejected.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental group pre-test score	35	12.485	4.31783	0.72985
Pair1				
Experimental group post-test score	35	19.955	3.55598	0.60107

Table 5: Experimental Group Pre-Test and Posttest Paired Samples Statistics

The mean score for experimental on pretest was 12.485; standard deviation 4.31783, whereas on posttest was 19.955; standard deviation 3.55598. There was a mean increase from pretest to posttest. However, the table does not indicate the extent of this mean rise. Hence, it was worth conducting the paired sample test for the level of significance of this mean difference.

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig(2-Tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Experimental group pre-test score Pair1 Experimental group posttest score	-6.44000	5.08019	.85871	-8.18511	-4.69489	7.500	34	.000

Table 6: Experimental Group Pre-Test and Posttest Paired Samples Test

A paired sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the intervention on students' scores on the EFL writing skills test. There was a statistically significant increase in the test scores from pretest ($M=12.485$, $SD=4.31783$) to posttest ($M=19.955$, $SD=3.55598$), $T(34) = 7.500$, $P=.000$, $P<0.05(2\text{-tailed})$. The mean increase in posttest scores was 6.44000 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -8.18511 to -4.69489. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) was been rejected. As a result, it can be deduced that teaching writing through integrated skills has brought a significant change in students' writing performance.

To see a significant difference between the content, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after the intervention, experimental group pre-posttest Paired Sample Statistics and experimental group pre-post t-test was computed respectively. The results are presented in the tables below.

	Mean	N	Std Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair1 exp pre	2.1214	35	.57959	0.09797
Content Exp post	3.2429	35	.60173	0.10171
Pair2 exp pre	2.1857	35	.61937	0.1046
Organization Exp post	3.1214	35	.53334	0.9015
Pair3 exp pre	2.1714	35	.49546	0.0837
Language use Exp post	3.086	35	.5353	0.0905
Pair4 exp pre	2.5786	35	.64390	0.1088
Mechanics Exp post	2.9571	35	.83685	0.1414
Pair5 exp pre	2.2929	35	.60173	0.1017
Style Exp post	3.2500	35	.54571	0.0922
Total Exp pre	11.35		2.94005	0.4969
Exp post	15.6574		3.05293	1.3274

Table 7: Experimental Group Pre-Test and Posttest Paired Sample Statistics

Table 7 portrays that experimental group students test scores on the pre-test of each rubric. The posttest mean scores were higher than that of the pre-test in all rubrics categories. The total mean posttest experimental group was 15.6574, std. deviation 3.05293, std. error mean 1.3274 indicated that students writing performance were improved than the total mean pre-test experimental group 11.35 std. deviation 2.94005 std. Error mean.49696.

But to examine whether the extent of the mean increment was significant or not, the researcher computed paired sample t-test. The presentation is seen in the table below

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig(2tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair1Content Exp pre-post	-1.12143	.47112	.07112	-1.28326	-.95959	-14.082	34	.000
Pair2 Organization Exp pre-post	-.93571	.72594	.12271	-1.18509	-.68634	-7.6261	34	.000
Pair3 Language use Exp pre-post	-.91429	.55883	.09446	-1.10625	-.72232	-9.679	34	.000
Pair4 mechanics Exp pre-post	-.37857	.94397	.15956	-.70284	-.05431	.2.373	34	.023
Pair 5 Style Exp Pre-post	-.95714	.52680	.08905	-1.13811	-.77618	-10.749	34	.000

Table 8: Experimental Group Pre-Test and Posttest Paired Samples T-Test

The result in table 8 proved that there was a statistically significant increase in mean scores for all rubrics' result. That is in content score, it increases from pre-test ($M=2.1214$ $SD=.57959$ to post test score ($M=3.2429$ & $SD=.60173$), $t(34) = -14.082$, $P=.000$, $P<.05(2tailed)$. The mean increase in post scores was 1.12143 with a 95% confidence interval boundary from -1.28326 to -.95959. Organization scores also showed significant mean increase from pre ($M=2.1857$ & $SD=.61937$) to posttest mean score ($M=3.1214$ & $SD=.53334$, $t(34) = -7.6261$, $P=.000$ $P<.05(2tailed)$. The mean increase in post scores was .93571 with a 95% confidence interval boundary from .118509 to .68634.

Similarly, language use scores mean increase from pre to posttest was ($M=2.1714$ & $SD=.49546$ and ($M=3.086$ & $SD=.5353$), $t(34) = -9.679$, $P=.000$, $P<.05(2tailed)$. The mean score increased in post -.91429 with a 95% confidence interval boundary from -1.10625 to -.72232. Mechanics scores also showed significance mean increase from pre ($M=2.5786$ & $SD=.64390$) to posttest mean score ($M=2.9571$ & $SD=.83685$), $t(34) = -2.373$, $P=.000$ $P<.05(2tailed)$. The mean score increased in post -.37857 with a 95% confidence interval boundary from -.70284 to -.05431. The same way, style scores mean increase from pre to posttest was ($M=2.2929$ & $SD=.60173$ and ($M=3.2500$ & $SD=.54571$, $t(34) = -10.749$, $P=.000$, $P<.05(2tailed)$. The mean score increased in post -.95714 with a 95% confidence interval boundary from -.113811 to -.77618. The finding shows that the intervention brought improvement on students writing performance. Therefore, the hypothesis (H_03) was rejected.

5. Discussions

In this section, the finding obtained from the analysis of quantitative data was presented. The main instrument used in this study was writing test. The test was administered in two folds pre and post for experimental and control group discussions first, then pre and post experimental group discussions, finally pre and post for each analytical rubric discussions were made below.

The first discussion was made on the results of the quantitative data particularly the section discussed the results of the inferential data gathered through teaching writing through integrated skills test scores. The present study indicates that in line with the first question the experimental and control group has achieved 12.485 and 12.457 $t(34)=1.086$, $P=0.285>0.05$ scores in the pre-test respectively. Whereas in the post-test the experimental and control group has got 19.955 and 13.192 $t(34) = 2.908$, $P=0.006<0.05$ scores respectively. This means the result from the statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between the experimental and control group in the pre-test result. After intervention the post-test, there was a significant difference between the experimental and control group. This is due to the intervention. Literature confirms this finding noting as manipulate writing activities in varied ways are crucial in addressing students lack of adequate writing skills (Richards and Rodger, 2014; Hammer, 2007 & Brown, 2001). Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_01) was rejected.

In the line of the second question the experimental pre-test group has achieved 12.457 scores in the pre-test, while in the post-test the same group has got 19.955, $t(34)=7.500$, $P=.000$, $P<0.05(2-tailed)$. This means the results from the statistical analysis revealed significant improvement between the pre-test and post-test. Whereas, the control group has achieved 12.457 scores in the pre-test while in the post test this group got 13.192, $t(34) = -2.95$, $P=.770$, $p>.05(2-tailed)$ scores in the five-writing rubric score. According to the result of pre-post control groups, there was certain improvement in posttest than pretest. However, the experimental group posttest was better than its counterpart the control group posttest score. This could be because of intervention. This finding coincides with Al-faoury (2012) on the effect of integrative skills teaching on developing students achievement indicated that students who took intervention had better achiever than the other. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_02) was rejected. As a result, it can be deduced that teaching writing through integrated skills has brought a significant change in students writing performance. This showed that due to teaching writing through integrated skills, the posttest experimental group students' performance was improved.

In the line with the third question, the experimental group sum of each rubric score has achieved 11.35 score before the intervention test, while in the sum of each rubric scores has achieved 15.6574 score after the intervention test. The observed paired sample t-test values (for content $p=0.000$, organization $P=0.000$, language use $p=0.000$, mechanics $p=0.023$ and style $P=0.000$) indicated that the writing through integrated skills has a significant effect on the different aspects of writing. This means the results from the statistical analysis revealed significant improvement between the before intervention test and after intervention test. Whereas, the sum of the control group each rubric score has achieved 11.636365, while in the posttest this group has got 11.361428 scores in the five writing rubric scores. There was no a statistically significance mean difference in test scores from pretest to posttest content, $P=.539, p>.05$ (2-tailed), organization, $P=.729, p>.05$ (2-tailed), language use, $P=.133, p>.05$ (2-tailed), mechanics, $P=.162, p>.05$ (2-tailed) and style, $P=.064, p>.05$ (2-tailed). This is because teaching writing through integrated skills provides a better basis for enhancing students writing performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_03) was rejected. This finding coincides with Yohannes (2010) focusing on more meaningful teaching writing lessons need students to analyze and process writing more deeply which helps them to improve their writing performance.

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings, this study concludes that training students in the teaching writing through integrated skills brings a significant improvement on students writing performance since training increases students awareness about the role of teaching writing through integrated skills in improving their writing performance. This is due to the fact that teaching writing through integrated skills provides the basis for changing students' writing performance compared to students' learning English through the conventional method without teaching writing through integrated skills. The conclusion of the second objective was the intervention group resulted in the development of students' writing skills and performance improvement in the post test which could indicate that there is a relation between teaching writing through integrated skills and students writing skills improvement. The improvement of students' performance towards writing due to teaching writing through integrated skills also indicated that the students are more motivated and confident in writing activity after treatment. The conclusion of the third objective was the experimental group results indicated that students writing skills in each writing sub-domain improved after intervention.

7. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of this study:

- Writing exercises are a bit challenging so that students will need to use integrated skill based way of writing to help them successfully accomplish their writing tasks.
- Writing lessons should be presented in the context of teaching writing through integrated skills as results; students could improve their use of integrated skills base way to help them improve their writing performance.
- Investigating the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on improving students writing performance is recommended
- Studies should be conducted to examine if treatment in each skill brings significantly effects on students language ability.

8. References

- i. Al-Faoury, O. H. (2012). The Effect of an Integrative Skills Program on Developing Jordanian
- ii. University Students' Achievement in English and Select Multiple Intelligences.
- iii. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Jordan: Jordan.
- iv. Barnard, R., & Viet, N. G. (2010). Task-based language teaching (TBLT): A Vietnamese case study using narrative frames to elicit teachers' beliefs. *Language Education in Asia*, 1(1), 77-86.
- v. Brewer, B., (1999). *Perception and Reason*. OUP, Oxford, England
- vi. Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- vii. Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE. Thousand Oaks. USA.
- viii. Creswell, J. W. (2011). Controversies in mixed methods research. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 4, 269-284.
- ix. Dorney, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- x. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching 4 th ed*. Harlow: Pearson
- xi. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*.
- xii. Cambridge university press.
- xiii. Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rogers. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*
- xiv. (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- xv. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and Applied linguistics*. Routledge.
- xvi. Yohannes Tefera. (2010). The Effect of Integrated Language Teaching to Students' retention as Compared to Non-Integrated. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.