DOI : 10.18843/rwjasc/v10i1/05
DOI URL : http://dx.doi.org/10.18843/rwjasc/v10i1/05

Writing Error Remediation through Guided Writing Strategy: A Mixed Methods Probe

Jamzien M. Umpa,

RC – Al Khwarizmi International College,
Science Laboratory School
Marawi City, Philippines

Cyd M. Batalon,

College of Education,
Mindanao State Unviersity
Marawi City, Philippines

Dr. Wardah D. Guimba,

College of Education,
Mindanao State Unviersity
Marawi City, Philippines

Prof. Roseniya G. Tamano,

College of Education,
Mindanao State Unviersity
Marawi City, Philippines

Jerryk C. Alico

MSU-Senior High School,
Mindanao State University
Marawi City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at determining whether guided writing as a remediation strategy is effective in improving students' writing ability and alleviating their writing errors. A class of twenty-five (25) Agri-Fishery Arts students in the Mindanao State University-Marawi Senior High School participated in this study. The use of guided writing strategy lasted for three months, which is equivalent to twenty-one sessions. The data were gathered through conducting a writing pre-test (descriptive essay) prior to the intervention and a writing post-test after completing the intervention. After the latter, interviews with fourteen (14) randomly selected participants were conducted to extract their personal perspectives regarding the strategy. The quantitative results showed that the respondents had fair to poor writing performance in the pre-test with multiple errors. Having applied the guided writing strategy, the researchers found significant improvements in the participants' writing ability as well as in their errors. The interview data revealed the students' difficulties during the intervention and the improvements they noticed while undergoing the strategy. The study concluded that guided writing strategy effectively improved the students' writing ability and lessened their errors.

Keywords: Writing Skills, Writing Errors, Guided Writing, Descriptive Essay, English Language Learning, Senior High School.

INTRODUCTION:

Writing is a necessary skill across all levels of human life. The importance of mastering this skill is twofold. First, it is a tool for communication. According to (Brown, 2001), writing exists inside a "context within which we exist, think, and relate to others, a context of cognitive and affective behaviour, and a blue print for personal and social existence." This is necessary especially in today's globalized world where a borderless exchange of ideas occurs. Secondly, it is a pillar of learning (Dani, 2014). This appreciation of writing is evident in the introduction of the skill during the earlier years of education. According to (Alinsunod, 2014), as year level increases, the ability to master this skill becomes increasingly difficult as well especially that there are standards and expectations that a learner should accomplish in a given

curriculum. This would then breed errors that, if not remediated immediately and appropriately, become long-lasting deficiencies.

(Richards & Schmidt, 2002) referred to errors as the "use of language in a way in which a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as faulty or incomplete learning." (Bustomi, 2009) supports this, stating that errors are a manifestation of a "lack of knowledge in the target language." On a positive note, committing errors are highly encouraged by several researchers i.e. (Ulla, 2014); (Saara, 2010) because they signify students' mastery level in writing and their inadequacies that need to be addressed. They are important information for crafting effective treatment strategies.

In this regard, the researchers were geared to conduct this study to diagnose errors committed during writing and remediate them through guided writing strategy. Simultaneously, the researchers intend to frame guided-writing as an effective strategy to administer should the circumstance arise on other classes through investigating how it improved the writing skills of the respondents of the study. The researchers aimed to become pioneers of guided writing strategy in the context of Mindanao State University-Main campus.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. What is the students' writing performance in the pre-test and post-test based on content, organization, vocabulary, language, mechanics, and voice?
2. Is there a significant difference between the students' pre-test and post-test performance in general and per criteria?
3. What are the writing errors committed by the students in the pre-test?
4. What are the improvements observed in the students' post-test composition?
5. What are the difficulties encountered by the students during the intervention and the contributions of the strategy to their writing skills in general and per criteria?

LITERATURE REVIEW :

As literatures were examined, the researchers selected and incorporated concepts that would shed light to the study's relevance. Furthermore, the researchers aimed to delineate the present study from previous researches by introducing nuances to what constitutes a good written material (Jacobs, et al., 1981), the error committed per standard of a good written material, the sources of errors (Sermsook, Liamnimitr, & Pokachorn, 2017), and the causes of writing difficulties (Alfaki, 2015).

Guided Writing:

Guided writing, as defined by Tyner 2004 as cited by (Dyan, 2010), is an instructional writing context chiefly teaching the writing process through modelling, support, and practice. Guided writing is an effective teaching strategy in expanding and developing texts in the written form during writing (Turbill, 2007). Furthermore, (Frase, 2008) conveys that guided writing allows a teacher to work closely with a small group of students based on a common need. Guided writing can assist the students to build their writing skills and encourage students to express their ideas into a written form (Brown, 2001).

In planning and organizing guided writing sessions, the same article speaks of the following: (1) Effective teaching of writing begins with assessment and the identification of the learning needs of the class. (2) Using this information and other relevant information, the teacher then groups the children with similar needs. (3) The number of groups in any one class will vary but it must be manageable. (4) The number of children in any group will also vary, usually six to eight children form a manageable group. (5) The groups should be flexible to enable each child to achieve success. (6) This may mean that a child attends two different guided writing sessions to consolidate a particular area of learning or to extend the child's learning.

Some authors such as Celce-Muria 2001 and Nation 2009; as cited by (Ratminingsih, 2013) suggested some activities in correcting writing errors specifically using Guided writing, namely: (1) Text Conversion which includes Revision and Editing Focused Exercises, Sentence Combining, Guided Paraphrase, (2) Text Elicitation, (3) Dictation, (4) Text Completion. On another perspective, there are eight activities that can be used in identifying and correcting errors, namely: identification, understanding, explanations, answering questions, correction, completion, ordering, substitution, and transformation.

Descriptive Writing:

Descriptive writing is important for this type of writing is the most basic foundation in learning to write.

(McCarthy, 1998) defined descriptive writing as a particular type writing that develops images through the use of precise sensory words and phrases and through devices such as figure of speech and the sounds of words. At the same time, descriptive writing is a maverick sort of domain that appears in other types of writing. In expository writing, description is used to present facts clearly. In narrative writing, description is utilized to show clear by the happenings and present them event-by-event. Persuasive writing chooses strong descriptive words to present and support opinions.
With this, another definition gave further accentuation on what is descriptive writing is all about, according to (Schachter, 1974) that descriptive writing describes a person, place, or thing in a way that enables the reader to visualize it. This is characterized by: (1) sensory details, (2) precise language, (3) comparisons, (4) strong verbs, and (5) hyperbole. Thus, descriptive writing descriptively teaches students to: (1) organize their thinking; (2) search for and communicate details; (3) define people, places and things, and (4) write with clarity and purpose.

Criteria for Good Writing:
While the standards of a good written material are relative, there are established bare minima as to what is considered good writing. In the ESL Composition Profile of (Jacob et al 1981), a good written composition satisfies the following criteria: Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Language, Mechanics, and Voice.

Content:
A good content contains a thesis statement and the development of that thesis statement. According to the course book of (Fava & Manning, 2007), a thesis statement is "a statement of one's standpoint or the view taken in the essay." It tells the readers the "information on how to develop the topic in the essay title." With regards to development, (Brandon & Brandon, 2011), in defining an essay in relation to a developmental paragraph, said that supporting sentences should be unified under a central idea and that there should be a consciousness in expanding the essay's perspective. Students are challenged by this criteria because according to Clifford 1987, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) "learners of English as a second or foreign language also face problems of exploring ideas and thoughts to communicate with each other." He encouraged that teachers should put emphasis on the message, ideas or thoughts they wish to convey rather than the grammar, spelling, punctuation, and others.

Organization:
Organization is defined multiple ways which includes the ability "to form into a coherent unity or function whole", "to set up an administrative structure", and "as a state of being orderly." A good organization is composed of unity, cohesion, coherence, and structure. According to Zeham and Islam 2005 as cite by (Satariyan and Mohseni, 2012), unity in writing is defined as "the connection of all ideas to a single topic." To nuance further, in the context of an essay, all ideas should relate to the thesis statement. This was attested by the Brandons 2011 opinion that the ability to stay with the topic especially the controlling idea. Coherence is the ability to create "an orderly relationship between ideas to a point that readers will know how an idea is connected to another and to the central thought smoothly" through the use of transitional devices to indicate a pattern and other means such as repetition of key terms, pronouns, and point-of-view. The last characteristic is the structure of an essay. This refers to being conscious of the parts of the essay. (Satariyan & Mohseni, 2012), specifies these parts as introduction, main body, and conclusion. They further nuance each part. Introduction is the first paragraph of the essay that explains the topic with a general idea. This comes in a form of thesis statement. The main body is characterized as the paragraph(s) that explains and supports the thesis statement and come between the introduction and the conclusion. The last paragraph of the essay is the conclusion which either summarizes or restates the thesis and the supporting ideas of the essay. It is necessary to be conscious of these parts so the readers can read smoothly. (Alfaki, 2015) said that students are mostly problematic in structuring their paragraphs and essays because they are not well-acquainted with the structures and fail to use cohesive devices appropriately.

Vocabulary:
Vocabulary is the reserves of "words and phrase" employed by a language, group, individual, or work or field of knowledge. According to Norish 1983, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), good writing or composition should consist of appropriate and varied arrange of vocabularies used along with proper grammar and varied range of sentence structure. The importance of vocabulary, according to Reid 1983, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), is that it reflects a concern for the reader and the purpose of writing.

The same sentiments are shared by the Brandons 2011 where they say appropriate choice of words, forms, and usage is crucial especially that the readers are predisposed to expect a conscious consideration from the writer of her audience. According to (Mercer & Zimmerman, 2015), the biggest obstacle in word choice and use is the unfamiliarity with which words are academic and which are not.

Language:
Harmer 2002, as cited in the study of (Amiri and Puteh, 2017) describes the criterion as "which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language". It is the structure and meaning system of language. The errors committed are likely due to unfamiliarity of the rules of grammar in the English language and unfamiliarity with syntactic structures (Ulla, 2014), and (Alfaki, 2015).

Mechanics:
Mechanics in writings refer to the rules of capitalization, spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, and handwriting to add to the grammatical and aesthetic value of the text (Dani, 2014). According to Byrne 1988, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), the reason why people commit errors in punctuation is because there is no universally established rules of punctuation. The same reason exists in the errors of capitalization given. On the other hand, according to Gowever et al. 1995, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) spelling errors occur because of the variation of pronunciations and other historical reasons that concern language. Poor handwriting, moreover, can be the effect of inadequate time. White and Arndt 1991, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) states that "of all the skills, writing is one which most benefits of time." In this case, poor handwriting is committed because students have to rush to finish their written material.

Voice:
Voice in this study is classified into audience and purpose. These two characteristics sometimes overlap since they are the targets of the written composition. According to (Park, 2010), these two diverge into "two general directions." The first one is toward actual people external to a text. This is largely applicable to technical writing. The second one is implied. This may be a set of suggested or evoked attitudes, interests, reactions, and conditions of knowledge which may or may not fit with the qualities of actual readers or listeners.

CAUSES OF WRITING DIFFICULTIES:

The Nature of Writing Process:
According to Byrne 1998, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), writing is one of the skills where the process is complex as it requires the mastery of grammatical devices, conceptual thinking and other significant elements. Bell and Burnaby 1984, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) further calibrate the difficulty of the skill to the extremes by saying that it is a complex activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate a number of variables simultaneously. They further add that in a sentence level there should be a balanced control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, and letter for action.

Lack of Learner's Motivation:
Courses that crafted for the elevation of the condition of writers and their writing skills should give consideration to "the learners' purposes for writing" Zamel 1997, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015). This means that when their concerns and interests are acknowledged, they are more encouraged to write. To further characterize these motivations, Leki 1991, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) posted that it is important to take into consideration the writer's desire to communicate something he or she is interested in because according to Pincas 1982, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), writers would write less if they are obliged to write something they do not want to write about.

Inadequate Time:
According to (Hedge, 1998), time is a factor to consider when teachings writing because writing activities by nature have different starting points in terms of the amount of time to complete it at its best form. Leaners need ample time to gather information, organize ideas, and write drafts, proof read, and revise. In satisfying the criteria for good writing, White and Arndt 1991, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) argue that the quality of written materials is affected by the amount of time the writer is given.

Lack of Practice:

(Ulla, 2014) stated that errors are transactional and dynamic. This means that constant exposure to the second or target language will eventually lessen the occurrence of these errors. Given that writing is a difficult skill to master, Grabe and Kaplan 1996, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) advice that there should be continuous effort and practice. In other words, (Hedge, 1998) says that what learners need to do to master writing is to write a lot.

RELATED STUDIES:

Guided Writing:

(Dani's 2014) study entitled "Improving Writing Skills through Guided Writing of the Eight Grade Students of SMPN2 Selat in Academic Year 2013/2014" aimed to facilitate and to provide guidelines in writing. (Dani, 2014) noticed that many students fail to reach the standard score for the daily tests which is 70. The researcher selected the 27 eigth grade students of SMPN 2 Selat section E consisting of 11 females and 16 males. The action research was conducted in India in a classroom at SMP N 2 Selat 2. The session was divided into two cycles (cycle I and cycle II) and each cycle consisted of four interconnected activities, namely: Planning (P), Action (A), Observation (O), and Reflection (R). Within the cycles as a series of tests such as a pre-test before a cycle starts and a post-test after every cycle. The researcher acted as observer and observed the situation. After the interconnected activities, the research conducted an interview. The data collected in the pre-test showed 48.40 errors meaning the students' writing skill were relatively low. The researcher also observed that most of the students looked confused and were not confident to write a paragraph. There were some problems in their writing ability such as the lack of vocabulary, the problem in writing grammatical sentences, spelling, punctuation, and limited vocabulary. When the researcher conducted cycle I and cycle II, the learners gained the mean figures of 61.66 and progressing mean figure of 77.81 respectively showed that their writing ability had improved after the intervention. In the qualitative aspect, the research reports the students were highly motivated in learning writing through guided writing because (62.78%) answered "A" with the description of "strongly agree."

The most similar to this study in terms of the rubric used for assessment is the study of (Aryaningtyas, Susilohadi, & Sarosa, 2012) entitled "Improving Students' Writing by Using Guided Writing." The purpose of the study is to identify whether guided writing can contribute significant improvements to the writing skills and learning motivation of second grade students of SMP Negeri Karangayar from August to October 2012. The research design was a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative data were collected through pre-test and post-test and were analyzed through comparing the mean scores. The qualitative data were collected through interview, questionnaire, and field notes and were analyzed through five stages, namely, assembly of data, coding of data, comparing the data, building interpretations, and reporting the outcomes.

In rating the students' written material, the ESL Composition Profile of (Jacob et al. 1981), a good written composition is composed of: Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Language, and Mechanics. In the pre-research data, the mean score of each criteria in the following: Content (M = 20.20), Organization (13.85), Vocabulary (13.00), Language Use (13.20), and Mechanics (3.65). The overall mean score of the pre-test was 63.80 which is below the passing grade for the English Lesson in SMP Negeri 1 Karangyar which was 80.00. The researcher also observed that the students faced problems in developing ideas, organizing text coherently, using appropriate vocabulary, constructing grammatically correct sentences. After the problems were identified, the researchers implemented guided writing as an intervention divided into two cycles. The result of the post-test after cycle I had an overall mean score of 78.60 while the result of the post-test after cycle II had an overall mean score of 83.10. In observing the improvements per criterion, the researchers noted that the students were now able to state the main idea and develop it through giving more detailed explanation. In terms of organization, they were better in structure, unity, cohesion, and coherence. In terms of vocabulary and language use, they were now able to utilize words appropriately and were also able to use correct grammar in constructing their sentences. In terms of mechanics, they were now able to demonstrate the conventions of writing and minimize the errors in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The researchers also reported that the inclusion of student-centred activities motivated the students to become more participative. Overall, guided writing have contribute to the improvement of the students' writing skills and motivation.

Error Analysis:
(Satariyan & Mohseni, 2012) aimed at investigating and categorizing the common writing errors committed by first year undergraduate students of Azad University of South Tehran Branch, Iran. Out of 360 students, 190 were selected based on Slovin's formula. Written compositions were gathered from the sample and error analysis model was adopted to evaluate the essays in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, mechanics, and syntax or language use. These categories were further divided into some subcategories. Each subcategory was rated using a rubric of 1-to-6 scale or criteria. Compositions rated 3 to 6 are considered as *with errors* while those rated 1 to 2 are regarded as *no error*. Errors that exceed fifty percent are regarded as *common errors*.
The common errors in content were problems with thesis statements which had a frequency of 177 with a percentage of ninety-three (93%), problems with development of ideas which had a frequency of 187 with a percentage of ninety-eight (98%). The common errors in organization were problems with the structure which are made up of problems with introductions which had a frequency of 187 with a percentage of ninety-six (96%) and problems with conclusions which had a frequency of 179 with a percentage of ninety-four (94%), problems with word choice which had a frequency of 167 with a percentage of eight-eight (88%), and problems with idiom form and usage which had a frequency of 118 with a percentage of sixty-two (62%). The common errors in language use were problems with the use of articles which had a frequency of 51 with a percentage of twenty-seven (27%), problems with tenses which had a frequency of 94 with a percentage of forty-nine (49%), problems with subject-verb agreement rules which had a frequency of 84 with a percentage of forty-four (44%), and problems with pronoun-antecedent agreement rules which had a frequency of 70 with a percentage of thirty-seven (37%) The common errors in mechanics were problems of capitalization which had a frequency of thirty (30%) and poor handwriting which had a frequency of 175 with a percentage of ninety-two (92%). The study also ranked the error according to priority. The error that needs to be prioritized first is the organization of writing and then followed by content, vocabulary, and mechanics respectively.

METHODOLOGY:

Research Design:
This is a mixed-methods research, particularly employing the sequential explanatory design. In this design, the quantitative data were collected first and then supported by qualitative data. The collection of quantitative information was done through writing tests which were assessed with the use of the Analytic Scoring Rubric of (Jacob et al. 1981). Between the pre-test and post-test was the implementation of Guided Writing Strategy. The intervention was patterned on the research of (Dani, 2014) with an interconnected cycle of activities: (1) Pre-Activity, (2) Whilst-Activity, and (3) Post-Activity. The qualitative phase was followed after the post-test in a form of interview to extract the respondents' experiences with the intervention.

Locale and Respondents of the Study:
This research was conducted in Mindanao State University-Marawi Senior High School, during the second semester of the school year 2018-2019, particularly from January to March 2018. The participants in the study were the Grade 11 Senior High School students in the Agri-Fishery Arts strand taking up English 2 (Reading and Writing) under the tutelage of Mr. Jerryk C. Alico. The researchers used a non-probability sampling procedure, specifically purposive sampling, wherein the elements are selected from the target population on the basis of their fit with the purpose of the study. A total of twenty-five (25) students, the exact class size of the chosen class, comprised the sample. The participants in the interview session were randomly selected fourteen (14) students.

Instrumentation:
Descriptive Essay Writing Test:
This test was used in accordance to the study of (Dani 2014) which was given to the students to focus on writing descriptive essay. However, the topic is modified based on the local context. The purpose of this test is to evaluate the participants' skill in writing and at the same time diagnose the errors they committed. Same writing was used in the pre-test and post-test. The researcher adapted the ESL Composition Profile of (Jacob et al. 1981) in correcting the participants' writings.

Guided Writing Lesson Plan:
The researchers constructed lesson plans and used them along with necessary instructional materials. The purpose was to remediate the diagnosed errors of respondents through guided writing. In implementing the lesson plan with the use guide writing strategy the researchers adopted a set of guidelines for Guided Writing Lesson from the Ontario Educational Excellence.
During the intervention, three (3) activities were included in the teaching scenario: Pre-Activity, Whilst-Activity, and Post-Activity. In the Pre-Activity, the researchers conducted preliminary activities such as greetings, room conditioning, and motivation. In the Whilst-Activity, the intervention proper commenced using the guided writing strategy. In the Post-Activity, the researchers asked the students about their difficulties during the teaching-learning process after applying guided writing. The students collected their works and the errors were discussed in the next sessions so that students would learn from their flaws. The lesson plan's duration was dependent on the necessary amount of time to teach a subject matter with a maximum duration of 30 minutes each for class lecture and intervention (timed writing).

Interview Guide:
The purpose of this instrument was to collect the participants' personal perspectives on the contribution of the intervention to their writing skills and to determine the challenges and difficulties they encountered during the intervention.

Attendance Sheet and Score Sheet:
The purpose of the attendance sheet is to add reasoning as to why students have improved or not based on presence or absence. The purpose of the scoring sheet is to record and monitor the scores of the students in the writing activities.

Data Gathering and Analysis:
The first phase, which was writing pre-test, was conducted to determine their pre-existing descriptive paragraph writing skill and the common errors they committed. The intervention phase was the valid and proper application of the strategy. The post-test was conducted after the implementation of the intervention to find out whether the students' writing skill improved or not. Then the interview was conducted to extract students' perspectives regarding guided writing. It was conducted before the pre-test, during the intervention, and after the post-test.
The pre-test and post-test scores were initially analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistics. The t-Test for Paired Samples was then used to determine whether a significant difference between students' pre-test and post-test performances exists. The errors were analyzed using the criteria in the analytic rubric of Jacob et.al (1981). Errors that exceeded fifty percent were considered the most common errors and the common improvements were determined by analyzing their compositions. Lastly, their interview answers underwent content analysis for themes.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:

Students' Performance:
Table 1 shows the general pre-test performance of the respondents. As can be seen, the overall score of 60.52 is transmuted as 75% which means "average". This suggests that the writing skills of the respondents are fairly satisfactory. The same results occurred in the studies of (Dani 2014) and (Arningtyas, Susilohadi, and Sarosa 2012) in which their respondents had relatively low scores in the pre-test. This was attested by Ayub (2013), Bell and Burnaby 1984, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) as they calibrate the difficulty of the skill to the extremes by saying that it is a complex activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate a number of variables simultaneously including content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, and letter for action.
Table 2 shows the general the post-test performance of the respondents. As shown, overall scores is 78.53 transmuted as 86%. In the scale, it is qualitatively describe as "very good". It suggests that the writing skills of the respondents improved significantly after the intervention. The same results manifested in the studies of (Dani 2014), (Dyan, 2010), and (Aryningtyas, Susilohadi, and Sarosa 2012) where their respondents' writing skills and performance improved significantly after implementing the strategy. With regards to facilitating and correcting errors in writing Turbill (2007) attested that guided writing is an effective teaching strategy in expanding and developing texts in the written form during writing. Conceding

to this (Brown 2001) said that guided writing can assist them to build their writing skills and encourage students to express their ideas into written form. In the study of (Ulla 2014) states that constant exposure to the second or target language will eventually lessen the occurrence of errors.

Table 3 shows the students' pre-test performance per criterion. As revealed, the overall mean score of the students in terms of content is 17.57 with a transmuted grade of 74% which shows that the students have "average" writing skill in terms of content. To elaborate on this, the errors identified in the students' written materials were problems with their thesis statement and lack of development. The interview responses further showed a common theme that they had a difficulty in giving details. According to Clifford 1987, as cited by (Alfaki, 2015) learners of English as a second language or foreign language face problems of exploration of ideas and thoughts to communicate with each other. It might also be caused by motivations of learners. Pincas 1982, as cited by (Alfaki, 2015) claims that writers would write less if they are obliged to write something they do not want to write about.

In terms of organization, the overall mean score of the students is 12.31 with a transmuted grade of 75% which show the students' writing skill in terms of organization are "average". For further authentication, the response of the respondents in the interview shows a common theme of difficulty with regards to sequencing their sentences and straying from the topic. According to (Alfaki 2015), this is likely due to unfamiliarity with the structure of an essay and failure to use cohesive devices appropriately.

In terms of vocabulary, the overall mean score is 12.39 with transmuted grade of 76% which shows that students' have "average" vocabulary skill. For clarity, the students had problems with choosing the most appropriate words and their form and usage. They further admitted that they have very limited vocabulary repertoire which makes appropriate words more pressing. According to (Mercer & Zimmerman, 2015), (Ulla, 2014), and (Bustomi, 2009) this is caused by unfamiliarity with words, inability or failure to master the second language, mother tongue interference, and overgeneralization.

In terms of language use, the overall mean score is 11.88 with a transmuted grade of 74% which shows that students writing skill in use of language is "average" in accurately demonstrating grammaticality. Specifically, the students have problems with sentence structure, agreement, tense, word order/function, articles, pronoun, preposition, fragment, run-on sentence, deletion and negation. To add weight, the interview responses reveal their difficulty is the unfamiliarity with grammar which is purported by (Ulla, 2014) and (Alfaki, 2015).

In terms of mechanics, the overall mean score is 3.35 with a transmuted grade of 79% which means "average". This shows that students' skills in using the convention of writing is average. The specific areas of this criterion which they poorly satisfied include spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and handwriting. To further authenticate this response in the interview revealed a common theme which is unfamiliarity with the conventions of writing. According to Byrne 1988, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), the reason why people commit errors in punctuation is because there is no universally established rules of punctuation. The same reason exists in the errors of capitalization. Moreover, according to Gowever et al. 1995, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) spelling errors occur because of the variation of pronunciations and other historical reasons that concern language.

In terms of voice, the overall mean score is 3.24 with a transmuted grade of 78% which shows that students' writing skills were "average". This shows students' skills in considering their audience or purpose when writing is average. In the interview responses, the lack of consideration for audience and purpose when writing emerged as the reason behind students' performance.

Table 4 shows the students' post-test performance per criterion. As revealed above, the overall mean score of the students in terms of content is 23.64 with a transmuted grade of 86% which translate to "very good." This suggests that the students have very good or above satisfactory writing skills in terms of content. For added clarity, the students were able to formulate good thesis statement and have made good developments of it. Furthermore, based on students' personal observation of their improvement, a common result arose which is their ability to write in a more detailed manner.

In terms of organization, the overall mean score of the students is 15.76 with a transmuted grade of 86% describe as "very good." This suggests that the students have very good or above satisfactory organization skills. To specify, the students were able to structure their essays according to parts, and make their ideas unified, cohesive, and coherent (See table 4.8). The students gave personal comments on their improvement which commonly was about achieving coherence.

In terms of vocabulary, the overall mean score of the students is 15.57 with a transmuted grade of 86% quantitatively translated as "very good." This suggests that the students have very good or above satisfactory vocabulary skills. In particular, the students had chosen their words appropriately, utilized

correct forms, and used them grammatically. Furthermore, they attested these improvements by saying that their vocabulary knowledge expanded.

In terms of language, their overall mean score is 15.47 with a transmuted grade of 85% which translate and describes as "very good." This suggests that the students have very good or above satisfactory skills in constructing grammatically correct sentences. Specifically, the students improved in structuring their sentences and correctly applying grammatical rules. These were affirmed by the responses of the students when they confirmed familiarity with grammatical rules in English.

In terms of mechanics, the overall mean score of the students is 3.96 with a transmuted grade of 86% and describes as "very good." This suggests that the students have very good or above satisfactory skills in following the conventions of writing. The students in this regard have correctly applied the rules of writing. Additionally, the students themselves confirmed during the interview that they are already familiar with the conventions of writing (see section 1.3.5 Theme 5).

In terms of voice, the students' overall mean score of 4.11 with a transmuted grade of 88% describes as "very good." This suggests that the students have very good or above satisfactory skills in considering their audiences and purpose when writing. These improvements were supported with personal accounts of students that they are more aware with their audience and purpose.

As revealed in table 5, the significance value of 0.000 is less than 0.05 levels of significance as set in this study. This leads to rejecting the hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test performances of the students. Therefore, it can be deduced that guided writing significantly improved the students' writing skills. Guided writing has the potential to assist the students in building their writing skills and encourage students to express their ideas into a written form (Brown, 2001).

As seen in table 6, the data show that the significance value of 0.000 in all criteria less than 0.05 level of significance which leads to the rejection of the hypotheses. Therefore, guided writing improved the overall writing skills since there is a significant improvement in each component used in this study. This is because guided writing, according to (Frase 2008), allows teachers to work closely with a small group of students based on a common need.

Errors and Improvements:

In terms of content, table 7 shows that the students' errors in terms of content include having problems with or no thesis statement (*f*=25, p=100) and having problems developing it (*f*=25, p=100). An example is shown below:

"I am interested in Basketball, Many young and old love to play sports. even they become old, they still playing it. *Basketball is a International sports. it is become commons and famous in difference countries. Basketball First founded in the united state of America, the countries that Basketball First play and they influence difference countries to adapted it."*

The sample lacks the structure that highlights a sentence that provides a general or a primary approach in introducing the central idea of the essay. In terms of development, the succeeding paragraphs failed to provide. According to Clifford 1987, as cited by (Alfaki, 2015), learners of English as a second or foreign language face problems with exploring ideas and thoughts to communicate with each other. It might also be caused by the motivation of learners. Pincas 1982, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) further supports that writers would write less if they are obliged to write something they do not want to write about.

In terms of organization, the errors committed relate to the structuring of their paragraphs, namely, problems with or absence of introduction (*f=17*, p=*68*), body (*f=17*, p=*68*), and conclusion (*f=20*, p=*80*). Other errors pertain Unity (*f=17*, p=*68*), Cohesion (*f=23*, p=*92*), and Coherence (*f=25*, p=*100*). A sample is shown below:

"The capabilities of my interests in playing volleyball and performing poetry concerts leads me to develop my potential skills to improve my confidence in socializing with other together with values, and merely expanding my Knowledge to handle my fears. In addition, doing these hobbies is like living with my own dreams."

The sample above shows little structure, unity, cohesion, and coherence. First, the controlling idea is confusing because it talks about the "capabilities of my interests" rather than "describing the interests". Second, all supporting materials show no relevance to the controlling idea since the paragraph talks about the "capabilities of the interest." Third, in weaving what the controlling idea should be such as describing her interests which are playing volleyball and performing poetry concerts, the succeeding paragraphs only discussed why she likes playing volleyball. No discussion appears in support of her interest in performing poetry concerts. Lastly, the conclusion did not tie back to the thesis statement but instead introduced an

idea entirely different idea. This is likely due unfamiliarity with the structures of an essay and fail to use cohesive devices appropriately (Alfaki 2015).
In terms of vocabulary, the common errors incorrect word choice (*f=21, p=84)*, forms and usage (*f=20, p=80)*. A sample is given below:
"Life is important so populate must take seriously and care depressed people."
The sample above shows that instead of using a noun "population", the writer used a verb "populate." This would suggest that given life is important, populating is necessary rather than the population taking care of the depressed. The word form is faulty because the ending of the word used a verb ending rather than a noun ending. According to (Mercer & Zimmerman, 2015) (Ulla, 2014) and (Bustomi, 2009), this is caused by unfamiliarity with words, inability or failure to master the second language, mother tongue interference, and overgeneralization.
In terms of language, the errors include faulty sentence structure *(f=22, p=88),* agreement (*f=20*, *p=80*), tense (*f=18, p=72)* word order/function (*f=16*, p=*64*), Article *(f=15, p=60),* Pronoun (*f=14*, *p=56*), Preposition (*f=21*, *p=84),* Fragment (*f=17, p=68*), and *(f=18, p=72)*. This is due to unfamiliarity of the rules of grammar in the English language and unfamiliarity with syntactic structures (Ulla, 2014); (Alfaki, 2015).
In terms of mechanics, the errors commonly committed were incorrect spelling *(f=23, p=92),* punctuation *(f=24, p=96)*, and capitalization *(f=15, p=60)* and poor handwriting *(f=15, p=60)*. According to Byrne (1988, as cited in the study of Alfaki, 2015), the reason why people commit errors in punctuation is because there is no universally established rules of punctuation. The same reason exists behind the errors of capitalization. On the other hand, according to Gowever et al. 1995, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), spelling errors occur because of the variation of pronunciations and other historical reasons that concern language.
In terms of voice, the only error they committed was being non-considerate with the audience or purpose (*f=19*, *p=76*). This may be due to the implied audience or purpose of the instruction in the pre-test (Park, 2010).
Table 8 shows the improvements of the respondents as observed in the post-test. In terms of content, data show the students' improvement in formulating their thesis statement (*f=16, p=64)* and developing (*f=19, p=76)*. In terms of organization, the students satisfied the structure composed of introduction (*f=19, p=76),* body (*f=19, p=76),* and conclusion (*f=15, p=60)*. Other areas of improvements were unity (*f=21, p=84),* cohesion (*f=20, p=80),* and coherence (*f=20) (P=80)*. In terms of vocabulary, the improvements were correct word choice (*f=17, p=60)* and word form and usage (*f=23, p=92)*. In terms of language, the improvements were correct sentence structure (*f=15, p=60)* and correct application of grammatical rules including agreement (*f=15, p=60),* tense (*f=16, p=64),* word order/function (*f=14, p=56),* Article (*f=15, p=60),* Pronoun (*f=16, p=64),* and Preposition (*f=15, p=60)*.

Students' Difficulties Encountered During the Intervention:
Writing detailed information:
The students' responses indicated that they are not knowledgeable with the topic they are assigned to write in a detailed manner. This is the same sentiments mentioned by Clifford 1987, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) in which students of English face problems with exploring ideas and thoughts to communicate with each other. Pincas 1982, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) also stated that students will write less if they do not know anything what they will write about. The students' responses are quoted below:

R1: It was difficult because of what should I write.
R3: In the content, I find it difficult in creating ideas and making it informative.
R10: In content, it's difficult for me because I need to be informative and more ideas.
R13: In the content, I find it difficult to choose a topic to direct my paragraph.

Making the written text unified and coherent:
According to the students, they encountered two difficulties, namely, unifying their text according to the topic and coherently arranging their sentences, their paragraphs, or the text as a whole because they do not know the starting point. These are additive elements to (Alfaki's 2015) description of disorganized written text where the writers are not well-acquainted with the structures and fail to use cohesive devices appropriately. The students' responses are quoted below:

R2: It was also difficult because I'm very messy with arranging sentences.
R5: I am not organized as a person, how much more in writing right? I found it difficult because everything seems to be disorganized.
R6: I find difficult on organizing the text. I keep away always on the topic that I want to deliver.
R7: I find difficult in organization because I don't know where to start.

Unfamiliarity of word meanings and usage and use of simple words:
The responses of the students in this particular area suggest that the difficulty they encountered are the unfamiliarity of word meanings and their usage in the context of the sentence or the tone of the essay and the use of simple words. These difficulties are likely caused by the inability or failure to master the second language (Ulla, 2014). The students' responses are quoted below:
R2: My vocabulary is limited. I always use simple words. Composing a text using unfamiliar words is what makes it difficult.
R3: It is difficult because it should be appropriate and connected to your sentences.
R7: In the vocabulary, I find difficult because there are words I don't know the meaning of.
R13: My vocabulary is less sophisticated because my words are very simple.

Incorrect application of grammatical rules:
According to the students' responses, they had problems with being grammatically correct. This is highly due to unfamiliarity with the rules of English grammar (Alfaki, 2015). The students' responses are quoted below:
R1: It was difficult because I don't know how to construct complicated sentences.
R2: I also find it difficult because sometimes the word I intend to be past tense become present tense.
R8: Yes, it is hard because I'm not yet good at grammar.
Incorrect use of punctuations:
The responses of the students to this question suggest that they had problems with using the appropriate punctuations. The source of this difficulty is their unfamiliarity with the appropriate usage of punctuations. This stems from what is claimed by Byrne 1988, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015) that there is no universally established rule for punctuation. The students' responses are quoted below:
R7: Sometimes, I am confused of letters, the commas or period what will I used.
R12: On how to use the proper usage of the comma, period etc.
R13: In the mechanics, I find it difficult because it can be a comma, period and others in the paragraph that we write.

No knowledge and no consideration of who the reader is or what the purpose is;
The difficulty, according to the students, is the absence of a material audience or purpose to write for. This is the consequence of (Park's 2010) second category of audience and purpose where there the audience is implied. This suggests that the students have not yet achieved the ability to imagine. Another means of making the audience or purpose prominent is through vocabulary which, according to Reid 1983, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), reflects a concern for the reader and the purpose of writing. The students' responses are quoted below:
R2: I am not using my voice because I don't know who my readers are.
R5: It is also difficult because I don't think of my audience or readers or the purpose before I write, I just write without thinking.
R9: It is difficult because I don't know how to get my readers interested.

Improvements in Writing after Applying Guided Writing:
Writing in a detailed manner:
The observation of the students in this particular area suggests that the strategy expanded their knowledge in writing materials in a detailed manner. This resembles the findings of (Fava-Verde and Manning 2007) and the (Brandon & Brandon, 2011) in which the written materials of the students in the post-test had a good thesis statement and developed it by expanding the perspectives of the essays. According to (Brown, 2001), guided writing allows learners to build and explore ideas translated into written form. The students' responses are quoted below:
R2: It improved my writing skills because I know what content to write.
R3: It improved how my writing in creating effective ideas.

R6: After guided writing, I now know how to choose a specific topic and delivering it through writing.

Unity and Coherence:
According to the students, the strategy improved their organization skill to unify all their ideas under one main idea and coherently order the relationship among statements. These two observations fulfills two of the standards set by (Brandon & Brandon, 2011) in which written materials should be consistent with the thesis statement and are exist in an orderly fashion. According to some of the activities suggested by Celce-Muria 2001 and Nation 2009, as cited by (Ratminingsih, 2013), guided writing allows students to model their written materials to what is considered a good written text reinforced by sentence combining and guided paraphrase. The students' responses are quoted below:
R3: It helps me organize my ideas and sentences.
R12: I learned to search some organization to connect on my idea or thoughts
R13: I learned to organize my thoughts coherently in my essay.

Familiarity of word meanings and usage and use of sophisticated words:
In this particular area, the students responded positively by indicating that they were improved by guided writing through making words more familiar both in meaning and in usage and using more sophisticated counterparts of simple words. This meets the standard of Norish 1983, as cited in the study of (Alfaki, 2015), in which good writing or composition should consist of appropriate and varied range of vocabularies used along with proper grammar and varied range of sentence structure. One of the activities Celce-Muria 2001 and Nation 2009; as cited by (Ratminingsih, 2013) suggested is dictation. The students' responses are quoted below:
R3: I have known some words that is not familiar to me.
R5: This helps me in choosing a perfect words suited by my sentence.
R6: My words on the sentences are not redundant, I make my sentences relevant after guided writing.
R14: It improves my vocabulary because I can now use some difficult words on my essay.

Correct constructions and correct application of Grammatical Rules:
The responses of the students in this area suggest that they improved in terms of constructing sentences and being grammatically correct. This satisfies the standards set by Harmer 2002, as cited in the study of Alfiyani, 2013 in which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language. It is the structure and meaning system of language. The students' responses are quoted below:
R5: Through this I'm starting to be conscious in writing. I check my grammar or the tenses I used.
R8: Yes, because I'm poor to the forming of the phrase and sentences.
R9: It improves me in constructing sentences.
R12: It improves my grammar.

Proper Capitalization and correct use of punctuations:
According to the students, they have improved through guided writing in terms of the mechanics such as proper capitalization of words in accordance to principles and correct use of punctuation in the context of the sentence. This suggests that they are able to correctly apply the rules of capitalization, spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, and handwriting to add to the grammatical and aesthetic value of the text (Dani, 2014). The students' responses are quoted below:
R1: Yes because I became more aware about utilizing the correct punctuation, capitalization and spelling
R2: It also improved my mechanics on my writing skill because I do not forget the capitalization and punctuation and so on.
R7: I improved of writing a capitalization and punctuations

Awareness of Audience and Purpose:
The improvement in this area is the awareness of the students' audience and purpose for writing according to the students responses. This is in accordance to (Park 2010) in considering both external and implied audiences and purposes when writing. The students' responses are quoted below:
R3: It made me more aware of my purpose and audience for writing.
R4: I am now more conscious of my readers.
R5: This, I found to be sincere when I write. Writing with passion and sincerity.
R7: Yes. I have largely considered who I am writing for and what my writing is for.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the findings, the researchers conclude that guided writing is an effective strategy in remediating errors in written materials of students. During the pre-research stage, the general writing performance of the students' was fairly satisfactory which falls within the range of fair to poor. The study evaluated the students' writing skills in six different areas using the modified ESL Composition Profile rubric composed of content, organization, vocabulary, language mechanics, and voice. The results in each criterion ranged from failed to fairly satisfactory. These suggest that they had poor writing skills in general and by criterion. However, after implementing guided writing and testing its effectiveness through a post-test, the students' general writing performance reached very satisfactory which ranges from good to very good. As to the criteria, all six produced results that are described as very satisfactory. This means that there are improvements in their writing skills in general and by criterion. Furthermore, this study nuanced particular manifestations of both major common errors committed in the pre-test. The metric for error identification was the rubric used in this study. The intention was to give further specifications as to why the students had poor writing skills before the implementation of the strategy. It was also necessary for these errors to be drawn out since it would be necessary material for crafting the lessons for the intervention of this study. It was noted that students had problems with formulating thesis statements and developing it, organizing them cohesively and coherently, structuring their essays according to its parts, choosing appropriate words, writing grammatically correct sentences, using the correct of conventions of writing, and considering their audience and purpose. To add depth to this, the researchers solicited observations from the students and the results pointed to unfamiliarity as the main cause of errors and difficulties.

The improvements after the intervention were also noted to give strength to the effectiveness of the strategy. Using the same metric, the improvements identified were formulating good thesis statement and good development of it, cohesiveness and coherence of the written material, structure, expansion of vocabulary and it correct usage, familiarity of grammatical rules in English, correctness of the use of conventions in writing, and prominent manifestations of considering the audience and the purpose of the text. The same interview guide questionnaire solicited the students' observation on how the strategy improved their writing skills. Their responses highly suggest an increase of familiarity with each criterion.

In general, this study introduces guided writing as an effective strategy in improving writing skills especially towards courses or teachers that highly concentrate in writing. It will contribute awareness on the use of guided writing as an intervention to remediate errors and ameliorate writing skills.

REFERENCES:

Alfaki, I. (2015). University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosing and Remedy. *International Journal of English Language Teaching, 3*(3).

Alinsunod, J. (2014). A Study on Common Writing Errors of Engineering Students: A Basis for Curriculum Development. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 2*(3), 7-15.

Aryaningtyas, Y., Susilohadi, G., & Sarosa, T. (2012). *Improving Students' Writing Skill by Using Guided Writing.* Surakata: Sebelas Maret University.

Brandon, K., & Brandon, L. (2011). *Paragraphs and Essays with Integrated Readings.* USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (Second ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Bustomi, A. (2009). *An Analysis on Students' Descriptive Writing: A Case Study on Harapan Jaya Senior High School at Cipondoh, Tangerang (master's thesis).* Jakarta: State Islamic University.

Dani, L. S. (2014). *Improving Writing Skill through Guided Writing of the Eighth Grade Students of SMPN 2 Selat in Academic Year 2013/2014.* Denpasar: Mahasaraswati Denpasar University.

Dyan, V. L. (2010). *Improving Writing Skill through Guided Writing: a classroom action research at the third-grade students of IPA 1 class of SMA N 1 Karanganyarin the Academic Year of 2009/2010(undergraduate thesis).* Negeril Karanganyar: SMU NegeriI Karanganyar. Retrieved October 14, 2014, from http://unmas-library.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/THESIS2.pdf

Fava, A., & Manning, A. (2007). *University Foundation Study: Essay Writing Course Book.* Lebanon: Garret Publishing Ltd.

Frase, L. (2008). *Effective Teaching Solutions. Guided Writing*. Retrieved February 2, 2017, from http://www.effectiveteachingsolutions.com/guidedwritingpdf.pdf

Hedge, T. (1998). *Writing: Resource book for Teachers.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jacobs, H., Stephen, A., Zingkgraf, D. R., Wormuth, V., Faye, H., Jane, B., & Hughey. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach.* Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

McCarthy, T. (1998). *Descriptive Writing.* USA: Scholastics Inc.

Mercer, N., & Zimmerman, C. (2015). Fostering Academic Vocabulary Use in Writing. *The Catesol Journal*.

Park, D. (2010). The meaning of "Audience". *College English, 44*(3).

Ratminingsih, N. (2013). *Improving Students' Writing Skills through the use of Guided Writing in Class XI of SMK N1 PandakBantul in the Academic Year of 2012/2014(undergraduate thesis).* Yogyakarta: PandakBantul.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics.* London: Longman: Pearson Education Limited.

Saara, S. M. (2010). *Error Analysis: Investigating the Writing of ESL Namibian learner (master's thesis).* South Africa: University of South Africa.

Satariyan, A., & Mohseni, A. (2012). *Writing Skill and Categorical Error Analysis: A Study of First Year Undergraduate University Students.* Iran: Islamic Azad University- South Tehran Branch.

Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. *Language Learning, 24*, 205-214.

Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pokachorn, R. (2017). An Analysis of Errors in Written English Sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL Students. *English Language Teaching, 10*(3).

Turbill, J. (2007). *Guided Writing.* Department of Education, Tasmania School Education Division.

Ulla, M. B. (2014). Analysis of the Language Errors in Writing among BSEE and AB English Students. *European Journal of Academic Essays, 1*(3), 39-47.

TABLES

Table 1: Pre-test General Performance of the Students

Student	Inter-rater 1	Inter-rater 2	Inter-rater 3	Mean Score	Overall Score & Transmuted Grade
1	69	85	56	70.00	60.52 = 75% **FAIRLY SATISFACTORY (Average)**
2	44	51	54	49.67	
3	53	72	56	60.33	
4	40	41	52	44.33	
5	40	52	55	49.00	
6	82	81	53	72.00	
7	80	88	59	75.67	
8	80	92	60	77.33	
9	67	59	57	61.00	
10	43	55	54	50.67	
11	56	70	49	58.33	
12	65	89	55	69.67	
13	63	74	53	63.33	
14	65	86	57	69.33	
15	77	85	56	72.67	
16	49	52	52	51.00	
17	49	61	54	54.67	
18	56	64	53	57.67	
19	78	95	56	76.33	
20	68	80	53	67.00	
21	72	76	31	59.67	
22	38	46	53	45.67	
23	39	47	55	47.00	
24	58	68	55	60.33	
25	38	59	54	50.33	

90 – 100 – *"Excellent"*, 80 – 89 – *"Very Good to Good"*, 70-79 – *"Average"*, 60-69 – "*Fair to Poor"* 60 below – *"Very Poor"*

Table 2: Post-test General Performance of the Students

Student	Inter-rater 1	Inter-rater 2	Inter-rater 3	Mean Score	Overall Score & Transmuted Grade
1	88	99	89	92.00	78.53 = 86% **VERY SATISFACTORY (very good to good)**
2	92	94	86	90.67	
3	76	96	80	84.00	
4	71	93	79	81.00	
5	74	82	79	78.33	
6	82	95	79	85.33	
7	70	91	78	79.67	
8	63	88	77	76.00	
9	75	93	75	81.00	
10	83	90	75	82.67	
11	72	92	74	79.33	
12	75	90	72	79.00	
13	74	89	72	78.33	
14	81	91	71	81.00	
15	81	89	71	80.33	
16	66	79	71	72.00	
17	83	91	71	81.67	
18	69	89	69	75.67	
19	71	90	69	76.67	
20	70	76	65	70.33	
21	70	89	65	74.67	
22	71	90	64	75.00	
23	59	75	63	65.67	
24	61	81	62	68.00	
25	73	91	61	75.00	

90 – 100 – *"Excellent"*, 80 – 89 – *"Very Good to Good"*, 70-79 – *"Average"*, 60-69 – "*Fair to Poor"* 60 below – *"Very Poor"*

Table 3: Students' Pre-test Performance per Criterion

Criteria	Over-all Mean Score	Transmuted Grade	Legend
Content	17.57	74%	Failed (Average)
Organization	12.31	75%	Fairly Satisfactory (Average)
Vocabulary	12.39	76%	Fairly Satisfactory (Average)
Language	11.88	74%	Failed (Average)
Mechanics	3.35	79%	Fairly Satisfactory (Average)
Voice	3.24	78%	Fairly Satisfactory (Average)

90 – 100 – *"Excellent"*, 80 – 89 – *"Very Good to Good"*, 70-79 – *"Average"*, 60-69 – "*Fair to Poor"* 60 below – *"Very Poor"*

Table 4: Students' Post-test Performance per Criterion

Criteria	Over-all Mean Score	Transmuted Grade	Legend
Content	23.64	86%	Very Satisfactory (Very Good to Good)
Organization	15.76	86%	Very Satisfactory (Very Good to Good)
Vocabulary	15.57	86%	Very Satisfactory (Very Good to Good)
Language	15.47	85%	Very Satisfactory (Very Good to Good)
Mechanics	3.96	86%	Very Satisfactory (Very Good to Good)
Voice	4.11	88%	Very Satisfactory (Very Good to Good)

90 – 100 – *"Excellent"*, 80 – 89 – *"Very Good to Good"*, 70-79 – *"Average"*, 60-69 – "*Fair to Poor"* 60 below – *"Very Poor"*

Table 5: Paired Samples t-Test of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test Performances

		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pretest vs. Posttest	-18.01	11.16	2.23	-22.62	-13.40	-8.06	24	.000	Significant

Table 6: Paired Samples t-Test of Students' Performances per Criterion

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Interpretation
	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
Pretest Content vs. Posttest Content	-6.07	3.39	.679	-7.47	-4.67	-8.94	24	.000	Significant
Pretest Organization vs. Posttest Organization	-3.45	2.36	.473	-4.43	-2.47	-7.29	24	.000	Significant
Pretest Vocabulary vs. Posttest Vocabulary	-3.18	2.59	.519	-4.25	-2.11	-6.13	24	.000	Significant
Pretest Language vs. Posttest Language	-3.58	2.36	.473	-4.56	-2.60	-7.57	24	.000	Significant
Pretest Mechanics vs. Posttest Mechanics	-.612	.514	.102	-.824	-.400	-5.95	24	.000	Significant
Pretest Voice vs. Posttest Voice	-.852	.577	.115	-1.09	-.613	-7.38	24	.000	Significant

Table 7: Common Errors Committed in the Pre-test

Criteria	Subcategories	Frequency (Per Student)	Percentage
Content	Thesis Statement	25	100
	Development of thesis	25	100
Organization	Introduction	17	68
	Body	17	68
	Conclusion	20	80
	Unity	17	68
	Cohesion	23	92
	Coherence	25	100
Vocabulary	Word Choice	21	84
	Word Form and Usage	20	80
Language	Sentence Structure	22	88
	Agreement	20	80
	Tense	18	72
	Word Order/Function	16	64
	Article	15	60
	Pronoun	14	56
	Preposition	21	84
	Fragment	17	68
	Run-ons	18	72
Mechanics	Spelling	23	92
	Punctuation	24	96
	Capitalization	15	60
	Handwriting	15	60
Voice	Audience and Purpose	19	76

Table 8: Common Improvements of the Students in the Post-test

Criteria	Subcategories	Frequency (Per Student)	Percentage
Content	Thesis Statement	16	64
	Development of thesis	19	76
Organization	Introduction	19	76
	Body	19	76
	Conclusion	15	60
	Unity	21	84
	Cohesion	20	80
	Coherence	20	80

Criteria	Subcategories	Frequency (Per Student)	Percentage
Vocabulary	Word Choice	17	60
	Word Form and Usage	23	92
Language	Sentence Structure	15	60
	Agreement	15	60
	Tense	16	64
	Word Order/Function	14	56
	Article	15	60
	Pronoun	16	68
	Preposition	15	60
Mechanics	Spelling	13	52
	Punctuation	14	56
	Capitalization	18	72
	Handwriting	18	72
Voice	Audience and Purpose	19	76