DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol18iss1pp96-116

Enhancing Writing Quality and Self-Efficacy Beliefs through Process-oriented Task-based Instruction and Multiple Feedback Forms

Samira Moussaoui
Sultan Qaboos University, Oman

Received: 20/06/2022 Modified: 20/11/2023 Accepted: 22/11/2023

Abstract: This article presents the research findings of a quasi-experimental study seeking to enhance the writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs of Algerian undergraduate learners. The study employed task-based writing instruction within the process approach framework, and various forms of formative feedback (self-, peer-, and teacher feedback). The sample comprised 24 English as a foreign language (EFL) undergraduate learners with an intermediate level in academic writing. Data were collected through pre- and post-intervention writing tests to assess the participants' writing quality, as well as pre- and post-intervention surveys, along with post-hoc interviews, to measure their writing self-efficacy levels. The analysis of the findings revealed that, in comparison to their pre-intervention performance, the participants exhibited varying degrees of progress in writing quality and a moderate increase in their self-reported writing self-efficacy levels. These results suggest that adopting a process-oriented task-based approach to teaching academic writing, along with diverse forms of formative feedback, positively enhances EFL learners' writing skills and fosters more positive beliefs in their English writing abilities.
Keywords: English as a foreign language (EFL), formative feedback forms (self-, peer-, and teacher), process-oriented task-based writing instruction, self-efficacy beliefs, writing quality

تحسين جودة الكتابة ومعتقدات الكفاءة الذاتية من خلال التدريب القائم على المهام وعلى أساس العملية واستخدام أشكال متعددة من التغذية الراجعة

سميرة موساوي
جامعة السلطان قابوس، سلطنة عمان

اسُتلم بتاريخ: 2022/06/20 عُدل بتاريخ: 2023/11/20 قُبل بتاريخ: 2023/11/22

الملخص: يقدم هذا المقال نتائج دراسة شبه تجريبية بهدف تحسين جودة الكتابة ومعتقدات الكفاءة الذاتية لدى طلبة جامعيين جزائريين. اعتمدت الدراسة تعليم الكتابة القائم على المهام وعلى أساس العملية، واستخدمت أشكالا متعددة من التغذية الراجعة (ذاتية، من الأقران، ومن الأستاذ). شملت الدراسة 24 طالباً جامعياً جزائرياً يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، ولديهم مستوى متوسط في الكتابة الأكاديمية. تم جمع البيانات من خلال اختبارات الكتابة ما قبل وما بعد التجريب لتقييم جودة الكتابة لدى المشاركين، وكذلك من خلال استبيانات ما قبل وما بعد التجريب ومقابلات ما بعد التجريب لقياس مستويات معتقدات الكفاءة الذاتية لديهم بالنسبة للكتابة. كشف تحليل النتائج عن أن المشاركين أظهروا درجات متفاوتة من التقدم في جودة الكتابة مقارنة بأدائهم قبل التجريب، وزيادة معتدلة في مستويات معتقدات الكفاءة الذاتية بالنسبة للكتابة حسب تقاريرهم الذاتية بعد التجريب. تشير هذه النتائج إلى أن تبني نهج التدريب القائم على أساس المهام والعملية في تعليم الكتابة الأكاديمية، إلى جانب استخدام أشكال متعددة من التغذية الراجعة، يسهم بشكل كبير في تحسين مهارات الكتابة لدى الطلاب الذين يتعلمون الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية كذلك من معتقدات الإيجابية بقدرتهم على الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية.
الكلمات المفتاحية: طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، التغذية الراجعة، تعليم الكتابة على اساس التدريب القائم على المهام والعملية، معتقدات الكفاءة الذاتية، جودة الكتابة

Email: s.moussaoui@squ.edu.om

Introduction

In academic environments, the possession of a robust writing capability is a sine qua non for evolution in all disciplines, at undergraduate as well as postgraduate levels, as writing underpins and permeates all academic communication. In the context of English language teaching, particularly foreign language programs, learners are required to develop stronger writing skills in order to complete a variety of academic assignments. However, many English as a foreign language (EFL) learners have fewer opportunities to practise and develop their writing skills, hence encounter more complex and demanding situations in writing (MacArthur et al., 2006). These challenges include cognitive, meta-cognitive, linguistic, socio-affective, and communicative constraints (Graham et al., 2013). These difficulties can be attributed to the learners themselves and/or may be the result of ineffective instructional methods used in teaching writing, and/ or arise from unfavourable learning atmospheres. For example, in many EFL contexts, including Algerian higher education institutions, writing courses focus on the finished product rather than the process. In different terms, writing instructors emphasise form and grammar correctness over the act and process of writing, that is, what the learners actually do while writing (i.e., planning writing, composing/drafting and revising) (MacArthur et al., 2016; Sasaki, 2000).

In this respect, different studies show that learners from diverse educational and cultural backgrounds and various levels of proficiency, including English as a foreign or second language learners, as well as those with fewer opportunities in writing or low motivation to write, tend to skip the prewriting processes and start drafting immediately (Graham & Harris, 2005; Graham et al., 2013; Sasaki, 2000). In addition, many learners often neglect the revision stage in the writing process and demonstrate limited knowledge of revision strategies, which have been shown to play an essential role in improving the quality of writing (Alhaisoni, 2012; Graham & Harris, 2005). This explains the fact that a considerable number of English as foreign language (EFL) learners often demonstrate a low level of meta-cognitive awareness about writing strategies, processes, and knowledge of academic topics and language features (Graham et al., 2013). Moreover, Studies report an insufficient body of research with tangible results with regard to the writing progress of EFL learners, predominantly due to the prevailing use of summative assessments as opposed to regular formative assessment (Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2006; Sasaki, 2000; Zhan et al., 2022). While summative assessments offer a record of performance at a specific point in time, they do not provide continuous feedback or insights pertaining to learners' writing improvement over time. In contrast, regular formative assessment, which includes ongoing feedback and opportunities for revision, is essential for comprehending learners' progress, identifying patterns, and designing precise interventions to support their writing development (MacArthur et al., 2016).

For a clearer apprehension of learners' writing progress, a favourable environment needs to be created, where students fully engage in writing processes and activities, with sufficient training and guidance on the use of effective writing strategies (Graham & Harris, 2005). An ideal environment for a successful engagement of learners is a collaborative writing classroom, wherein they can avail themselves of ample opportunities to communicate and exchange ideas, express themselves through writing, use the language for various purposes, and develop more positive attitudes towards writing and higher levels of motivation and self-efficacy (Graham & Perin, 2007; Lee, 2013). In addition, research on writing and affect, which encompasses the psychological and emotional factors that can positively or negatively influence writing outcomes, suggests that providing positive feedback through different modes (oral, written, individual, group, whole-class) and in a regular constructive manner will not only enhance the learners' writing and language skills, but will infuse them with heightened confidence in their writing abilities which will, by way of consequence, motivate them to undertake more challenging tasks and gain more autonomy in writing (Cui et al., 2021; MacArthur et al., 2016).

Thus, the body of research on EFL and ESL writing recommends major changes in writing pedagogy. It is important to emphasise the role of process-oriented and task-based writing instruction models which have, throughout the last few decades, contributed, separately or in combination, to boosting learners' writing progress regardless of their writing performance level, origin, or age category (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; MacArthur et al., 2006). The process-oriented approach paved the way for the task-based approach, and both models have been used abundantly in teaching different language skills and contexts worldwide due to their considerable benefits (Ellis, 2003; Norris & Ortega, 2018; Willis & Willis, 2007). Like the process-oriented model, task-based instruction (TBI) or task-based learning (TBL) has been es-

poused in many schools and higher education institutions for its major benefits in second and foreign language learning (Van den Branden, 2006). In the field of ESL/ EFL writing, research conducted on the benefits of TBI has yielded important findings, some of which were associated with learners' affect. In other words, TBI has proved to have positive effects on the learners' writing achievement as well as their affect level, particularly their attitudes towards writing and their writing self-efficacy beliefs. The latter is considered as an important psychological trait that can impact positively or negatively on language learners' writing achievement (Mitchell et al., 2023; Pajares, 2003); the effect can be greater on EFL learners, particularly those with a lesser experience.

This paper sheds light on the role of task-based instruction, used in combination with the process approach, in enhancing writing quality and promoting positive self-efficacy beliefs among university learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). It also investigates the effects of diverse feedback types on improving the said variables. Drawing upon prior research, the following sections will explore the interconnected aspects and implications of these key elements, providing a detailed examination of their influence on EFL learners' writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs.

Task-based Writing Instruction and Writing Quality

Achieving quality in academic writing is a challenging process for many university learners, particularly those who write in English as a foreign language. Writing quality requires not only a good mastery of academic writing conventions, but also a considerable knowledge of a variety of competences: linguistic (knowledge and skills about language use and usage), discourse (knowledge about academic topics and composing skills), and strategic (knowledge and skills about the writing processes and strategies) (Graham et al., 2013). To develop these skills among learners and improve their writing quality, research suggests that implementing task-based writing instruction, particularly within the process approach framework, can have positive effects on learners' writing performance (MacArthur et al., 2016).

In this respect, it is argued that writing quality can be boosted through goal-oriented instruction, where the emphasis is on guiding students toward specific objectives, focusing not only on the final product, which highlights polished writing and clarity, but also on the complex writing process, involving various stages through which diverse writing tasks unfold (Graham et al., 2013); the latter approach encourages creativity and critical thinking, resulting in unique and meaningful writing. Indeed, writing a coherent piece that engages readers and complies with academic writing standards necessitates a complex process that comprises various stages of goal-setting (defining clear objectives), planning (organizing ideas), composing (generating content/drafting), revising and editing (refining, restructuring, and correcting errors). These stages and sub-processes are complementary and recursive (repeated in cycles) and require multiple skills and strategies to achieve the desired goal.

In alignment with the prior understanding, it is worthy of note that this study employed a modified version of the Task-based Instruction (TBI) model, which combines TBI with a process approach that involves stages, emphasizing authentic writing tasks, task sequencing, and the integration of language input and output (Brown & Lee, 2015; Zhaochun, 2015). This modified model stimulates a learning environment where students' language acquisition is facilitated and their motivation and engagement in the writing process are encouraged. Hence, the focus of task-based instruction is not only on task completion but also on enhancing an integrated approach that fosters language skills and motivation through authentic and meaningful writing experiences (Harmer, 2007; Muluneh, 2018; Van den Branden, 2006).

Examining the concept from a theoretical angle, task-based instruction is essentially a learner-centered approach that stems from the socio-constructivist and collaborative learning theories (Brown & Lee, 2015; Nunan, 2004). It focuses on the top-down processes and encourages collaborative learning to engage learners and maximise their learning outcomes (Van den Branden, 2006). In a collaborative learning environment, learners are encouraged to develop various cognitive and socio-affective skills that allow them to enhance their communicative skills while performing the intended tasks. With specific emphasis on writing, students may have various opportunities to work conjointly to enhance their cognitive skills (e.g., brainstorming and evaluating ideas) and perform their writing tasks (e.g., planning and composing). They can also promote their communicative skills while increasing their motivation and confidence levels in writing (Harmer, 2007; Van den Branden, 2006).

Recent studies have emphasised the importance and effectiveness of task-based instruction in enhancing language learning and engagement (Brown & Lee,

2015). This can be achieved through engaging learners in authentic tasks leading to increased intrinsic motivation, an achievement of learning goals, and enhanced language skills. As a learner-centred approach, TBI focuses on meaningful learning experiences and encourages autonomy and responsibility among learners (Brown & Lee, 2015; Nunan, 2004).

Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Writing Performance and Feedback

According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy refers, generally, to the beliefs learners have in their ability to achieve desired performance levels that influence their learning, including writing, and other life events. These beliefs can shape their emotions, thoughts, motivation, as well as their behaviour, by exerting an impact on their cognitive, affective, motivational, and decision-making processes (Gan et al., 2023; Li, 2022). In the context of writing, self-efficacy beliefs can influence what and how learners employ their writing knowledge and skills in performing a particular writing task or situation. This explains the fact that learners' self-efficacy beliefs have an influential effect on their learning behaviour, that is, the choices and actions they make. In this respect, MacArthur et al. (2006) claim that:

> The self-perceptions that students come to hold about their capabilities influence the choices they make and the courses of action they pursue. Students tend to select tasks and activities in which they feel competent and confident and to avoid those in which they do not, for unless they believe that their actions will have the desired consequences, they have little incentive to engage in those actions (p. 159).

Self-efficacy beliefs can also help determine the amount of effort students will put into performing an activity and the degree of perseverance and resilience they will exhibit in confronting learning obstacles and difficulties (MacArthur et al., 2016; Pajares & Johnson, 1994; Pajares & Valiante, 2002; Shell et al., 1995).

Self-efficacy beliefs are also explained with reference to other influencing factors. Thus, while learners' self-efficacy beliefs can have an impact on their writing performance, they can, in turn, be influenced by various factors, such as their writing ability level, their writing experience (previous success or failure), positive or negative evaluation received from others, and their attitudes, motivation, or apprehension towards the writing situation, task or the target language (Abdullatif, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2016; McCarthy et al., 1985). That is to say, writing self-efficacy may have a positive or negative correlation with one or a combination of the afore-mentioned factors. To illustrate, some research studies conducted on the effect of self-efficacy beliefs on writing report that when learners demonstrate positive attitudes or motivation towards writing tasks and/ or situations, they are more likely to possess a higher level of writing self-efficacy, which also reflects positively on their writing performance (Abdellatif, 2007; Shell et al., 1989).

With respect to students' writing performance, studies have reported that writing self-efficacy correlates with first (L1) and second (L2) or foreign language (FL) writing processes and products (MacArthur et al., 2016). Thus, it has been reported that learners' self-efficacy and writing performance improved as a result of receiving process-oriented goals, which provide guidance on effective strategy use to enhance writing (Graham et al., 2013; MacArthur et al., 2016). The same effect was observed when they received regular constructive feedback on the quality of their strategy use (Graham & MacArthur, 1988; MacArthur et al., 2016; MacArthur et al., 1992; Schunk & Swartz, 1993). To explain further, learners' writing competence significantly improves when they connect their writing process goals with feedback; simultaneously, their utilization of writing strategies increases. Consequently, writing instruction that emphasizes self-regulatory strategies not only enhances learners' writing skills but also strengthens their self-efficacy beliefs (MacArthur et al., 2006). Furthermore, research indicates that writing self-efficacy positively correlates with text quality (Pajares & Valiante, 2002). In other words, when students exhibit greater confidence in their writing abilities, their writing quality improves.

Conversely, research found that students developed a lower level of self-efficacy as a result of receiving negative feedback on their writing; this was also the case with obtaining low scores in writing (Abdellatif, 2007). As in a vicious circle, students' low self-efficacy beliefs had a negative influence on their writing processes. Thus, it was claimed that students with low self-efficacy had the tendency to make longer pauses while composing (drafting) and they devoted little or no effort and time to planning their essays (Graham et al., 2013). Low self-efficacy was also found to have a hindering effect on students' metacognitive strategy use which affected negatively on their overall writing processes (Abdellatif, 2007; MacArthur et al., 2016).

Enhancing Writing Quality and Self-efficacy through Multiple Feedback Types

Stemming from socio-constructivist and collaborative learning theories, task-based instruction emphasizes collaborative learning and interactive engagement (Van den Branden, 2006). The impact of task-based instruction on writing self-efficacy can mainly be seen in the effects collaborative writing has on developing learners' writing skills, socio-affective skills, and writing autonomy, which in turn enhance their confidence in writing. In addition, collaborative writing and goal-setting facilitate the writing process and task completion (the intended piece of writing) (MacArthur et al. 2016).

On the other hand, providing effective feedback through self-, peer-, and/or teacher guidance plays a crucial role in enhancing writing performance (Cui et al., 2021) and self-efficacy among learners (Graham et al., 2013; Tai, 2016). In other words, guiding learners with effective feedback throughout the writing process assists them in promptly identifying strengths and weaknesses in their writing. Regular feedback fosters progressive enhancements, resulting in improved writing quality during the composition process and an increased perception of writing abilities (MacArthur et al., 2016). In addition, offering a variety of feedback types, instead of relying on exclusively one type, can enhance learners' writing quality and self-efficacy in several ways. In a collaborative writing environment, learners have various opportunities to learn from their peers through guided or trained peer-feedback and discussions, self-correction, and teacher feedback. These formative feedback forms may yield considerable benefits when applied in combination and on a regular basis.

Self-correction, self-evaluation, or self-assessment is one of the most known, yet less practised, forms of feedback. It is a revision strategy that can be implemented successfully in writing to assist learners revise their writing on their own (MacArthur et al., 2016). In order to use the strategy effectively, it is important to teach students about the evaluation criteria and the effective ways to implement them in revising their writing (Graham et al., 2013). The self-evaluation strategy has yielded positive results on the revision process and writing quality. In addition, it has been reported that students who employ self-assessment enhance their motivation and self-efficacy levels, and develop a greater level of autonomy and ownership as writers (Graham et al., 2013).

Peer-evaluation is another form of feedback; it is used interchangeably with peer-assessment, peer-response or peer-review. Peer-feedback can take the form of pair responses (Kwok, 2008), small-group or a whole-group response (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001), hence, considered as a form of collaborative feedback. This strategy has been proved to have various benefits for EFL learners, especially enhancing their cognitive, linguistic, and socio-affective skills (Min, 2006). In addition, it helps improve their communicative and critical thinking skills through the process of exchanging, discussing, and evaluating each other's writing, which will additionally result in improved written drafts (Cui et al., 2021; Moussaoui, 2012). As the learners engage in a collaborative environment, as writers and readers, their motivation to write and their writing self-efficacy beliefs increase, together with their degree of writing autonomy (Kong & Teng, 2020; Moussaoui, 2012).

Like self- and peer-feedback, teacher feedback is an essential part of the writing process as a whole, particularly during the revision process, which is often the final stage of writing. Teacher feedback may also have different modes (verbal and written) and forms (one-on-one, small- or whole-group feedback). Studies show that while teacher feedback can be preferred among some learners (Cui et al., 2021), particularly when provided in both written and oral modes, furnishing peer-evaluation, after training, and teacher feedback has resulted in enhanced writing performance and an increased level of self-efficacy (Cui et al., 2021; Moussaoui, 2012).

Combining the afore-mentioned forms, through one or a combination of modes (e.g., verbal, written, or both) can result in considerable positive effects on the students' writing performance at both the process and the product levels, as the quality of the latter depends to a great extent on the process through which it has been achieved (MacArthur et al., 2016). Within a task-based approach, the incorporation of a variety of feedback types in writing may not only result in raising the students' awareness of the role of feedback in developing their writing performance, but can contribute to ameliorating their writing ability from a (meta-) cognitive, linguistic, and socio-affective levels (Graham et al., 2013).

After examining the existing literature pertinent to the significance of task-based instruction along with various feedback forms and their influence on the writing quality and self-efficacy, the following sections outline the research problem of the study, its re-

search objectives and questions, with an aim to explore the efficacy of implementing the afore-mentioned approach.

Research Problem

In Algerian universities, undergraduate EFL learners take an English writing course for three years as part of their curriculum. In their third-year, they are required to demonstrate an ability to write organized, coherent, and meaningful essays on different academic topics. However, a large number of these students appear to face challenges in composing in the target language, which can be due to various reasons, including their limited writing ability, limited linguistic ability, negative beliefs about their writing ability (i.e., low self-efficacy level), and/ or as a result of receiving negative or no feedback on their writing.
Despite the abundant research that exists in the field of EFL and ESL writing, insufficient work has been produced on the impact of implementing a combination of task-based writing instruction along with a variety of formative feedback forms on increasing college students' writing quality. In addition, there is scant evidence about the use of the afore-mentioned approach to writing instruction (i.e., the TBI with a combination of multiple feedback forms) in enhancing these EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs, a psychological trait that can be a determining factor in their success or failure in writing in the target language (Graham & Perin, 2007; Hyland & Hyland, 2019).

Research Aims and Questions

With the intention of enhancing the writing quality of undergraduate learners and nurturing their positive self-efficacy beliefs, an intervention writing course was introduced through a quasi-experimental design. This course utilized task-based instruction within a process-oriented framework and incorporated various feedback forms. To provide more concrete insight, the present paper aims to illuminate the favourable effects of task-based instruction within a process-oriented framework and different feedback types (self-, peer-, and one-on-one teacher feedback) on elevating the writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs of Algerian university EFL learners. To address these aims, the following research questions were formulated.

1. How does the integration of multiple feedback types in conjunction with process-oriented task-based writing instruction impact the writing quality of participants?

a. Do significant differences in essay writing quality exist among high-, average-, and low-achievers before and after the intervention?

b. How does participants' writing self-efficacy change when they are exposed to a diverse range of feedback types within a process-oriented task-based writing instruction framework?

Research Instruments and Design

Participants and Context

The study involved a sample of 24 randomly selected male and female sophomores, aged 19-21 years, who had voluntarily enrolled in the study, majoring in English at the Setif University English Department, Algeria. The gender and age variables were not taken into consideration in this study; however, the researcher sought to recruit a homogeneous sample to minimize the effects of any potential confounding variables. It is worth mentioning that the participants' first and predominant acquired language was Arabic, and that English and French were acquired as foreign languages. The latter may have influenced their writing abilities and language transfer.

In their first undergraduate year, the participants had attended a basic writing course focusing mainly on sentence- and paragraph-level skills and did not cover aspects like the writing processes and strategies, paragraph and essay types, and academic formal writing, thus the participants lacked or possessed limited awareness and knowledge in these particular areas. An examination of their grades in the previous semester indicated their general academic performance ranged between low and high-intermediate levels, while their writing ability was assessed as intermediate with varying degrees of writing difficulties.

The aim of this intervention course was, hence, to provide these participants with an extensive training in the different academic writing skills pertinent to paragraph and essay writing, to enhance their writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs. The group participated in the pre-, during-, and post-intervention writing tasks while a writing self-efficacy survey was administered before and after the intervention writing course. The latter lasted for a period of eight weeks.

Research Instruments

The present research adopted a quasi-experimental method, utilizing a single pre-test and post-test experimental group. Various strategies were employed to

enhance control over the independent variable (intervention), minimize the influence of potential confounding variables, and strengthen the internal validity of the study. These strategies included the random assignment of participants to the experimental group, and conducting a pre-test to assess the participants' existing level of performance. Standardization served to preserve the consistency of the instructions and the intervention procedures. Finally, the reduction of external influences on the outcome variables (writing quality and self-efficacy level) was obtained by conducting a post-study interview with participants to confirm that no additional instructions on academic writing were received during the intervention.

The study implemented a process-oriented task-based instruction and multiple types of feedback, with an aim to enhance the participants' writing quality and their self-efficacy beliefs. To achieve this twofold objective, two research instruments were used at the pre- and post-intervention phases. To measure the participants' writing quality before and after the intervention course, pre- and post-tests were employed, which consisted of a 250-400 word academic essay in English. In addition, a pre- and post-intervention survey was administered to measure the respondents' writing self-efficacy level. The survey was based on a modified version of the English Writing Self-Efficacy Scale (EWSES) used by Mohammed Abdel Latif (2007), which had been originally created by Pajares and Valiante (1999). The EWSES consisted of ten (10) statements used to measure the students' self-efficacy level in their overall writing ability as well as their ability to perform specific aspects of essay writing. For the purpose of qualitative analysis, the statements were classified into four categories (conventional, linguistic, organizational or structural, and compositional self-efficacy) according to the criteria of essay evaluation used in assessing the pre–and post-tests). To measure the participants' EWSE level, a Five-Likert scale was used, ranging from very unconfident (=1) to very confident (=5). It is important to highlight that both the writing test and the survey underwent piloting within a comparable context. Moreover, the survey was tested on a similar sample (possessing similar characteristics) during an exploratory study, without necessitating any modifications.

A post-hoc semi-structured interview was conducted after the completion of the intervention course to verify the results of the statistical analysis, particularly as pertains to the participants' self-efficacy beliefs. The interview comprised five questions to elicit answers on the participants' self-efficacy beliefs before and after the intervention, as well as their progress in writing and the impact of feedback on writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs.

Intervention Course

The intervention course aimed at implementing a comprehensive approach to improve the participants' writing self-efficacy beliefs and writing skills, particularly the quality of writing. The design was based on the process-oriented task-based instruction, and supported through the Self-regulation Strategy Development (SRSD) model of Graham and Harris (2005). The course focused on an explicit teaching of the participants to effectively understand, monitor, and self-regulate writing strategies, paragraph and essay organizational skills, academic language and style, and writing conventions. To facilitate the implementation of the intervention, different materials were employed throughout the intervention period, including lesson plans to guide the mini lessons and practice sessions (planning and brainstorming, drafting and organizing essays, and revising and editing tasks), handouts with clear instructions to perform specific writing tasks throughout the writing process, and evaluation checklists for self- and peer-feedback.

The course went through three major phases for eight weeks during which an explicit instruction through mini-lessons and practice sessions were conducted. Each phase included one to two mini lessons of an explicit instruction on the major features of academic writing and conventions, pre-writing, drafting, and revision strategies. The practice sessions were conducted in small group workshops to foster collaboration and maximize learning, as well as pairwork and individual tasks for independent practice. Group and individualized feedback were provided by the researcher for guidance. The following is a description of each stage of the intervention course.

The first phase of the intervention course spanned four two-hour sessions, during which the participants were introduced to the major features and conventions of academic essay writing. The features included aspects related to: paragraph and essay structure, essay types and organizational patterns, academic writing style and register, the purpose of writing as well as audience needs. In addition, aspects of internal organization like unity, cohesion and coherence, as well as conventions and formatting were introduced through various tasks.

The second intervention phase lasted for two weeks with three two-hour sessions. The participants re-

ceived explicit teaching of brainstorming and planning (pre-writing) as well as drafting strategies to guide them in selecting a topic, discussing essay type and purpose, patterns of organization, register, style, and audience. The participants received training in writing an attention grabber, a thesis statement, and topic sentences. Assistance was also provided with generating ideas for the topic (s), using different brainstorming strategies, drawing an outline for the essay, following the essay structure and pattern (s) of organization (block, point-by-point, chain methods) based on essay type to draft a five-paragraph essay of at least 250 words based on the prepared outline. Further practice was provided for the participants to generate more content, analyse ideas and organize them into coherent paragraphs using linking words and transitions to express the intended relationships (e.g., cause-effect) between ideas and paragraphs in relation to the essay genre, purpose, and pattern of organization. In the drafting stage of writing, the focus was mainly on content generation and organization rather than grammar and mechanics. The planning and brainstorming were mainly performed collaboratively during the initial stages, while drafting essays was an individual effort. In later stages (i.e., after the participants had had sufficient practice), the tasks of planning and drafting were performed individually.

The third phase of the intervention course focused on introducing the participants to and raising their awareness of the importance of revision and its impact on enhancing writing quality. Revision strategies were taught explicitly, followed by extensive collaborative (peer-evaluation) and individual (self-evaluation) practice sessions. The revision phase comprised rereading the written draft and identifying areas of revision with a focus on development of ideas, i.e. depth of analysis, variety, and relevance. It also involved essay organization with regard to essay and paragraph structure, pattern of organization, cohesion and coherence. Additionally, the revision process addressed aspects such as word choice and language accuracy and fluency, formal style, and mechanics, with the aim of further fine-tuning the written work.

The first stage of revision was a collaborative endeavour where the participants received peer-feedback by means of guided checklists and oral feedback from the researcher. The process was followed by self-correction using a similar checklist, after which the participants would write a second draft for more comprehensive feedback from the instructor. In the final phase, one-on-one conferences were conducted with the participants after consulting the written feedback. On the basis of that feedback, the writers then proceeded with extra revisions and editing and produced a final draft.

To conduct self- and peer-evaluation, a training session was conducted to guide participants in evaluating each other's writing and using checklists. The evaluation criteria and sub-criteria were thoroughly explained, and guided oral feedback was provided during collaborative (peer-evaluation) sessions, in conjunction with self-revision processes. Further scaffolding tasks, guidance, and feedback were provided according to individual participants' needs. The rest of the intervention sessions were devoted to the practice of essay writing on different topics (free choice), following the process of writing (planning, drafting, and revising), with a combination of collaborative and individual tasks. After the intervention course, the post-test (essay writing), post-survey, and post-hoc semi-structured interview were conducted.

Research Ethics and Informed Consent

This research aligns with ethical considerations, as reflected in obtaining the relevant academic clearances and participant consent, ensuring transparency and responsibility throughout the study. Prior to commencing the study, the researcher obtained an initial permission by submitting a proposal to the research committee of the English Department, Setif University, Algeria. Following departmental approval, the central committee at the Faculty of Languages further scrutinized and approved the research.

The participants formally expressed their consent to take part in the pre-, during-, and post-intervention phases, through signing a 'Contract of Agreement', which briefly introduced the research aims. It also assured confidentiality and anonymity of collected data and granted participants the right to withdraw at any point. To secure anonymity, pre- and post-study questionnaires, tests, and interview data were coded.

Data Analysis Procedures

The pre- and post-intervention results were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis of the writing tasks was conducted using a graded rubric that included five major criteria of essay writing quality: content and analysis, flow and organization, language and style, writing conventions, and format. Each criterion was further divided into sub-criteria. To ensure inter-rater reliability, the researcher, independently, conducted a consensus study with another informed instructor. The obtained results of the Kappa Coefficient Test indicate a value of 0.72, which is considered satisfactory and signifies

a substantial level of agreement between the raters. The scores obtained were further analysed through the Software Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) to measure the overall writing quality as well as the sub-scores for the afore-mentioned criteria of writing quality. The analysis included descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, mode, median, minimum and maximum values), a Paired Samples TEST to compare the pre- and post-test results, and a One-way ANOVA to compare the writing quality between high-, average-, and low-achievers.

The qualitative analysis of the writing tasks consisted of a deeper examination of the participants' written drafts prior and posterior to the administration of the writing course. The analysis was conducted thematically, with reference to the five criteria used in the graded rubric, focusing specifically on comparing the progress made by high-, average-, and low-achieving participants. This categorisation was conducted to emphasize variations in writing quality among sub-groups and, hence, identify specific strengths and weaknesses, providing insights into participants' writing abilities. Moreover, the categorisation served as an assessment of the impact of the intervention on high-, average-, and low-achievers, offering valuable information for future improvements. To support the analysis, authentic excerpts from the particpants' pre- and post-tests were quoted without corrections to provide unmodified evidence of their actual language proficiency. The classification of the participants was based on the average score of their total pre- and post-intervention scores. The average score ranges for the three categories were as follows: 75% to 95%, 55% to 74%, and 35% to 54%, respectively, as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Participants' Categories

Category of participants	High achievers	Average achievers	Low achievers
Number of participants	08	10	06
Test Score Range (%)	75-95 %	55-74 %	35-54 %

The quantitative analysis of the pre- and post-intervention survey results (i.e., participants' writing self-efficacy level) was also conducted through the same software, focusing on descriptive statistics (mean, mode, median and standard deviation) of the whole variable (WSE) and its ten individual statements. In addition, Paired Samples and Chi-square TESTs were utilized to compare four different types of writing self-efficacy (Linguistic, Organizational/Structural, Compositional, and Conventional) between the pre- and post-intervention phases. These self-efficacy categories were formulated based on the ten statements outlined in Table 6. Furthermore, a qualitative thematic analysis was conducted, centered around these identified self-efficacy types, to interpret the results of the participants' beliefs in their ability to perform particular aspects of essay writing .

The analysis of the post-hoc semi-structured interview results went through the transcription of the participants' recorded responses, coding of the data, and a thematic qualitative analysis based on the self-efficacy categories, mentioned above, and the participants' categories (high-, average-, and low-achievers). The analysis is supported with sample excerpts from the participants' answers for evidence.

Research Findings

Quantitative Analysis of the Participants' Writing Quality

The quantitative analysis of the pre- and post-tests results comprises descriptive statistics, Paired Samples TESTs, to examine the progress, per criterion, made by the participants after the intervention, and ANOVA TESTs, to compare the writing quality of high-, average- and low-achievers. The analysis revealed important findings on the progress of the participants' writing quality as compared to what it was before the intervention course.

As indicated in Table 2, the mean value of the participants' total score was 65.12 compared to 54.77 before the intervention course, a difference of 10 points. With regard to the sub-scores obtained in the different aspects of essay writing (referred to as criteria), the progress was mainly clear in essay organization and flow of ideas, with a sub-score increasing from 14.4% to 17.56% out of 25%. Similarly, a notable amelioration was observed in language accuracy and style (from 12.83% to 16.2% out of 25%) as well as the format of the essay (from 6% to 9.99% out of 10%), with an increase surpassing 3%. An improvement was also noticed in content and writing conventions with a 2-point (out of 20 %) increase in the former and only 1.3% (out of 10 %) in the latter.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics: Pre- and Post-Intervention Writing Quality Results

	Content & Analysis (20 %)		Flow & Organization (25 %)		Language & Style (25 %)		Conventions (20%)		Format (10 %)		Total Score (100 %)	
Participants	24		24		24		24		24		24	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Mean	12.00	14.04	14.40	17.56	12.83	16.20	8.69	9.99	6.00	9.99	54.77	65.12
Median	11.50	14.50	13.21	17.86	12.50	17.50	8.00	9.33	6.00	9.33	53.25	65.75
Mode	11.00	10.00	12.14	18.57	7.50	21.25	8.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	43.00	59.00
Minimum	8.00	8.00	9.28	9.28	6.25	6.25	3.00	5.00	5.33	6.66	33.00	36.00
Maximum	7.00	9.00	3.57	24.28	23.75	23.75	9.00	10.00	14.66	17.33	87.00	93.00
SD	2.59	3.03	3.54	4.14	5.34	5.35	2.29	2.60	1.72	2.61	13.57	14.48

Pre: Pre-intervention results Post: Post-intervention results SD: Standard Deviation

Additionally, the Paired Samples TEST evidenced significant variations in mean scores between the post-test and pre-test for each of the sub-score variables, as indicated in Table 3 below. Primarily, there occurred a significant improvement in content, with a mean difference of 2.33 (t (23) = 4.897, p < .001). In similar fashion, organization demonstrated a major improvement, with a mean difference of 3.30 (t (23) = 4.067, p < .001). Language and style also exhibited a marked increase, with a mean difference of 3.18 (t (23) = 3.855, p = .001). The use of writing conventions equally improved, attaining a mean difference of 1.17 (t (23) = 3.149, p = .004). Finally, the format of the essays displayed a significant amelioration, with a mean difference of 1.38 (t (23) = 5.935, p < .001).

Table 3: Paired Samples TEST: Pre- and Post-Intervention Writing Quality Results

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Content.post Content.pre	2.33333	2.33437	.47650	1.34762	3.31905	4.897	23	.000
Organization.post Organization.pre	3.30429	3.98010	.81243	1.62364	4.98494	4.067	23	.000
Language.post Language.pre	3.17708	4.03751	.82415	1.47219	4.88198	3.855	23	.001
Conventions.post Conventions.pre	1.16750	1.81606	.37070	.40064	1.93436	3.149	23	.004
Format.post Format.pre	1.37500	1.13492	.23166	.89577	1.85423	5.935	23	.000

These results underscore statistically significant advancements in content, organization, language and style, writing conventions, and format between the pre-test and post-test measurements. The Paired Samples TEST exhibited significant mean differences between the pre-test and post-test measurements for each variable. The observed enhancements indicate that the intervention effected a positive impact on the participants' writing skills in these areas.

Analysis of the Differences Between and Within Sub-groups

ANOVA tests were conducted to investigate the overall variations in post-test scores between and within the three sub-groups (high-, average- and low-achievers). The results are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4: Differences Between and Within Sub-groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Btween Groups	4443.125	2	2221.563	64.811	.000
Within Groups	719.833	21	34.278		
Total	5162.958	23			

Additionally, a post-hoc test was carried out for a deeper examination of the differences between the existing pairs (high-achievers and average-achievers,

high-achievers and low-achievers, and average-achievers and low-achievers) and the identification of which of these achieved more advancement (compared to the others). The results of the post-hoc tests are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Post-hoc Test: Multiple Comparisons within Sub-groups

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High-achievers	Average-achievers	18.00*	2.77714	.000	12.2246	23.7754
	Low-achievers	35.83*	3.16191	.000	29.2578	42.4089
Average-achievers	High-achievers	-18.00*	2.77714	.000	-23.7754	-12.2246
	Low-achievers	17.83*	3.02337	.000	11.5459	24.1208
Low-achievers	High-achievers	-35.83*	3.16191	.000	-42.4089	-29.2578
	Average-achievers	-17.83*	3.02337	.000	-24.1208	-11.5459

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The ANOVA results point towards a significant variation among the groups of total, high-achievers, average-achievers, and low-achievers in their post-test scores. The between-groups sum of squares is 4443.125, with 2 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square of 2221.563. The F-value is 64.811, and the p-value is less than .001 ($p < .001$). This indicates meaningful differences in the post-test scores between the groups. The within-groups sum of squares is 719.833, with 21 degrees of freedom, yielding a mean square of 34.278. The total sum of squares is 5162.958. In total, these data indicate that there are statistically significant variations in the post-test scores across the different achievement groups.

The post-hoc tests evidenced significant mean variations in the post test results between high-achievers, average-achievers, and low-achievers. The mean scores of the high-achievers significantly surpassed those of average achievers (mean difference: 18.00, $p < .001$) and low-achieving participants (mean difference: 35.83, $p < .001$). The average-achievers obtained substantially lower mean scores relative to their high-achieving counterparts (mean difference: -18.00, $p < .001$), but markedly higher scores than the low-achievers (mean difference: 17.83, $p < .001$). The scores of the low-achievers were significantly lower than the high-achievers and average-achievers, with mean differences of -35.83 ($p < .001$) and -17.83 ($p < .001$), respectively.

Altogether, these figures indicate substantial variations in the post-test scores, with performance reflecting the capabilities of the three categories: the high-achieving group recorded the most noticeable progress, followed by the average participants, with the low-skill category obtaining the least progress.

Qualitative Analysis of the Participants' Writing Quality

A thematic qualitative analysis was conducted to provide a comprehensive analysis of the progress realized by the participants in writing quality before and after the intervention course. The participants' writing quality was principally measured through analysing specific criteria, including the quality of ideas and depth of analysis, flow and organization, language accuracy and style, writing conventions, and format. Each of these criteria is discussed below with regard to the participants' written drafts. The analysis of the participants' writing quality was conducted on their pre- and post-intervention tests scores. It is worthy of note that the participants were divided into three main categories: high-, average-, and low-achievers as indicated in Table 1.

Quality of Ideas and Depth of Analysis. The quality of ideas and depth of analysis were moderately average among the high-achievers before the writing course, but witnessed significant improvement after the intervention compared to the other two categories of participants. Although the quantitative results demonstrated an increase of two points in the mean score of the whole group in this aspect of writing, the high-achieving participants' essays presented a superior quality of ideas and deeper analysis, particularly after the training period. They employed a constant degree of depth and sophistication in their content discussion throughout both tests. For instance, notwithstanding some repetitions, the following excerpt is an example of the high-achievers' ability to furnish subtle reasoning and enlarge their dis-

cussion beyond the immediate topic, which is a testimony to a high degree of critical thinking and depth of understanding.

> Furthermore, the reason behind attending school for other people might be to have prestige. Some people think that well-educated people are more respected than illiterate people within societies. So, they opt for learning to be prestigious. Also, they believe that societies are classified as having high culture according to their intellectual achievements and the rate of educated people.

By contrast, the average and low achievers demonstrated only a minor improvement in the quality and variety of ideas, but their analysis suffered from superficiality. As pertains to content quality, the low-performing students exhibited little progress, with their post-test sample mentioning the drawbacks of the internet, stating, "The first one relates to the internet when it is a source of information, sometimes some information is wrong and incorrect." The average-achievers realized the most improvement in content by extending the discussion to encompass various aspects of the internet's impact. By way of example, in the post-test, they refer to "the internet's impact on science, education, and global changes like the [Arab] revolutions ".

Organization and Flow. Essay organization and flow refer to the overall organization and structure of the piece of writing, its cohesion and coherence. Most of the participants' essays showed a significant enhancement in the overall organization of ideas, paragraphs and sentences, and a generally smooth flow of ideas. However, in comparison to the low-performing participants, the high-performers' essays exhibited better internal organization, with logically connected and more complex patterns of organization, sentence forms, and transitional phrases that created a logical and more natural flow of ideas throughout the essay. This was the case in this pre-test sample, where flow and organization were marked through the signals of sequence, exemplification and purpose: "Besides, learning a foreign language keeps the threats and menaces of other nations, for instance, experts and engineers in sensitive places have to learn various languages in order to stand aware and vigilant from any foreign dangers". Similarly, in the post-test, these aspects of organization and others improved as is noticeable in this extract:

> To start with, some people attend school because they are obliged to. There are some people who do not have the desire to attend school, they may have the attitude that it is a waste of time and work is more profitable. But those people are obliged to learn either because their families obliged them to attend school, or because learning is obligatory in the … official constitution of the country.

The high-achievers demonstrated robust organizational abilities in both tests. In the post-test, they preserved those skills providing superior pieces with a clear introduction, offering various reasons for attending school, and concluding with a synopsis of the main points. The progress was evident in their ability to develop their ideas and provide a cohesive structure in the post-test. The example excerpt given above demonstrates the writer's ability to use appropriate cohesive devices, follow a logical order to move from general to specific to create a coherent text, and establish comparisons within sentences. This group of participants also showed awareness at the level of paragraph organization and the ability to employ a clear structure, as indicated in their choice of topic sentences in the pre-test sample sentence: "Learning a foreign language has many important aspects".

On the other hand, both the low- and average-achievers showed little improvement in this aspect, as evidenced by their pre-test samples that lacked a clear structure. The average-achievers focused more on maintaining cohesion between sentences and paragraphs, but used less complex patterns of organization to express the cause-effect and/ or comparison-contrast relationships. The low-achievers pre-test quote, "There are many many adventages of the internet in different domains,"' had no clear organization and developed no specific points. In the post-test, there was minimal progress observed in their organization as they focused on mentioning the disadvantages of the internet without a clear structure. Similarly, the average achiever's pre-test quote, "As a student at university internet changed my life but to a positive one, I use it for my studies, …" lacked a clear structure and did not provide further elaboration or supporting points. In the post-test, they demonstrated some progress by mentioning the impact of

the internet on science and education, but the organization remained limited, as is evident in this sample, "... internet has opened a lot of doors to people espacially to scientist and researchers to compare their work, besides in education, a lot of changes happened where the schools are depending on using the net in their teaching." Overall, the high-performing participants constantly used strong organizational skills in both tests, while the low-achiever and average achiever students showed limited advancement in this indicator, with an absence of clear structures in their pre-test samples.

Language Use and Style. As far as language use (grammatical structures, forms, and vocabulary choice) and style are concerned, there was variable improvement among the participants. The high-achieving students improved their already high level of language use from the pre-test to the post-test. They employed advanced language skills, such as in the pre-test sample, where they stated, "For example, the new earthquake alarm software is just in Japanese, so we have to learn that language." The high-achievers, thus, succeeded in ameliorating their style, using genre- and topic-specific academic register, and a combination of simple, compound, and complex language structures .

However, the average- and low-achievers' academic writing style recorded limited improvement. For example, the low-achiever students struggled with repetitive language, sentence structure, and grammatical forms, as seen in the pre-test sample, "There are many many advantages of the internet in different domains… students need more the internet than the other people because they are need it for doing their topics, project researches or many things about their studies". In the post-test, the improvement in language use and style were not significant. The following extract includes a variety of errors that may impede clarity and focus .

In the other hand, Internet may have other face, in other word internet has many disadvantages that many people now it. The first one relates to the internet when it is a source of information, sometimes some information are wrong and incorrect, in this case people cannot depend on it all the time. Now internet as a means of communication, also people may find problems when they communicate with other people, may some people give fake information to other people…

Writing Conventions. Writing conventions refer mainly to the mechanical aspects of writing, such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. A comparison of the participants' written drafts at the pre-intervention phase showed that various types of mechanical errors were committed by the participants, particularly the average and low-achievers, as is evident from this run-on sentence in a pre-test sample by an average-achiever:

As a student at university internet changed my life but to a positive one I use it for my studies, everything that the teacher says I note it and from the first moment I open my laptop I go directly google and type what he said in the lecture even if I didn't note what the teacher said I try to search for more information.

At the post-intervention stage, almost all the high-performing participants achieved significant improvement, with error-free essays for some of them, unlike their average- and low-achieving peers, who experienced only a slight improvement. The high-achievers demonstrated minimal errors in conventions throughout both tests. They showed constant adherence to conventions, as evidenced in the post-test sample with proper punctuation and capitalization:

> Furthermore, the reason behind attending school for other people might be to have prestige. Some people think that well-educated people are more respected than illiterate people within societies. So, they opt for learning to be prestigious. Also, they believe that societies are classified as having high culture according to their intellectual achievements and the rate of educated people.

Format. Unlike the other aspects of writing, essay format (e.g., margins, indentations, spacing) is considered as a minor aspect as it does not interfere with the construction of meaning and it hardly requires a cognitive effort. Thus, and based on the quantitative results, the overwhelming majority of participants demonstrated a mastery of the rules pertaining to essay format .

In summary, the high-achieving students already performed at a high level and even improved their proficiency across all criteria. The average-achiever students showed the most progress in content, expanding the discussion to comprise various aspects of the internet's impact. However, they needed improvement

in organization, language use, and conventions. The low-performing students showed limited progress in all criteria and would benefit from substantial improvement in content depth, organization, language use, and compliance with conventions.

Quantitative Analysis of the Participants' Writing Self-Efficacy

The results of the participants' English writing self-efficacy (EWSE) survey, which aimed at measuring their writing self-efficacy level, particularly in using specific essay writing skills, such as organization, language use and mechanics (conventions), are displayed in Table 6. They consist of the total score of the whole variable and the sub-scores of these specific aspects of essay writing. The scale adopted in EWSE was a five-point Likert-type ranging from very unconfident (=1) to very confident (=5).

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics: Pre- and Post-intervention English Writing Self-Efficacy Level

	Pre-intervention Results				Post-intervention Results			
EWSE Statements/ Categories	*M*	*Mo*	*Md*	*S.D.*	*M*	*Mo*	*Md*	*S.D.*
Conventional Self-efficacy								
1. I can correctly spell all the words in a one-page essay.	3.42	3.00	3.00	1.21	3.29	4.00	4.00	1.33
2. I can correctly punctuate a one-page essay.	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.14	3.17	3.00	2.00	1.17
Linguistic Self-efficacy								
3. I can correctly use parts of speech.	3.75	4.00	5.00	1.22	3.79	4.00	4.00	1.14
4. I can write simple sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.	3.96	4.00	5.00	1.16	3.75	4.00	4.00	1.22
5. I can correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes.	3.87	4.00	5.00	.99	4.00	4.00	4.00	.98
6. I can write an essay with appropriate vocabulary.	3.12	3.00	3.00	.80	3.33	3.00	3.00	.92
7. I can write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.	2.79	3.00	3.00	1.10	2.96	3.00	2.00	.95
Compositional Self-efficacy								
8. I can write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea.	3.67	4.00	4.00	1.01	3.29	3.00	3.00	.75
Organizational/ Structural Self-efficacy								
9. I can organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express them.	3.79	4.00	4.00	.72	3.75	4.00	4.00	.67
10. I can write an essay with a good overall organization (order of ideas, effective transitions, etc.).	3.54	3.00	3.00	.78	3.62	4.00	4.00	.65
English Writing Self-efficacy (total)	3.49	3.60	3.60	.61	3.49	3.45	3.30	.46

Table 7: Paired Samples TEST: Pre- and Post-intervention English Writing Self-efficacy Level

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Conventional Self-efficacy Post Conventional Self-efficacy Pre	.02000	.21213	.15000	-1.88593	1.92593	133	1	.916
Linguistic Self-efficacy Post Linguistic Self-efficacy Pre	.10200	.14789	.06614	-.08162	.28562	.542	4	.198
Structural Self-efficacy Post Structural Self-efficacy Pre	-.16500	.53033	.37500	-4.92983	4.59983	-.440	1	.736

The findings show that the total mean value of the EWSE variable is 3.49 at both the pre- and post-intervention phases. This implies that the participants were edging towards being confident, with no significant progress after the intervention course. However, and with reference to the EWSE individual items,

corresponding to English essay writing skills, there seems to be a minimal increase, of varying degrees, in the mean values of most of the aspects of essay writing, between the pre- and post-intervention periods .

From a statistical standpoint, the major areas that evidenced progress in the participants' confidence level encompassed those related to language use (items 3, 5, 6, and 7), mechanics (item 2), and essay organization (item 10), with mean values comprised within the range of 2.96 to 4.00. The standard deviation values that correspond to most of the mentioned items are below 1.0, indicating that the results reflect a normal distribution. On the other hand, there appears to be an insignificant decrease in the mean values of the remaining items (items 1, 4, 8, and 9).

In summary, these findings demonstrate that in comparison with the pre-intervention phase, the participants appear to have achieved a certain degree of advancement in their confidence level in some aspects of essay writing subsequent to the administration of the intervention writing course. The improvement pertained essentially to those features related to language use (e.g., correct grammar use, appropriate vocabulary, and syntactic structures), essay organization, and mechanics (particularly correct punctuation of a one-page essay).

To compare the pre- and post-test scores in the conventional, linguistic, and structural self-efficacy, the Paired Samples TEST was employed. For the Conventional Self-efficacy measure, there was a small mean difference of 0.020 between post-test and pre-test scores, which was not statistically significant (p = 0.916). Similarly, the Linguistic Self-efficacy measure showed a mean difference of 0.10200, also not statistically significant (p = 0.198). Finally, the Structural Self-efficacy measure had a mean difference of -0.16500, which was not statistically significant either (p = 0.736). In summary, there were no significant differences in the measured variables between pre- and post-test scores for any of the three categories .

The Chi-square TEST was executed for the variable 'Compositional Self-efficacy' following the impossibility of a T-test owing to the nature of the variable. The T-test assumes the variable's continuity or approximately normal distribution, with the likelihood of the variable in question being categorical or nominal. Thus, the Chi-square TEST, designed for the analysis of categorical data, was employed as an alternative. The obtained results from the Chi-square TEST evidenced no statistically significant association or difference (Chi-square = .143, df = 1, Asymp. Sig. = .705) between the observed and expected frequencies.

All in all, although there was a slight increase in post-test scores for the Conventional, Linguistic and Organizational Self-efficacy, along with a slight decrease for Compositional Self-efficacy based on the descriptive statistics, both the Paired Samples TEST and the Chi-square TEST did not show a significant improvement in participants' self-efficacy across these categories .

Qualitative Analysis of the Participants' Writing Self-efficacy

The qualitative analysis of the participants' English writing self-efficacy, whose results furnish insights into the impact of the intervention on the participants' beliefs across different areas, consisted of an interpretation of the quantitative results (mean values) in terms of the ten individual statements displayed in Table 6. These items were categorized into four main aspects of essay writing, namely: writing quality (item 8); sentence, paragraph, and essay structure and organization (items 9 and 10); language use (items 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7); and mechanics/ conventions (items 1 and 2). With reference to self-efficacy, these categories were labeled as: compositional self-efficacy, organizational or structural self-efficacy, linguistic self-efficacy, and conventional self-efficacy. The four types of self-efficacy are explained briefly in the following.

Compositional Self-efficacy. This refers to the participants' degree of confidence to produce a good quality piece of writing (paragraph or essay). This includes the ability to write a good paragraph with a good topic sentence and supporting details, which entails writing a strong essay with a clear purpose, rich and clear ideas, appropriate language use, and good structure and organization. Based on the quantitative (Descriptive Statistics and Chi-square) results discussed above, the participants achieved no noticeable progress in compositional self-efficacy .

Organizational/ Structural Self-efficacy. This type of self-efficacy refers to the student writers' confidence in their ability to 'organize sentences into a paragraph' and 'write an essay with a good overall organization', with an appropriate order of ideas and an effective use of transitions. The quantitative results evidence that the participants' organizational self-efficacy has improved in the wake of the intervention course, mainly at the level of essay overall organization compared to their ability to organize sentences into paragraphs.

Linguistic Self-efficacy. Linguistic self-efficacy consists of the students' ability to use correct grammar, syntactic structures, and vocabulary. In other terms, (i) grammatical correctness includes aspects like the use of plural forms, verb tenses, prefixes and suffixes; (ii) grammatical/ syntactic structures refer to the use of simple, compound sentences and subordinate clauses; and (iii) vocabulary use entails an appropriate use of general and academic register. According to the descriptive statistics displayed in Table 6, above, the participants appear to have made some progress in their linguistic self-efficacy, particularly in their use of the parts of speech, grammatical forms (e.g., plural forms, verbs, prefixes) and academic vocabulary .

Conventional Self-efficacy. This category consists of the student writer's ability to correctly spell and punctuate a one-page essay. These are usually referred to as writing mechanics, which may affect meaning if they are not used properly and effectively. The results show that the participants' conventional self-efficacy has slightly improved, particularly in punctuating a one-page essay, while it decreased slightly in spelling .

In a nutshell, it appears that although there was no significant improvement in the participants' overall writing self-efficacy, their confidence level was enhanced to a certain degree after the writing course, namely their linguistic, organizational, and conventional self-efficacy, which is proof of the positive effect of the intervention writing course .

Qualitative Analysis of the Post-hoc Interview Results

The results of the Paired Samples TEST assessing the participants' writing self-efficacy perceptions demonstrated that no significant improvement occurred in all four categories of self-efficacy: compositional self-efficacy, linguistic self-efficacy, organizational self-efficacy, and conventional self-efficacy. However, the data from the post-hoc semi-structured interview furnished supplementary insights into the students' perceptions and evidenced varying degrees of amelioration in their confidence levels. In the interviews, the participants were questioned about their general confidence regarding their writing skills and their perceptions, which indirectly touched on the different categories of self-efficacy, mentioned earlier .

The responses from these interviews offered important evidence to back up the statistical results. The answers from low-achievers indicated that they encountered initial difficulties with writing and a lack of confidence in numerous areas. For instance, one student mentioned, "Before the training, sometimes I felt that I was not able to write... my problems in writing were in cohesion and coherence... mainly because of my attitude towards writing and I didn't have the habit of writing." However, following the training, they acknowledged improvement in their skills and heightened confidence, stating, "Now, I know where the problem is... I feel that after training, I have developed better skills. I feel more confident... The teacher's feedback helped me very much." These quotes underscore the development of compositional self-efficacy, organizational self-efficacy, and overall confidence in writing.

Responses by average-achievers highlighted issues with essay writing and a sense of dissatisfaction. One student stressed, "Sometimes I didn't know what to write about some topics... I was not so motivated to write." However, after the intervention, they felt improvement and acknowledged the value of feedback, stating, "The training was the right opportunity for me to write and be motivated... I paid more attention to the organizational structure of essays and paragraphs... though I still need more training and practice." These quotes demonstrate stronger skills in organizational self-efficacy and a boost in writing confidence.

High-achiever responses indicated a prior liking for writing, but difficulties with academic writing and assessment. One student mentioned, "I used to like writing before the training because I used to write paragraphs... I rarely felt anxious about writing except a few times during exams where I had to write academically." However, subsequent to the training,

they expressed augmented confidence and lower anxiety, stating, "During the training, I have learnt to revise my essays and write several drafts after receiving teacher and peer feedback... Now, I am more confident than before, and I have no anxiety because I like writing... training helped me improve my writing and my grades in other subjects because I have learnt to answer questions better and in a more elaborate way." These quotes illustrate the progress in compositional self-efficacy, linguistic self-efficacy, and general writing confidence.

In summary, while the Paired Samples TEST did not point to a major improvement in the four categories of self-efficacy, the post-hoc semi-structured interviews were valuable sources of evidence for the different degrees of improvement in the participants' confidence levels. The integrated quotes from low-, average-, and high-achievers demonstrate that the training effected a beneficial impact on their attitudes, skills, and writing self-efficacy, specifically in the aspects of compositional self-efficacy, organizational self-efficacy, linguistic self-efficacy, and conventional self-efficacy.

Discussion

The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative results from the pre- and post-intervention writing tasks (pre- and post-tests) as well as the English Writing Self-efficacy (EWSE) survey has yielded significant insights into the effects of task-based writing instruction, within the framework of the process approach, and a variety of feedback types on the enhancement of writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs among EFL university learners. The subsequent discussion will examine these findings based on the research questions posed.

According to the statistical analysis of the pre- and post-tests, the mean value of participants' writing quality has increased by 10 %. There was an improvement in the overall quality (total score) and the different aspects (sub-scores) of essay writing quality, particularly in organization, language use and style, content and analysis, and the format of the piece of writing. These results were also confirmed through the Paired Samples TEST, indicating that participants' writing quality significantly improved as a result of the intervention course. Similarly, the qualitative analysis of the pre- and post-tests revealed a significant improvement in the mentioned aspects of essay writing among participants with varying degrees of achievement. The progress achieved by the participants was attributed to implementing task-based writing instruction paired with the process approach, providing substantial training in writing strategies, acquiring academic language and style, organizational and communicative skills, as well as ample practice in revision and editing skills to enhance their written products. In addition, the training was coupled with a variety of guided feedback types, including self-assessment, peer-review, and teacher written feedback and one-on-one conferences. These enabled student writers to learn about their own and their peers' errors, review and refine their written drafts. These findings validate the first research question, stating that the integration of multiple feedback types in conjunction with task-based writing instruction positively impacts the participants' writing quality. These findings also support those obtained in some previous studies within EFL and ESL contexts. For instance, Rahman (2017) concludes that providing different feedback forms while students perform different types of writing tasks, improves their writing competence.

These results, in addition to the insights gained from both statistical ANOVA analysis and qualitative examination of the pre- and post-intervention outcomes, reveal significant advancements among participants of varying achievement levels: high, average, and low. Evidently, high-achievers exhibited notable mastery in various aspects of essay writing and exhibited marked improvement in the post-test. For instance, their clarity of expression was evident in "There are some people who do not have the desire to attend school, they may have the attitude that it is a waste of time and work is more profitable". On the other hand, the average- and low-achievers made progress in their writing quality overall, but their advancement in using an academic writing style and depth of analysis was limited. An instance from a post-test of an average achiever demonstrated limited clarity and coherence in this example, "... internet has opened a lot of doors to people especially to scientist and researchers to compare their work, besides in education, a lot of changes happened where the schools are depending on using the net in their teaching." Similarly, the low-achievers' academic writing style and language use remained limited, and the ideas lacked depth and specifics, as in this excerpt, "In the

other hand, Internet may have another face, in other words, the internet has many disadvantages that many people know it".

These disparities can be attributed to a range of factors, such as motivation, along with other elements like writing ability, and the amount of effort made by the participants. In this respect, according to Graham and Harris (2005) and MacArthur et al. (2016), proficient writers (referred to as high-achievers in this study) engage in more strategic planning and revision, placing greater emphasis on substance rather than form, and investing more time in composing coherent ideas and revising their writing. Conversely, less proficient writers tend to focus more on surface-level corrections and grammatical details. Moreover, MacArthur, et al. (2016), report that skilled students typically respond more positively and responsibly to feedback compared to their less skilled peers. The cumulative findings affirm that integrating task-based writing instruction with a diversity of feedback mechanisms effectively elevates writing quality, notably within the high-achieving cohort. These observations substantiate the second research question of this study, indicating that there is a significant difference in essay writing quality among high-, average-, and low-achievers before and after the intervention.

Finally, the third research question, which aimed at examining the extent to which task-based writing instruction and multiple feedback forms promote a higher level of writing self-efficacy among EFL undergraduate learners, was substantiated to a moderate extent. Thus, based on the descriptive statistics, mainly the mean value of the overall English Writing Self-efficacy (EWSE) variable and the mean value of some individual statements (Table 6), with a particular focus on compositional self-efficacy, the participants did not make any progress in EWSE after the intervention course. Likewise, the results of the Paired Samples and Chi-square TESTs did not indicate a significant improvement in the four categories of self-efficacy, suggesting that the intervention course did not impact the participants' writing self-efficacy. However, the qualitative analysis of the ten individual statements demonstrated a slight increase in some aspects of EWSE, specifically linguistic, organizational, and conventional self-efficacy. Additionally, the findings from the post-hoc semi-structured interviews provided valuable evidence for varying degrees of improvement in the participants' self-efficacy levels. The interview excerpts indicated that the intervention course, conducted within the task-based process-oriented framework in combination with multiple feedback forms, had a positive impact on three categories of participants: low-, average-, and high-achievers. The effects were multifaceted, influencing their attitudes, motivation to write, writing skills, and writing self-efficacy beliefs. An instance of this is the high-achiever's experience who stated, "During the training, I have learnt to revise my essays and write several drafts after receiving teacher and peer feedback... Now, I am more confident than before... the training helped me improve my writing… and my grades." The low-achiever's perspective further exemplifies this prevailing pattern, expressing, "I feel that after training, I have developed better skills. I feel more confident... The teacher's feedback helped me very much".

It is worth noting that the contradiction observed between the statistical results (no significant improvement) and the qualitative findings (significant improvement) can be attributed, in part, to the small sample size. Additionally, participants may have encountered challenges in accurately reporting their actual self-efficacy levels using the survey's scale to measure different statements. This could be due to a lack of awareness regarding their own self-efficacy beliefs or limitations in expressing these beliefs through the provided scale. This discrepancy underscores the complex nature of self-efficacy assessment and highlights the need for further investigation into the accuracy of self-efficacy reporting among participants in similar contexts.

Thus, based on the preceding discussion, it is plausible to claim that despite the conflicting results mentioned earlier, the post-hoc interviews provided clear evidence that participants' confidence in their ability to perform specific aspects of essay writing improved to varying degrees among the three categories (high-, average-, and low-achievers). These results align with a study (Tai, 2016) where participants' writing performance and self-efficacy beliefs were enhanced through an instructional collaborative writing course.

To sum up, the implementation of task-based writing instruction, within the process-approach framework, in conjunction with a variety of feedback types yielded positive effects on the participants' essay writing quality and their writing self-efficacy level, to a moderate extent, in some aspects of essay writing.

These outcomes affirm the substantial validation of the three previously discussed research questions.

Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of task-based writing instruction within the process-oriented framework, alongside the use of multiple feedback forms, on enhancing EFL undergraduate learners' writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs. The results obtained confirm that the learners' writing quality improved considerably after the intervention writing course, compared to the pre-intervention phase, supporting the first research question. The findings also validate the second and third research questions, showing that there is a significant difference between high-, average-, and low-achievers in writing quality after the intervention course. Moreover, the implementation of the task-based approach, paired with the process approach and a variety of feedback types promoted the learners' writing self-efficacy beliefs to a moderate extent. Therefore, it is recommended that writing instructors adopt a variety of feedback types within a task-based and process-oriented instructional framework and prioritize learners' self-efficacy beliefs, along with other psychological constructs, when designing course syllabi and planning activities.

Implications, Recommendations, and Limitations

The present study aimed to investigate the effects of implementing task-based writing instruction (TBI) within the process-oriented framework and multiple feedback types on enhancing university learners' writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs through a quasi-experimental design. The analysis and discussion of the findings highlight the complex nature of developing academic writing skills, particularly for EFL learners, including novices. Although self-efficacy beliefs significantly influence learners' success in writing; it is crucial to recognize that improvements in writing skills arise from a mixture of interacting factors. EFL writing instructors should, hence, dedicate significant effort and time to support learners; acknowledging the multifaceted nature of skill development and the interplay of diverse variables.

In concrete terms, this study has highlighted some benefits of employing the task-based model, within the process approach framework, and a variety of feedback mechanisms in enhancing undergraduate learners' essay writing quality and nurturing their beliefs in their writing abilities (WSE). In this regard, it is recommended that EFL writing instructors:

- Incorporate task-based instruction in teaching essay writing to EFL learners to develop their academic writing skills and improve the quality of their products;

- Prioritize the learners' needs by using different types of feedback and offering them hands-on practice to understand and use self- and peer-evaluation effectively;

- Provide consistent constructive feedback by adopting one-on-one or group conferences as part of students' writing processes, particularly during the revision stage, to optimize their progress;

- Enhance their awareness of their own beliefs about their writing abilities and how these beliefs can influence their success or failure in writing;

- Promote collaborative writing to foster learners' socio-affective and communicative skills as well as elevate their autonomy level.

The study also recommends that future writing research should endeavour to pinpoint deeper relationships between different types of writing self-efficacy, including situational self-efficacy (which encompasses the types mentioned in this study: compositional, organizational, linguistic, and conventional aspects), and how each of them may influence individual learners' overall writing quality and specific aspects of writing. This holistic exploration might reveal clearer results regarding how individual learners' self-efficacy, including situational self-efficacy, affects their writing skills and quality, in addition to understanding the intricate interplay between different types of self-efficacy. Another valuable avenue for future research is to examine particular strategies that may contribute to advancing specific types of writing self-efficacy and, subsequently, enhancing writing quality.

Despite the valuable results yielded in the present study, acknowledging its limitations and constraints is of paramount importance. The first limitation consisted in the absence of a control group, which may influence the generalizability of the findings. Nevertheless, while the study did not include a control group, the employment of a pre-post single experimental group design, through a careful control of the

variables, has brought about significant results pertaining to the multifaceted effects of Task-based Instructional and multiple feedback types on the participants' writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs. Moreover, while the absence of a control group did not introduce bias or markedly affect the validity of the findings, utilizing a comparison group would have facilitated the feasibility and clarity of the comparison between the effects of the intervention course. The second constraint encountered in this study was the sample size, attributed to participants' withdrawal during the intervention. While a larger sample size would have enhanced the generalizability of the findings, the size employed in this study significantly contributes to our understanding of the impact of implementing task-based writing instruction and a variety of feedback forms on the enhancement of writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs among undergraduate EFL learners .

References

Abdellatif, M. M. (2007). The factors accounting for the Egyptian EFL university students' negative writing affect. *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language & Linguistics, 9*(7), 57-82

Alhaisoni E. (2012). A think-aloud protocols investigation of Saudi English major students' writing revision strategies in L1 (Arabic) and L2 (English). *English Language Teaching, 5*, (9), 144-154. http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p144

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* Freeman.

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson Education.

Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., Gai, X., Jiang, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on EFL students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 788474. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Gan, Z., Liu, F., & Nang, H. (2023). The role of self-efficacy, task value, and intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in students' feedback engagement in English learning. *Behavioural Sciences, 13*(5), 428. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13050428

Graham, S., Fitzgerald, J., & MacArthur, C. A. (2013). *Best practices in writing instruction.* The Guilford Press.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2005). *Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties*. Paul. H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.

Graham, S., & MacArthur, C. (1988). Improving learning disabled students' skills at revising essays produced on a word processor: Self-instructional strategy training. *Journal of Special Education, 22* (2), 133-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/002246698802200202

Graham, S., MacArthur, C., Schwartz, S., & Page-Voth, V. (1992). Improving the compositions of students with learning disabilities using a strategy involving product and process goal setting. *Exceptional Children, 58*(4), 322-334. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299205800405

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (ed.). Longman: Pearson Education Limited

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues.* Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. In *feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1-22). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.003

Kwok, L. (2008). Students' perceptions of peer evaluation and teachers' role in seminar discussions. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*(1), 84-97.

Kong, A., & Teng, M. F. (2020). The operating mechanisms of self-efficacy and peer feedback: An exploration of L2 young writers. *Applied Linguistics Review, 14*(2). https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0019

Lee, Y. (2013). Collaborative concept mapping as a pre-writing strategy for L2 learning: A Korean application. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 3*(2), 254-258. https://doi.org/10.7763/IJIET.2013.V3.275

Li, D. (2022). A review of EFL students' English writing self-efficacy. *IRA-International Journal of Education & Multidisciplinary Studies, 18*(03), 94-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jems.v18.n3.p4

MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (2006). *Handbook of writing research*. The Guilford Press.

MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.

McCarthy, P., Meier, S., & Rinderer, R. (1985). Self-efficacy and writing: A different view of self-evaluation. *College Composition and Communication, 36*(4), 465-471. National Council of Teachers of English. https://doi.org/10.2307/357865

Min, H. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(2), 118-141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003

Mitchell, K. M., Zumbrunn, S., Berry, D. N., & Demczuk, L. (2023). Writing self-efficacy in postsecondary students: A scoping review. *Educational Psychology Review, 35*, 82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09798-2

Moussaoui, S. (2012). An investigation of the effects of peer evaluation in enhancing Algerian students' writing autonomy and positive affect. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69*, 1775-1784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.127

Muluneh, T. K. (2018). Improving students' paragraph writing skill through task-based approach. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal, 9*(3), 351. https://doi.org/10.4172/21516200.100035

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2018). *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 19*(2), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308222

Pajares, F., & Johnson, M. J. (1994). Confidence and competence in writing: The role of self-efficacy, outcome expectancy, and apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 28*(3), 313-331. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171341

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1999). Grade level and gender differences in the writing self-beliefs of middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 24*(4), 390-405. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1998.0995

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2002). Students' self-efficacy in their self-regulated learning strategies: A developmental perspective. *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient, 45*(4), 211–221. https://doi.org/10.2117/psysoc.2002.211

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2001). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for K-12 teachers*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Rahman, M. N. (2017). Incorporating different forms of feedback in teaching writing: An insight into a real classroom. *BELTA Journal, 1*(1), 64-82. https://doi.org/10.36832/beltaj.2017.0101.04

Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 259-291. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00028-X

Schunk, D. H., & Swartz, C. W. (1993). Goals and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and writing achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18*(3), 337-354. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1993.1024

Shell, D. F., Colvin, C., & Bruning, R. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, attribution, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade-level and achievement-level differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(3), 386-398. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.87.3.386

Shell, D. F., Murphy, C. C., & Bruning, R. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(1), 91-100. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.1.91

Tai, H.-C. (2016). Effects of collaborative online learning on EFL learners' writing performance and self-efficacy. *English Language Teaching, 9*(5), 119-125. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n5p119

Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching: A practical guide to task-based teaching for ELT training courses and practising teachers.* Oxford University Press.

Zhan, Y., Wan, Z. H., & Sun, D. (2022). Online formative peer feedback in Chinese contexts at the tertiary level: A critical review on its design, impacts and influencing factors. *Computers & Education, 176*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104341

Zhaochun, S. (2015). A tentative study on the task-based teaching of writing to English majors in Chinese settings. *English Language Teaching, 8*(3), 71-79. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p71