

## **EFFECTIVENESS OF EXPLICIT DIRECT INSTRUCTION IN THE WRITING COMPOSITIONS OF GRADE 11 SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

**Morina Y. Batin<sup>1</sup>, Cristie Ann L. Jaca<sup>2</sup>**

*1.Department of Education, Mandaue City Comprehensive National High School*

*2.Cebu Technological University*

### **Abstract**

This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) Method in enhancing the writing abilities of Grade 11 students. Grounded in Explicit Direct Instruction (Hollingsworth, 2009). The primary objective was to determine the effectiveness of the Explicit Direct Instruction Method through pretest and posttest assessments across writing tasks, while identifying significant improvement during the intervention. The sample for this study consists of eleventh-grade students with low ability in Writing. Using a quasi-experimental one-group pretest–posttest design, the study assessed students' performance in four areas of writing across disciplines, namely narration, description, cause and effect, and comparison and contrast. Findings revealed that Grade 11 students initially performed at the Beginning level across all competencies, with weaknesses in content development, organization, grammar, and mechanics. The findings underscore the importance of fostering clear and direct instruction, high levels of student engagement, and structured lesson formats, suggesting implications for educational practices aimed at enhancing written skills. After the implementation of EDI, students demonstrated significant improvement, with narration reaching a Proficient level and the other areas improving to Developing. T-test results showed highly significant differences ( $p < .001$ ) between pre-test and post-test scores, with large effect sizes indicating a strong impact of the intervention. The study concludes that Explicit Direct Instruction is an effective pedagogical method for improving senior high school students' writing performance. Recommendations include implementing targeted writing intervention strategies, integrating Explicit Direct Instruction, and training in teacher development programs. Overall, this study advocates for the systematic incorporation of Explicit Direct Instruction to empower students' written compositions.

**Keywords:** explicit direct instruction, effectiveness, senior high school, teaching and learning, writing compositions

## 1. Introduction

Writing is a fundamental academic competency that enables learners to communicate ideas, construct arguments, and demonstrate higher-order thinking across disciplines. In senior high school, writing proficiency serves as a critical foundation for academic success, career readiness, and lifelong learning. However, despite its recognized importance, writing remains one of the most challenging language skills for many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, particularly in contexts where English is primarily learned through formal classroom instruction rather than everyday communication. In the Philippines, national and international assessments have consistently indicated persistent learning gaps in literacy, emphasizing the need for evidence-based instructional approaches that strengthen students' writing competence while addressing disparities in language achievement (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023; Department of Education [DepEd], 2024).

Writing is a cognitively demanding process that requires learners to integrate linguistic knowledge, organization of ideas, vocabulary, grammar, audience awareness, and self-regulation (Graham, 2023). Many senior high school students struggle with generating coherent ideas, organizing information logically, applying appropriate grammatical structures, and producing compositions that meet academic standards. These challenges are often exacerbated by traditional instructional practices that emphasize product-oriented assessment rather than explicit teaching of writing strategies and processes. Consequently, students frequently develop limited confidence and motivation toward writing, resulting in compositions characterized by weak organization, insufficient elaboration, and frequent language errors (Graham, 2023; Kim et al., 2021).

Recent scholarship has highlighted the importance of explicit instruction in improving writing outcomes among adolescent learners. Explicit instruction involves systematic modeling, guided practice, immediate corrective feedback, scaffolded learning activities, and gradual transfer of responsibility from teacher to learner. This instructional approach aligns with cognitive theories of learning by reducing unnecessary cognitive load while enabling students to internalize effective writing strategies through repeated demonstration and practice (Rosenshine, 2012; Archer & Hughes, 2011). Contemporary meta-analyses further demonstrate that structured writing instruction significantly improves students' writing quality, organization, sentence construction, and overall academic achievement across diverse educational settings (Graham et al., 2023).

One instructional model that operationalizes these principles is Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI). Unlike conventional lecture-based teaching, EDI incorporates clearly articulated learning objectives, teacher modeling ("I do"), guided practice ("We do"), collaborative engagement ("You do together"), independent application ("You do alone"), continuous checking for understanding, and timely feedback. Such features promote active learner participation while ensuring that misconceptions are addressed immediately.

Emerging evidence suggests that EDI is particularly effective in supporting learners who experience difficulties in academic writing because it provides structured scaffolding that gradually develops independence and mastery (Hollingsworth & Ybarra, 2018; Stockard et al., 2018).

Within the Philippine educational landscape, the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum and the Department of Education's continuing emphasis on strengthening foundational literacy have intensified the need for pedagogical interventions grounded in empirical evidence. While numerous studies have examined writing instruction in basic education, relatively few have investigated the effectiveness of Explicit Direct Instruction in improving the writing compositions of senior high school learners, particularly in public secondary schools. Existing local studies often focus on general writing strategies or technology-assisted instruction without systematically evaluating instructional models that explicitly teach the writing process through structured teacher guidance and scaffolded practice. Consequently, there remains limited evidence regarding the applicability and effectiveness of EDI within the Philippine senior high school context.

Grounded in the principles of explicit instruction, cognitive learning theory, and gradual release of responsibility, this study investigated the effectiveness of Explicit Direct Instruction in enhancing the writing compositions of Grade 11 senior high school students. Specifically, the study examined students' writing performance before and after exposure to EDI and determined whether the instructional intervention produced statistically significant improvements in the quality of their compositions. By providing empirical evidence on the effectiveness of EDI in developing writing proficiency, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on evidence-based literacy instruction and offers practical implications for English language teachers, curriculum developers, school leaders, and policymakers seeking to strengthen writing instruction in Philippine secondary education. Furthermore, the findings support ongoing efforts to improve literacy outcomes through pedagogical practices that are systematic, learner-centered, and responsive to the demands of twenty-first-century education.

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

This research determined the effectiveness of using the Explicit Direct Instruction Method in enhancing writing abilities among the Grade 11 Senior High School students of Mandaue City Comprehensive National High School during Academic Year 2025-2026 as a basis for developing a lesson guide with relevant writing tasks.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the Grade 11 students' writing ability on their compositions in relation to the competency of distinguishing between and among patterns of development in writing across disciplines in four areas:
  - 1.1 narration
  - 1.2 description
  - 1.3 cause and effect
  - 1.4 comparison and contrast?
2. What are the students' post-writing scores after using the explicit direct instruction method?
3. Is there a significant difference between the Pre-test and Post-test using the explicit direct method?
4. How may a lesson guide be developed with writing tasks using the explicit direct method to help improve students' writing?

### 2. Review of Literature

Writing is a complex cognitive and linguistic skill requiring the mastery of organization, coherence, grammar, and diverse rhetorical patterns of development (Deanne, 2008). In senior high school, students across academic and technical tracks are expected to demonstrate writing proficiency across disciplines; however, many learners struggle to articulate ideas logically due to a lack of structured guidance (Graham & Perin, 2007; Haryanti & Sari, 2019). This pedagogical challenge is particularly critical under the Philippine basic education landscape. Republic Act 10533 (K to 12 Enhanced Basic Education Act) and DepEd Memo No. 39, s. 2016 mandate a strengthened curriculum to address learning gaps in complex courses like Senior High School Reading and Writing. Consequently, frequent, routine, and deliberate writing-to-learn instruction is vital to support student creativity, critical thinking, and academic achievement (Graham et al., 2020; Huerta & Garza, 2019).

To bridge these performance gaps, this study anchors itself on Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) as a structured framework to enhance the composition performance of Grade 11 students at Mandaue City Comprehensive National High School. Grounded in behaviorist (Skinner, 1968) and cognitive learning theories (Gagné, 1985), EDI asserts that learning is maximized when complex concepts are systematically broken down, modeled by the teacher, and practiced with immediate feedback (Archer & Hughes, 2011). The framework utilizes a strategic sequence: clearly stated objectives, teacher modeling ("I

Do"), guided practice ("We Do"), independent practice ("You Do"), and continuous checks for understanding (Hollingsworth & Ybarra, 2009). This systematic approach ensures that diverse learners—including those navigating writing in a second language—can navigate the structural and linguistic conventions required in academic compositions (Hollingsworth, 2009; Pek et al., 2019).

The instructional scaffolding embedded within EDI is heavily supported by Vygotsky's Social Constructivism, which posits that higher-order thinking develops through targeted guidance within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). According to this perspective, a learner's potential development is transformed into actual, independent development through the internalization of structured adult or peer support (Schunk, 2012; Suci, 2018). In writing instruction, this transition from external direction to self-regulation makes the writing process significantly more efficient (Payong, 2020). By aligning EDI with process-oriented writing theory, teachers can systematically scaffold students through the essential, non-linear stages of prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing, thereby building sustainable, lifelong writing capabilities (Sarmiento & Dela Cruz, 2021).

Complementing this instructional delivery is the Contextual View of Writing Development, which asserts that writing is not merely an isolated cognitive skill but a socially situated activity embedded within institutional systems (Prior, 2006). Within this model, writing functions as a social act within a classroom community where genres, tools, and feedback mechanisms interact to shape the final text (Russell, 1997). Writing proficiency grows as students learn to negotiate these external, real-world communicative purposes and adapt their work to specific discourse expectations (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Therefore, improving written composition involves transforming writing from a dry, mechanical task into a meaningful, socially connected interaction.

Parallel to its contextual nature, writing is fundamentally governed by the Cognitive Process Theory of Writing, which views composition as a recursive, goal-directed cognitive operation rather than a linear transcription of thought. This theory outlines three interactive components: the task environment, the writer's long-term memory, and the core writing processes of planning, translating, and reviewing (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Zheng, 2020). Academic writing competence relies on a student's capacity to coordinate these mental processes through continuous reflection and strategic decision-making (Huerta & Garza, 2019). Ultimately, by synthesizing EDI with these contextual and cognitive frameworks, this study investigates how explicit instructional interventions can optimize students' internal cognitive strategies and social participation to significantly improve their overall writing composition performance.

### 3. Methods and Materials

This study employed a quasi-experimental design that aimed at enhancing and determining the effectiveness of Explicit Direct Instruction among Senior High School students while also exploring their capabilities of writing compositions. This approach demonstrated that such designs were effective for assessing causal relationships in teaching/learning contexts (Huang et al., 2020). Also, the collection of specific data was essential for gaining insight into the challenges that students faced and the skills they needed to develop and write effectively. By integrating quantitative methods, the study sought to provide a deeper understanding of the factors influencing students' writing experiences.

The research study was conducted at one of the public schools in Mandaue City. The school provided an optimal research environment characterized by well-equipped facilities and abundant resources that facilitated the collection and analysis of data about the study, Effectiveness of Explicit Direct Instruction of Senior High School students. Within this research environment, designated spaces were allocated for data collection purposes.

The research respondents were the Grade 11 Senior High School students aged 16 to 19 who were currently enrolled at a public school in Mandaue City. A total of 40 Grade 11 students participated during the Academic Year 2025-2026. This group was specifically selected using a purposive sampling technique, ensuring that the respondents were those enrolled in the Writing course during the first semester. There were four sections that the researcher had handled, and the 40 respondents were taking the subject under her class. Moreover, this method allowed for a focused exploration of the written abilities and experiences of students actively engaged in a relevant subject area, thus providing valuable insights into the effectiveness of Explicit Direct Instruction within the context of their education. Of the total respondents, 17 were male, accounting for approximately 46.51% of the sample, while 23 were female, representing about 46.51%. This distribution reflected a slightly higher representation of female students in the sample compared to their male counterparts. The balanced participation of both genders provided a diverse perspective, enriching the study's findings related to communication abilities and experiences among Grade 11 Senior High School students. Overall, the composition of the respondents ensured that the research captured a comprehensive view of the student population in the context of enhancing written skills.

The research instrument used in this study was a well-established scale. It consisted of the writing activity that determined the Grade 11 students' writing ability. This allowed students to write four types of writing, namely narration, description, cause and effect, and comparison and contrast. From their writing outputs, the students' writing ability was rated using the assigned rubric for writing ability by Heidi Andrade. This rubric provided a clear framework for evaluating appropriate written tasks based on the expected learning output, ensuring that the assessment was both structured and relevant.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

##### The Pre-test Performance of the SHS Students

The Grade 11 students' writing ability was identified based on the written compositions they had made in class. This was in relation to the competency in distinguishing between and among patterns of development in writing across disciplines. The pre-test results of the written compositions of the Grade 11 students were done before the use of explicit direct instruction in relation to the competency of distinguishing between and among patterns of development in writing across disciplines, namely narration, description, cause and effect, and comparison and contrast. The rubric presented had a range of scores per criterion, which covered Excellent, Proficient, Developing, and Beginning. To describe the pretest performance of the 40 students who participated in this study, the scores were analyzed using descriptive statistics, namely mean and standard deviation, and summarized using frequencies and percentages.

##### Writing Ability in Narration

Narration is a writing mode that tells a story or recounts a sequence of events in a logical, usually chronological order. It often includes characters, settings, conflict, and a plot that moves the story forward (Lunsford, 2019). In the writing task, the 40 respondents are tasked to narrate their first day of school as a grade 11 student. The frequencies and percentages of responses are given below. To describe the general response for this sub-variable, the mean and its interpretation are indicated in the bottom row.

Table 2  
Students' Pre-Test Writing Ability in Narration

| Criteria                     | Excellent |   | Proficient |      | Developing |      | Beginning |      | Weighted Mean | sd   | level      |
|------------------------------|-----------|---|------------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|---------------|------|------------|
|                              | (4)       |   | (3)        |      | (2)        |      | (1)       |      |               |      |            |
|                              | f         | % | f          | %    | f          | %    | f         | %    |               |      |            |
| 1. Content and Ideas         | 0         | 0 | 5          | 12.5 | 24         | 60   | 11        | 27.5 | 1.85          | 0.62 | Developing |
| 2.Organization and Coherence | 0         | 0 | 3          | 7.5  | 21         | 52.5 | 16        | 40   | 1.68          | 0.62 | Beginning  |
| 3.Grammar and Language Use   | 0         | 0 | 10         | 25   | 20         | 50   | 10        | 25   | 2.00          | 0.72 | Developing |

|                                     |   |   |   |   |    |      |    |      |      |      |           |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|------|----|------|------|------|-----------|
| <b>4.Mechanics</b>                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 52.5 | 19 | 47.5 | 1.53 | 0.51 | Beginning |
| <b>5.Vocabulary and Word Choice</b> | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 47.5 | 19 | 47.5 | 1.58 | 1.75 | Beginning |

|                 |  |  |  |  |             |             |                  |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| <b>Over-all</b> |  |  |  |  | <b>1.73</b> | <b>0.96</b> | <b>Beginning</b> |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|-------------|-------------|------------------|

*Legend of the Weighted Mean: 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning*

Table 2 presents the pre-test scores of the Grade 11 students' writing based on their compositions in narration. The pre-test results under narration revealed that the Grade 11 students demonstrated a Beginning level of writing ability. The distribution of students' performance across different criteria was also indicated. **Content and ideas:** A total mean score of 1.85 (SD = 0.62), shows that students' level was at the developing level. **Grammar and Language use:** A total mean score of 2.00 (SD = 0.72), belong to the developing level, showing that sentence-level control was a relative strength. On the other hand, **Organization and coherence:** A total mean score of 1.68 (SD = 0.62), **Mechanics:** A total mean score of 1.59 (SD = 0.51), **Vocabulary and word choice:** A total mean score of 1.58 (SD = 1.75) belong to the beginning level, demonstrating a weak grasp of the material.

Overall, mechanics got the lowest mean among the other writing components. Letters in capital are useful for sentence initials, the beginning of important words, in topics, and headings. The problems occur because of the difficulty of classifying nouns as proper and common nouns. In summary, the mean score of 1.73 (SD = 0.96) indicates that students demonstrated basic competence in expressing ideas; they still lacked coherence, organization, and depth in presenting fully developed written outputs. Additionally, most of the students got lower scores, although a considerable number got a developing level. It is noticeable that many learners and sometimes graduates possess very limited writing competence (Ramos, 2021). In fact, Magsambol (2020) reported that in the Philippines, some senior high school students cannot even write a decent English sentence.

### Writing Ability in Description

Description is a writing strategy that uses vivid sensory details to help the reader visualize a person, place, object, or event. It appeals to the senses—sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch—to create imagery and evoke emotions (Kirsznier & Mandell, 2020). In the writing task, the 40 respondents are tasked to describe their most unforgettable birthday celebration. The frequencies and percentages of responses are given below. To describe the general response for this sub-variable, the mean and its interpretation are indicated in the bottom row.

Table 3  
Students' Pre-Test Writing Ability in Description

| Criteria                     | Excellent |   | Proficient |     | Developing |      | Beginning |      | Weighted Mean | Sd   | level     |
|------------------------------|-----------|---|------------|-----|------------|------|-----------|------|---------------|------|-----------|
|                              | (4)       |   | (3)        |     | (2)        |      | (1)       |      |               |      |           |
|                              | f         | % | f          | %   | f          | %    | f         | %    |               |      |           |
| 1. Content and Ideas         | 0         | 0 | 2          | 5   | 26         | 65   | 12        | 30   | 1.75          | 0.54 | Beginning |
| 2.Organization and Coherence | 0         | 0 | 1          | 2.5 | 22         | 55   | 17        | 42.5 | 1.60          | 0.55 | Beginning |
| 3.Grammar and Language Use   | 0         | 0 | 0          | 0   | 21         | 52.5 | 19        | 47.5 | 1.53          | 0.51 | Beginning |
| 4.Mechanics                  | 0         | 0 | 0          | 0   | 19         | 47.5 | 21        | 52.5 | 1.48          | 0.51 | Beginning |
| 5.Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0         | 0 | 1          | 2.5 | 16         | 40   | 23        | 57.5 | 1.45          | 0.55 | Beginning |
| Over-all                     |           |   |            |     |            |      |           |      | 1.56          | 0.54 | Beginning |

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 3 reflects the students' pretest results under the description. The results indicated the mean score of 1.56 (SD = 0.54), suggesting a **Beginning level** when tasked to write using sensory details. This also means that students had difficulty generating vivid imagery. With a mean score of **1.56**, the overall performance is categorized as "**Beginning.**" **Vocabulary and Word Choice** (M = 1.45) and **Mechanics** (M = 1.48) were the lowest domains, indicating limited use of descriptive language and frequent surface errors. Their descriptions lacked sensory detail and relied on generic adjectives. **Content and Ideas** (M = 1.75) revealed that students struggled to elaborate on the object or scene they were describing. Likewise, **Organization and Coherence** (M = 1.68) showed difficulty in arranging details logically (e.g., from general-to-specific or spatial order). Notably, there were no students who achieved an "Excellent" score or did not meet expectations. These characteristics are typical of early descriptive writers, who often produce lists of disconnected traits rather than coherent descriptive paragraphs (Wijayanti, 2021).

The standard deviation of **0.54** indicates a relatively tight distribution of scores, suggesting that most students perform similarly in terms of description. The results indicate that students could not provide vivid details, sensory descriptions, and logically organized content. Moreover, it aligns with the findings that learners with limited exposure to descriptive techniques often fail to create clear imagery, leading to vague and simplistic outputs (Kamil, 2020). The low scores suggest that students' descriptive skills were not yet developed, likely due to insufficient practice and gaps in vocabulary and grammar (Alonzo & Kim, 2018).

### Writing Ability in Cause and Effect

Cause and effect writing explains why something happens and what results from it. This method analyzes the relationships between events, conditions, or actions to show how one leads to another (Kirsznner & Mandell, 2020). In the writing task, the 40 respondents are tasked to enumerate and explain the causes and effects of climate change in the Philippines. The frequencies and percentages of responses are given below. To describe the general response for this sub-variable, the mean and its interpretation are indicated in the bottom row.

Table 4  
Students' Pre-Test Writing Ability in Cause and Effect

| Criteria                      | Excellent<br>(4) |   | Proficient<br>(3) |     | Developing<br>(2) |      | Beginning<br>(1) |      | Weighted<br>Mean | sd          | level      |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------|-----|-------------------|------|------------------|------|------------------|-------------|------------|
|                               | f                | % | f                 | %   | f                 | %    | f                | %    |                  |             |            |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 0                | 0 | 6                 | 15  | 23                | 57.5 | 11               | 27.5 | 1.88             | 0.65        | Developing |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 0                | 0 | 3                 | 7.5 | 24                | 60   | 13               | 32.5 | 1.75             | 0.59        | Beginning  |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 0                | 0 | 0                 | 22  | 20                | 55   | 18               | 45   | 1.55             | 0.50        | Beginning  |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 0                | 0 | 0                 | 0   | 21                | 52.5 | 19               | 47.5 | 1.53             | 0.51        | Beginning  |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0                | 0 | 3                 | 7.5 | 17                | 42.5 | 20               | 50   | 1.58             | 0.64        | Beginning  |
| <b>Over-all</b>               |                  |   |                   |     |                   |      |                  |      | <b>1.65</b>      | <b>0.59</b> | Beginning  |

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 4 reveals the results of the pretest under Cause and Effect. The results as seen indicate that the mean of the pretest score was 1.65 (SD = 0.54), suggesting a Beginning level. Students showed difficulty articulating causal relationships. **Content and Ideas** (M = 1.88) indicated that students could identify causes or effects, but often not both, or they did not explain the relationship clearly. **Organization and Coherence** (M = 1.75) showed that logical connectors ("because" "therefore," "as a result") were rarely used. Paragraphs lacked clear sequencing, and causal chains were incomplete. Grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary were also low (=1.45–1.70), reflecting incomplete sentences and vague language. These weaknesses reflect common findings that learners struggle with causal logic without explicit linking devices and modeling (Graham & Perin, 2020). Students have difficulty in explaining relationships between events, presenting logical reasoning, and organizing causal sequences—skills that require higher-order thinking. Graham and Harris (2019) revealed in their study that students often struggle with

analytical writing tasks without guided instruction, which explains the weak performance. The results suggest a limited ability to express cause-and-effect relationships clearly and cohesively.

Overall, the mean scores, which range from 1.00 to 1.75, indicate that while students possess foundational writing skills, they have not yet achieved proficiency in organizing ideas, applying appropriate patterns of development, and expressing concepts with clarity and coherence. The result indicated the difficulties in writing among Grade 11 HUMSS students in a private Philippine college, and identified the main problem areas as grammar, organization of ideas, vocabulary, and writing mechanics. These difficulties resulted in incoherent and disjointed writing outputs. To address this, a workbook targeting specific writing challenges was developed to help improve writing skills (IIARI, 2025).

## WRITING ABILITY IN COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

Comparison and contrast writing examines the similarities and differences between two or more subjects. This pattern of development helps readers understand relationships, distinctions, and the relative advantages of the items being analyzed (Oshima & Hogue, 2017). In the writing task, the 40 respondents are tasked to compare and contrast how natural disasters affected our communities in the past versus in the present. The frequencies and percentages of responses are given below. To describe the general response for this sub-variable, the mean and its interpretation are indicated in the bottom row.

Table 5  
Students' Pre-Test Writing Ability in Comparison and Contrast

| Criteria                      | Excellent<br>(4) |   | Proficient<br>(3) |     | Developing<br>(2) |      | Beginning<br>(1) |      | Weighted Mean | sd          | level     |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------|-----|-------------------|------|------------------|------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
|                               | f                | % | f                 | %   | f                 | %    | f                | %    |               |             |           |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 0                | 0 | 2                 | 5   | 22                | 55   | 16               | 40   | 1.65          | 0.58        | Beginning |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 0                | 0 | 0                 | 0   | 24                | 60   | 16               | 40   | 1.60          | 0.50        | Beginning |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 0                | 0 | 1                 | 2.5 | 21                | 52.5 | 18               | 45   | 1.58          | 0.55        | Beginning |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 0                | 0 | 1                 | 2.5 | 16                | 40   | 23               | 57.5 | 1.45          | 0.55        | Beginning |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0                | 0 | 4                 | 10  | 17                | 42.5 | 19               | 47.5 | 1.63          | 0.67        | Beginning |
| <b>Over-all</b>               |                  |   |                   |     |                   |      |                  |      | <b>1.58</b>   | <b>0.57</b> | Beginning |

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 5 summarizes the results of the pretest under Comparison and contrast. The results as seen indicate that the pretest mean score was 1.58 (SD = 0.57), suggesting a Beginning level; students demonstrated weak comparison-contrast structures. with **Content and Ideas** (M = 1.65) showing shallow comparisons. **Organization and Coherence** (M = 1.63) indicated difficulty using point-by-point or block organization. Transitions such as “similarly,” “in contrast,” and “however” were rarely used. Surface-level issues appeared in grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary (= 1.45–1.70). Without guidance, students produced unbalanced paragraphs or unrelated points.

A descriptive study conducted in Alamada, Cotabato, assessed the writing competence of 248 Grade 11 students using analytic rubrics. It showed that students were mostly at a "Developing" level in overall writing proficiency. They scored higher in content and structure but lagged in lexico-grammatical ability and mechanics. The study emphasized the need for enrichment in vocabulary, grammar mastery, spelling, punctuation, and writing skills development (Callora & Suñas, 2023). These challenges mirror findings that comparison/contrast writing is cognitively demanding due to the need for parallel structure and conceptual alignment (Yu & Lee, 2020). Students had challenges in identifying relevant similarities and differences and structuring them logically. Comparison-and-contrast writing is cognitively demanding because it requires organization, critical thinking, and linguistic precision (Saddler, 2018). The low score signals that students lacked strategies for comparing concepts effectively and had difficulty constructing paragraphs that show balanced and coherent points of comparison.

### **The Post-test Performance of the Students after the use of the EXPLICIT DIRECT INSTRUCTION**

This section presents the distribution of the post-test results of the students. Moreover, the post-test was given after the conduct of the explicit direct instruction in the classroom. The same set of students participated in the post-test. Hence, scores are processed and interpreted in the same way as the pretest results. The posttest results reveal a clear and significant improvement in students' writing performance, demonstrating the effectiveness of Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) in enhancing the writing compositions of Grade 11 learners. After the structured and systematic delivery of lessons, characterized by modeling, guided practice, and independent application, students showed notable gains across the key components of narration, description, comparison and contrast, and cause and effect. These improvements indicate that EDI successfully provided learners with clear expectations, step-by-step demonstrations, and immediate corrective feedback, which collectively strengthened their ability to plan, organize, and refine their writing. The students' enhanced post-test scores affirm that when instruction is explicit, scaffolded, and consistently reinforced, learners develop greater confidence and competence in executing complex writing tasks. This upward shift not only supports the pedagogical value of EDI but also aligns with theories of structured learning, emphasizing

that direct, focused guidance equips students with the necessary cognitive strategies to improve their writing outcomes measurably.

Table 6  
**Post-Test Writing Performance of the Students after the Conduct of Explicit Direct Instruction in Narration**

| Criteria                     | Excellent<br>(4) |      | Proficient<br>(3) |      | Developing<br>(2) |      | Beginning<br>(1) |     | Weighted<br>Mean | sd   | level      |
|------------------------------|------------------|------|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-----|------------------|------|------------|
|                              | f                | %    | f                 | %    | f                 | %    | f                | %   |                  |      |            |
|                              |                  |      |                   |      |                   |      |                  |     |                  |      |            |
| 1. Content and Ideas         | 8                | 20   | 16                | 40   | 15                | 37.5 | 1                | 2.5 | 2.78             | 0.80 | Proficient |
| 2.Organization and Coherence | 5                | 12.5 | 17                | 42.5 | 18                | 45   | 0                | 0   | 2.68             | 0.69 | Proficient |
| 3.Grammar and Language Use   | 3                | 7.5  | 21                | 52.5 | 13                | 32.5 | 3                | 7.5 | 2.60             | 0.74 | Proficient |
| 4.Mechanics                  | 2                | 5    | 16                | 40   | 21                | 52.5 | 1                | 2.5 | 2.48             | 0.64 | Developing |
| 5.Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0                | 0    | 17                | 42.5 | 23                | 57.5 | 0                | 0   | 2.43             | 0.50 | Developing |
| Over-all                     |                  |      |                   |      |                   |      |                  |     | 2.59             | 0.69 | Proficient |

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 6 reveals the results of the posttest under narration. The results indicate that the mean of the posttest score was 2.59 (SD = 0.69), suggesting a Proficient level. **Content and Ideas** improved markedly (post M = 2.77), indicating clearer plots, more coherent event progression, and richer elaboration. Students were better able to establish context, introduce characters, and maintain thematic unity. **Organization and Coherence** also demonstrated notable improvement (post M = 2.67). Students displayed awareness of narrative structure—e.g., using transitions such as “after that,” “suddenly,” and “in the end.” Their narratives flowed more smoothly and showed a clearer beginning–middle–end progression. **Grammar and Language Use** (post M = 2.60) improved through more controlled sentence construction and reduced grammatical errors, demonstrating that repeated guided practice effectively strengthened sentence fluency. Significant gains also appeared in **Mechanics** (post M = 2.48), with fewer basic errors, and **Vocabulary and Word Choice** (post M = 2.42), where students began integrating more specific verbs, descriptive adjectives, and action words to make narratives vivid. These improvements align with research indicating that explicit strategy instruction (e.g., modeling narrative patterns, guided writing) enhances both macro-organization and micro-level accuracy (Kim & Park, 2020).

Based on Vygotsky's theory, students' skill development may be separated into two categories: actual development and potential development. The children's capacity to solve issues or tasks on their own indicates their actual level of development, but their ability to learn under the supervision of instructors, parents, other adults, or peers with more advanced skills indicates their potential level of growth. Basically, this potential ability will turn into a new level of actual development, with the consequence that if you find a new problem, you need help and guidance from adults, so this is called a new potential development. This event causes the level of development of students' capability in real learning, continuous learning, and a lifelong learning process (Schunk, 2012). This result shows a clear improvement in students' narrative writing after the intervention. This shows that students became more capable of developing ideas, organizing events, and applying appropriate grammar and vocabulary. This improvement supports the claim that explicit and structured instruction leads to significant gains in writing quality (Graham, 2022).

Table 7  
**Post-Test Writing Performance of the Students after the Conduct of Explicit Direct Instruction in Description**

| Criteria                      | Excellent<br>(4) |     | Proficient<br>(3) |      | Developing<br>(2) |      | Beginning<br>(1) |     | Weighted Mean | sd          | level             |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-----|---------------|-------------|-------------------|
|                               | f                | %   | f                 | %    | f                 | %    | f                | %   |               |             |                   |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 2                | 5   | 23                | 57.5 | 15                | 37.5 | 0                | 0   | 2.68          | 0.57        | Proficient        |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 1                | 2.5 | 14                | 35   | 25                | 62.5 | 0                | 0   | 2.40          | 0.55        | Developing        |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 1                | 2.5 | 10                | 25   | 28                | 70   | 1                | 2.5 | 2.28          | 0.55        | Developing        |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 0                | 0   | 6                 | 15   | 34                | 85   | 0                | 0   | 2.15          | 0.36        | Developing        |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0                | 0   | 17                | 42.5 | 23                | 57.5 | 0                | 0   | 2.25          | 0.44        | Developing        |
| <b>Over-all</b>               |                  |     |                   |      |                   |      |                  |     | <b>2.35</b>   | <b>0.53</b> | <b>Developing</b> |

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 7 displays the results of the posttest under description. The results displayed that the mean of the posttest score was 2.35 (SD = 0.53), suggesting a Developing level. Students showed improvement in descriptive writing, although not yet reaching the

Proficient level. **Content and Ideas** increased significantly (post  $M \approx 2.68$ ). Students provided more meaningful details, deeper elaboration, and clearer focus on the subject being described. **Organization and Coherence** improved (post  $M = 2.22$ ), with many using spatial or topical ordering. Paragraphs became more unified, with transitions such as “to the left,” “in the background,” or “in addition.” Improvements in **Grammar** (post  $M \approx 2.28$ ) and **Mechanics** (post  $M \approx 2.23$ ) reduced sentence-level errors and increased clarity. **Vocabulary and Word Choice** (post  $M \approx 2.25$ ) was one of the strongest gains, reflecting the introduction of sensory language and more precise modifiers (e.g., “gleaming,” “rough,” “fragrant”). These patterns support findings that descriptive writing improves significantly when learners are exposed to lexical enrichment activities and modeling of sensory detail (Flores & Smith, 2021). They became better at presenting details and organizing descriptions, but still needed support in using richer vocabulary and sensory imagery. According to Kamil (2020), vocabulary development is crucial for descriptive writing, and students gradually improve with practice. The results indicate progress but also highlight areas where further instruction is needed. In relation to this writing component, explicit direct instruction is a structured teaching method where teachers clearly state learning objectives, model skills, and provide guided practice with frequent checks for understanding to ensure students master new material. The approach uses a systematic framework that includes breaking down complex concepts, demonstrating skills, and providing immediate feedback to students. This method is versatile, can be used across all grade levels and subjects, and is designed to help diverse learners, including those with special needs and English language learners, succeed (Hollingsworth, 2009). The shift from Beginning to Developing indicates that the writing intervention was effective in enhancing students’ narrative competence.

Table 8  
Post-Test Writing Performance of the Students after the Conduct of Explicit Direct Instruction in Cause and Effect

| Criteria                      | Excellent<br>(4) |     | Proficient<br>(3) |      | Developing<br>(2) |      | Beginning<br>(1) |     | Weight<br>ed<br>Mean | sd   | level      |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-----|----------------------|------|------------|
|                               | f                | %   | f                 | %    | f                 | %    | f                | %   |                      |      |            |
|                               |                  |     |                   |      |                   |      |                  |     |                      |      |            |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 3                | 7.5 | 20                | 50   | 16                | 40   | 1                | 2.5 | 2.63                 | 0.67 | Proficient |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 0                | 0   | 21                | 52.5 | 18                | 45   | 1                | 2.5 | 2.50                 | 0.55 | Developing |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 0                | 0   | 14                | 35   | 25                | 62.5 | 1                | 2.5 | 2.33                 | 0.53 | Developing |

|                              |   |   |    |      |    |      |   |     |      |      |            |
|------------------------------|---|---|----|------|----|------|---|-----|------|------|------------|
| 4.Mechanics                  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 30   | 27 | 67.5 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.28 | 0.51 | Developing |
| 5.Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0 | 0 | 9  | 22.5 | 31 | 77.5 | 0 | 0   | 2.23 | 0.42 | Developing |

|                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |             |             |            |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|-------------|------------|
| <b>Over-all</b> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | <b>2.39</b> | <b>0.56</b> | Developing |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|-------------|------------|

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 8 explains the results of the posttest under cause and effect. The results as seen indicate that the mean of the posttest score was 2.39 (SD = 0.56), suggesting a Developing level. **Content and Ideas** (post M  $\approx$  2.63) showed clearer articulation of both causes and effects. Students were able to elaborate on the consequences and provide simple examples. **Organization and Coherence** (post M = 2.25) improved through better use of cohesive devices, clearer topic sentences, and more linear sequencing. According to Stephen Krashen, language acquisition develops gradually through continuous exposure and meaningful practice, which may explain why students still encountered challenges in the technical aspects of writing despite the intervention (Krashen, 1984). **Grammar and Mechanics** (post M = 2.23–2.26) also improved, reflecting more accurate sentence construction when explaining relationships. **Vocabulary and Word Choice** (post M = 2.23) increased, with the use of terms such as “triggered,” “led to,” and “resulted in,” showing clearer causal reasoning. These gains correspond with research showing that cause-and-effect writing improves when students are explicitly taught discourse markers and reasoning structures (Lestari & Gunawan, 2021).

Additionally, this reveals that although the students demonstrated improvement in their writing performance after the intervention, they still require further enhancement in several writing skills. According to Lev Vygotsky, as cited by Rashtchi (2019), mentioned that learning develops through guided instruction and continuous practice, suggesting that students may achieve higher proficiency levels when provided with sustained scaffolding and writing support. The result reflects noticeable improvement in students' ability to explain causal relationships. While they demonstrated better reasoning and organization after the intervention, some still struggled with fully articulating complex cause-and-effect relationships. Graham and Harris (2019) emphasize that analytical writing improves significantly when students receive guided practice—consistent with the positive gains observed in this study.

## Writing Scores in Comparison and Contrast

Table 9  
Post-Test Writing Performance of the Students after the Conduct of Explicit Direct Instruction in Comparison and Contrast

| Criteria                      | Excellent<br>Beginning<br>(4) |      | Proficient<br>(3) |      | Developing<br>(2) |      | Beginning<br>(1) |     | Weighted<br>Mean | sd          | level      |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-----|------------------|-------------|------------|
|                               | f                             | %    | f                 | %    | f                 | %    | f                | %   |                  |             |            |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 8                             | 20   | 16                | 40   | 15                | 37.5 | 1                | 2.5 | 2.78             | 0.80        | Proficient |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 5                             | 12.5 | 17                | 42.5 | 18                | 45   | 0                | 0   | 2.68             | 0.69        | Proficient |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 3                             | 7.5  | 21                | 52.5 | 13                | 32.5 | 3                | 7.5 | 2.60             | 0.74        | Proficient |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 2                             | 5    | 16                | 40   | 21                | 52.5 | 1                | 2.5 | 2.48             | 0.64        | Developing |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 0                             | 0    | 17                | 42.5 | 23                | 57.5 | 0                | 0   | 2.43             | 0.50        | Developing |
| <b>Over-all</b>               |                               |      |                   |      |                   |      |                  |     | <b>2.59</b>      | <b>0.69</b> | Proficient |

**Legend of the Weighted Mean:** 3.26-4.00- Excellent, 2.51-3.25-Proficient, 1.76-2.50-Developing, 1.00-1.75-Beginning

Table 9 presents the results of the posttest under comparison and contrast. The results as seen indicate that the mean of the posttest score was 2.47 (SD = 0.56), suggesting a Developing level. **Content and Ideas** (post M = 2.58) showed stronger and more relevant comparison points. Students were able to identify clear bases for comparison and develop them systematically. **Organization and Coherence** (post M = 2.27) improved with the use of structured patterns. Paragraphs became more logically connected using transitions. **Grammar and Language Use** (post M = 2.42) reflected more controlled use of parallel structures and fewer agreement or tense errors. **Vocabulary and Word Choice** (post M = 2.60) displayed the greatest improvement. Students incorporated precise comparative words ("more efficient," "less reliable," "equally important"), making contrasts more explicit. This aligns with studies showing that genre-based scaffolding significantly enhances comparison-contrast writing performance (Huang, 2021).

Students improved in comparison-and-contrast writing, becoming more capable of identifying similarities and differences and organizing them logically. However, they still required refinement in coherence and precision. This supports research showing that students gradually acquire higher-order writing skills through explicit instruction and

repeated practice (Villanueva, 2020). The results were supported by the theory of Contextual View of Writing Development, which entails that writing is not simply a matter of individual cognitive skill acquisition (e.g., planning, drafting, revising) but is embedded in socially situated activity systems (Prior, 2006). In this model, the “activity system” comprises multiple interrelated components: the subject (e.g., student), the object/motive (what the student is trying to accomplish through writing), mediational tools (e.g., word processing, peer feedback, genre conventions), rules/division of labor (classroom roles, peer vs teacher feedback), community (peers, teacher, discipline) and the outcome (the written text or transformation achieved).

### Significant Difference Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores

To determine the effectiveness of the Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI), the pretest and posttest performances are compared as presented in the tables; their scores increased by an average. Hence, a paired sample t-test was used.

Table 10  
Test on the Significant Difference Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Performances of the Respondents – Narration

| Competency                    | Mean     |           | Mean Difference | t    | p-value | Effect Size | Decision  | Interpretation                    |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|------|---------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
|                               | Pre-Test | Post-Test |                 |      |         |             |           |                                   |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 1.85     | 2.77      | 0.925           | 9.50 | <.001*  | 1.503       | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 1.68     | 2.67      | 1.00            | 9.31 | <.001*  | 1.472       | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 2.00     | 2.60      | 0.600           | 9.35 | <.001*  | 0.846       | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 1.52     | 2.48      | 0.950           | 9.41 | <.001*  | 1.330       | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 1.57     | 2.42      | 0.850           | 9.28 | <.001*  | 0.318       | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference.

Table 10 analysis of the data for narration indicated a significant **improvement** from the **pretest** mean of **1.73** to the **posttest** mean of **2.59**, with a mean difference of **0.86**, and a **p-value less than 0.001**, which suggests a **significant difference**; the largest

mean differences were in Content and Organization ( $\approx 0.93$ – $1.00$ ), corresponding to large effect sizes ( $d > 1.50$ ), showing substantial developmental progression. This degree of change is consistent with evidence that structured genre-based teaching leads to dramatic improvements in narrative quality (Santangelo & Graham, 2020).

This result denotes that after a week of using the Explicit Direct Instruction, students show a significant change in their performance, though the improvement is a bare minimum. Explicit teaching strategies positively influence student achievement because they provide clear instruction, guided practice, and immediate feedback that improve learners' academic performance (Hattie, 2020). This statistical significance was further reinforced by the findings of several studies in the field of education.

Table 11

**Test on the Significant Difference Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Performances of the Respondents – Description**

| Competency                    | Mean     |           | Mean Difference | t     | p-value | Effect Size | Decision  | Interpretation                    |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|-------|---------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
|                               | Pre-Test | Post-Test |                 |       |         |             |           |                                   |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 1.75     | 2.67      | 0.925           | 11.13 | <.001*  | 1.76        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 1.60     | 2.40      | 0.800           | 10.90 | <.001*  | 1.72        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 1.52     | 2.27      | 0.750           | 8.06  | <.001*  | 1.27        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 1.48     | 2.25      | 0.675           | 8.12  | <.001*  | 1.28        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 1.45     | 2.25      | 0.800           | 10.90 | <.001*  | 1.72        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference.

Table 11 presents the results under description. All descriptive-writing criteria recorded **statistically significant** gains, from a pretest mean of 1.56 to the posttest mean of 2.35, with a mean difference of 0.79 and a p-value ( $p < .001$ ). Effect sizes were notably large ( $d \approx 1.70$ – $1.80$ ), especially for Content and Vocabulary, showing that explicit modeling and guided descriptive tasks effectively elevated student performance. The increase in scores reflects that students were likely more engaged during the instructional period leading to the post-test.

Table 12

**Test on the Significant Difference Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Performances  
of the Respondents – Cause and Effect**

| Competency                    | Mean         |               | Mean<br>Difference | t    | p-<br>value | Effect<br>Size | Decision  | Interpreta-<br>tion               |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|------|-------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
|                               | Pre-<br>Test | Post-<br>Test |                    |      |             |                |           |                                   |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 1.88         | 2.63          | 0.750              | 8.06 | <.001*      | 1.27           | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 1.75         | 2.50          | 0.750              | 7.52 | <.001*      | 1.19           | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 1.55         | 2.33          | 0.775              | 8.50 | <.001*      | 1.34           | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 1.50         | 2.27          | 0.775              | 9.24 | <.001*      | 1.46           | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 1.57         | 2.23          | 0.650              | 6.61 | <.001*      | 1.04           | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference.

Table 12 analysis of the data for cause and effect indicated a significant **improvement**. The pretest mean score of 1.65 indicates a moderate level of causal logic among students before the implementation of the instructional methods. However, following the intervention, the posttest mean rose to 2.39, reflecting a clear shift. The mean difference of 0.74 signifies a tangible enhancement in students' cause-and-effect writing. Coupled with a p-value of less than 0.001, these results indicate a significant difference, affirming the effectiveness of the instructional strategies employed in enhancing students' writing ability. Moreover, the effect size was large ( $d > 1.00$ ), especially in Grammar and Mechanics, indicating that students benefited from structured practice in expressing complex relationships.

Table 13

**Test on the Significant Difference Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Performances of the Respondents – Comparison and contrast**

| Competency                    | Mean     |           | Mean Difference | t     | p-value | Effect Size | Decision  | Interpretation                    |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|-------|---------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
|                               | Pre-Test | Post-Test |                 |       |         |             |           |                                   |
| 1. Content and Ideas          | 1.65     | 2.58      | 0.925           | 12.33 | <.001*  | 1.95        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 2. Organization and Coherence | 1.60     | 2.40      | 0.800           | 10.90 | <.001*  | 1.72        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 3. Grammar and Language Use   | 1.57     | 2.42      | 0.850           | 8.64  | <.001*  | 1.37        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 4. Mechanics                  | 1.45     | 2.33      | 0.875           | 10.73 | <.001*  | 1.70        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |
| 5. Vocabulary and Word Choice | 1.63     | 2.60      | 0.975           | 9.95  | <.001*  | 1.57        | Reject Ho | There is a significant difference |

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$  indicates a significant difference.

Table 13 presents the results under description. The result indicated that all competencies showed **highly significant differences** from the **pretest** mean of **1.58** to the **posttest** mean of **2.47**, with a mean difference of **0.89**, and a **p-value less than 0.001**, which suggests **a significant difference**, also indicating a very low probability that these results occurred by chance, thereby affirming the effectiveness of the intervention.

Content and ideas had one of the highest effect sizes ( $d \approx 1.95$ ), indicating extremely strong gains. The significant differences highlighted a **substantial impact** of the instructional methods employed on students' writing skills. This reveals that Explicit Direct Instruction significantly impacts students' writing abilities by scaffolding, modelling, guided practice, and independent practice. These insights are related to the study of Luizinho (2020), writing is an important skill for language productivity. In addition to this, developing writing skills will enable students to learn how to compose ideas, organize their thoughts and arguments, support critical points, and share information (Domantay & Ramos, 2018). The outcome is consistent with the findings of Graham and Perin (2007), whose meta-analysis showed that explicit teaching of writing strategies produces substantial gains in students' writing quality across various grade levels. This also affirms with the study of Jaca (2026) that timely, specific feedback is central to writing development.

**Lesson Guide with Writing Tasks**

The Lesson Guide is a carefully structured resource aimed at addressing writing challenges among students, offering a systematic approach to enhancing their writing skills. This guide consists of a series of lessons that are methodically designed to deepen students' understanding of contextual writing, particularly in connecting writing tasks to real-life situations, meaningful experiences, or subject-specific content, fostering a sense of relevance, purpose, and responsibility in communication. One of the primary objectives of the guide is to help students recognize and navigate the patterns of writing development surrounding written compositions. This involves improving one's writing compositions through mastering content and ideas, organization and coherence, grammar and language use, mechanics, vocabulary, and word choice while also following the EDI.

**5. Conclusion**

Based on the findings, the implementation of Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI) has shown a profound impact on students' written abilities. By fostering clear and direct communication, high levels of student engagement, and a structured lesson format, the EDI method enables students to enhance clarity, scaffold learning, and strengthen their ability to distinguish among patterns of development in writing across disciplines. Overall, these findings underscore the importance of strengthening students' foundational and higher-order thinking and writing skills that encourage active participation and enhance teachers' teaching strategy.

**Conflict of Interest Statement**

The author declares no conflict of interest.

## References

- Aguilar, R. (2018). *Twitter as a learning tool: from potential to evidence*. In F. Rosell-Aguilar, T. Beaven and M. Fuertes Gutierrez (eds.), *Innovative Language Teaching and Learning at University: Integrating Informal Learning into Formal Language Education* (pp. 99-106). Voillans, France: Researchpublishing.net. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2018.22.780>
- Aguilar, R., Beaven, F., & Fuertes, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Social media in L2 education: exploring on-line collaborative writing in EFL settings*. In *Innovative language teaching and learning at university: integrating informal learning into formal language education* (pp. 17-26). Research-publishing.net. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2018.22.772>
- Alfaki, I.M. (2015). *University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy*, Vol. No. 3. Pp. 40-5
- Al-Mukdad, S. (2019). *Investigating English academic writing problems encountered by arab international university students. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(3), 300-306. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tppls.0903.07>
- Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). *Explicit Instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. Guilford.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. A. (2022). *Introduction to research in education* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Atanacio-Blas, F., Meraña, M., F. Averion, R., Anne Badanoy, M., Lee De Leon, A., & Collene Ragudo, Y. (2018). *Articulated Difficulties of Grade 11 Students At Taytay Senior High School (Tshs) in English Proficiency. PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 1186–1202. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2018.33.11861202>
- Atashian, S., & Al-Bahri, K. (2018). *Towards Arab Students' Grammatical Errors in Academic Writing & their Perceptions*. *Arab World English Journal*, 1, 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/mec1.10>.
- Boltron, M. T., & Ramos, A. L. (2021). *Improving Beginning Reading Literacy through Marungko Approach. ASEAN Journal of Basic and Higher Education*, 5(1), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://paressu.org/online/index.php/aseanjbh/article/view/285>
- Callora, I. J. O., & Suñas, W. P. (2023). The Writing Competence of Senior High School Students in the Public Schools in Alamada, Cotabato. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 7(2), 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7646848>
- Deane, P. (2008). *Writing proficiency as a complex integrated skill*. ETS Research Report.

- Domantay, M. D., & Ramos, L. Q. (2018). *English Writing Performance of Grade 11 Students. Journal of Advanced Studies*, 1(December), 1–19.
- Department of Basic Education. (2019). Vote No. 14. ANNUAL Report 2018/2019. A 25 Year Review of progress in the basic education sector. Compiled by the: Department of Basic Education. Directorate: Research Coordination, Monitoring & Evaluation.
- DepEd Executive Committee | Department of Education. (n.d.). Retrieved March 3, 2023. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/D>
- Department of Education. (2016). *DepEd Memorandum No. 39, s. 2016: Adoption of the basic education research agenda*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Fareed, M., Ashraf A., and Bilal, M. (2016). *ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. Journal of Education and Social Sciences*. Vo. 4 (2): 81-92.
- Flores, R., & Smith, J. (2021). Enhancing descriptive writing through explicit vocabulary instruction: A classroom-based study. *Journal of Literacy and Language Education*, 8(2), 45–60.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Flower, Linda; Hayes, John R. (December 1981). "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing". *College Composition and Communication. National Council of Teachers of English*. 32 (4): 365–387. doi:10.2307/356600. JSTOR 356600.
- Fosnot, C.T. (2015). *Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, and Practice 2nd Edition*, New York, Teacher College Press. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Constructivism.html?id=rvnFQgAACAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Constructivism.html?id=rvnFQgAACAAJ&redir_esc=y)
- Graham, S. (2023). The sciences of reading and writing must become more fully integrated integrated. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 58(4), 711–727. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.520>
- Graham, S., Hebert, M., Sandbank, M., & Harris, K. R. (2023). Meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in grades 6–12. *Review of Educational Research*, 93(4), 548–593.
- Hacermida, G. A. L., & Aboy, I. G. (2021). The metacognitive strategies and writing competence of Grade 11 students in a Philippine public high school. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v4i2.352>

- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Adkins, M. (2020). Practice-based professional development and self-regulated strategy development for Tier 2, at-risk writers in second grade. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101846>
- Haryanti, & Sari, F. (2019). The Use of Genre Based Approach to Improve Writing Skill in Narrative Text at the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Ethika Palembang. *English Community Journal*, 280.
- Hattie, J. (2020). *Visible learning: Feedback*. Routledge.
- Hollingsworth, J. R., & Ybarra, S. E. (2009). *Explicit direct instruction (EDI): The power of the well-crafted, well-taught lesson*. Corwin Press.
- Huang, L., Chang, Y., Wu, F., & Huang, Y. (2020). Effects of a flipped classroom approach to teach evidence-based medicine to medical technology students: A quasi-experimental study. *BMC Medical Education*, 20, 1946.
- Huerta M and Garza T (2019) 'Writing in science: why, how, and for whom? A systematic literature review of 20 years of intervention research (1996–2016)', *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(3):533-570, doi:10.1007/s10648-019-09477-1.
- Hyland, K. (2022). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jaca, C. A., Jaluague, J., Lonoy, C., Mendoza, E. L., Mercado, R., & Sandimas, P. (2019). *Teachers' Perspectives on the Reading and Writing Subject of the Senior High School Curriculum*. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(6), 309–322.
- Jaca, C. A. L. (2026). Effects of generative AI-supported feedback on academic writing quality in senior secondary education. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 10(3), 372–380. <https://doi.org/10.55214/2576-8484.v10i3.12399>
- Jeong, S., Clyburn, J., Bhatia, N. S., McCourt, J., & Lemons, P. P. (2022). Student thinking in the professional development of college biology instructors: An analysis through the lens of sociocultural theory. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 21(2), ar30. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.21-01-0003>
- Keo, S. (2017). *What Are Reading & Writing Competencies?* Retrieved from <https://www.theclassroom.com/reading-writing-competencies-17564.html>
- Kim, Y.-S. G., Yang, D., Reyes, M., & Connor, C. (2021). Writing instruction improves students' writing differentially depending on instruction and child characteristics: A meta-analysis for primary grade students. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 100408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100408>

- Kim, S., & Park, J. (2020). Teaching text organization to improve coherence in student writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(6), 783–801. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819831405>
- Kirszner, L. G., & Mandell, S. R. (2020). *Patterns for college writing: A rhetorical reader and guide* (15th ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory, and applications*. Pergamon Institute of English.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Luizinho, R. N. (2020). Constructing First Additional Language learning: a content and thematic analysis of CAPS. MA Thesis. Stellenbosch. Stellenbosch University.
- Lunsford, A. A. (2019). *The St. Martin's handbook* (9th ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Magsambol, B. (2020). *Senior HighSchool Students Striuggle to Write In English Report. Rappler Philippines*. Retrieved from <https://www.rappler.com/nation/senior-high-school-students-find-hard-write-english> on October 8, 2021.
- Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society*, edited by C. W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Official Gazette. (2013). *Republic Act No. 10533: Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2017). *Introduction to academic writing* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Pablo, J. C. I., & Lasaten, R. C. S. (2018). *Writing difficulties and quality of academic essays of senior high school students*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4), 46-57.
- Payong, M. R.(2020). Zona Perkembangan Proksimal dan Pendidikan Berbasis Konstruktivisme Sosial Menurut Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky. 12(2), 164–178. <https://doi.org/10.36928/jpkm.v12i2.589>
- Pek, L. S., Mee, R. W. M., Shing, S. R., Theemas, D., & Nadarajan, N. T. M. (2019). *Strengthening tertiary students' writing skills through TREND model*. *Asian Journal of Contemporary Education*, 3(1), 65-71. Doi:10.18488/journal.137.2019.31.65.71
- Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2023). Implementing process-genre approach, feedback, and technology in L2 writing in higher education. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8, Article 34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00211-7>

- Philippines. Department of Education. (2021). *Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metrics 2019: National Report of the Philippines*. <https://neqmap.bangkok.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Southeast-Asia-Primary-Learning-Metrics-2019-National-Report-of-the-Philippines.pdf>
- Portillo-San Miguel, E. J. (2021). Writing difficulties encountered by Humanities and Social Sciences students in Philippine Politics and Governance. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 3(3), 156–167. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v3i3.656>
- Ramos, E.T. and Gatcho, A.R. (2020). *Common Writing Problems and Writing Attitudes among Freshman University Students in Online Environments: An Exploratory Study*. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*. Vol. 1 (1): 49-66
- Rashtchi, M. (2019). Scaffolding argumentative essay writing via reader-response approach: A case study. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 4(12). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-019-0078-2>
- Santangelo, T., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2021). Self-regulated strategy development: A framework for writing instruction that improves student outcomes. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 36(3), 222–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lrdp.12241>
- Sarmiento, J. P., & Dela Cruz, R. A. (2021). *Process Writing Approach in Enhancing High School Students' ESL Writing Competency*. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 51–62. [https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2021.4\(4\).06](https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2021.4(4).06)
- Sukesi, E., Emzir, & Akhadiyah, S. (2019). *Reading Habits, Grammatical Knowledge, Creative Thinking, And Attainment in Academic Writing: Evidence from Bengkulu University, Indonesia*. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(3), 176–192.
- Sumardi, HN. And Tarjana S. (2018). *Senior Highschool Students' Problems in Writing: A Preliminary Study of Implementing Writing E-Journal as Self-Assessment to Promote Students' Writing Skill*. 2nd English Language and Literature International Conference Proceedings. Vol 2.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Widya, S. O., & Wahyuni, I. (2018). *The Correlation Between Grammar Mastery and Writing Thesis Proposal at STKIP YDB Lubuk Alung*. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 5(2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.5.2.75-80.2018>
- Wijayanti, R. (2021). The role of mechanics and vocabulary in improving descriptive text writing. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 16(1), 23–35.

- Writing Skills of Senior High School Students: A basis for intervention program. (2024). *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 8(4), 2890–2894. RSIS International. <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/Digital-Library/volume-8-issue-4/2890-2894.pdf>
- Zhang, X. (2021). Collaborative writing in ESL classrooms: Insights from sociocultural theory. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(2), 173–181. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1202.02>
- Zheng, Y. (2020). Revisiting the cognitive process theory of writing: A review and application in EFL contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 13(6), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n6p1>
- Zhi., H. L. (2014). *A Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling*. PubMed, 105-11.