RESEARCH **Open Access**

The effect of reflection supported learning of writing on students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations

Taddese Deti[1*], Tekle Ferede[1] and Dagne Tiruneh[1]

*Correspondence:
detitaddese@gmail.com

[1] Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, P. O. Box 378, Jimma, Ethiopia

Abstract

This study investigates how reflection-supported learning of writing affects students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. First-year natural sciences students from Jimma University were study participants. In the study, a quasi-experimental design was used. Consequently, from 25 sections in the first year of natural sciences, two sections were selected using lottery method. A coin was flipped to assign them to the control and the experimental groups. In the study, a control group of 49 and an experimental group of 50 participants participated. A questionnaire was administered to both groups before and after treatment to measure writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. A one-way between groups Multivariate Analysis of Variance was calculated using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 24. The SPSS software was also used to calculate Paired samples t-test in determining the differences in mean scores within each group pre and posttreatment. There was a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the combined dependent variables, writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. Thus, reflection-supported learning of writing has a positive effect on students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. Hence, EFL instructors are called on to support their writing teaching with students' guided reflection on the pieces of writing that they produce.

Keywords: Writing attitude, Writing achievement goal orientation, Writing apprehension, Reflection-supported, Writing performance, Learning through reflection

Introduction

In language education, one of the learning goals is to improve students' writing skills. Writing is a skill that supplements other learning skills. Zen (2005), Barkaoui (2007) and Hidi and Poscolo (2006) point out that writing activities can be used to reinforce students' linguistic competencies, cognitive competencies, and sociocultural competencies. For example, teachers can reinforce vocabulary, speaking, listening, reading, and grammar skills through writing activities. By asking students to reflect on their prior experiences, attitudes, and feelings related to the materials presented in the classroom, teachers can reinforce students' cognitive competencies. Classroom activities that

include note-taking and summarizing main points from earlier presented speaking and listening instructions can enhance students' communication skills. Thus, to achieve academic success, students at all levels of education must develop effective writing skills.

Unlike other language skills, writing is a demanding skill for various reasons: It involves, for instance, complex practices such as phonology, morphology, semantics, and syntactic structure (Hussain, 2017; Rao, 2019). Also, while writing, we handle several activities simultaneously, such as composing ideas, expressing intentions, solving problems, translating and reviewing, selecting words, deciding how to argue, and deciding how to express ourselves (Bulqiyah et al., 2021; Al-Rawahi and Al-Balushi, 2015; Hapsari, 2018).

When students enroll in post-secondary schools, their academic expectations are changed. At these stages, understanding course materials and summarizing ideas is not enough. These stages should focus on exploring and analyzing ideas, making connections, and thinking about issues in novel ways (Horkoff & Mclean, 2015). To engage in these kinds of activities, students need writing skills. According to Defazio et al. (2010), although some students develop high writing proficiency, others struggle. Attitudes, motivation, teaching methods, study skills, materials used, etc. contribute to writing difficulty. Paker and Erarslan (2015) contend that if students have a positive attitude towards writing activities, they are eager to engage in every activity assigned to them by their teachers. They also take their own initiative to practice the skill within and outside the classroom. Students with high anxiety may not be motivated to participate in activities, and that results in weak writing performance. According to Zaid (2011), Sarkhoush (2013), and Abedianpour and Omidvari (2018), students with positive attitudes toward composition activities engage in those activities for sustained periods of time. On the other hand, students' success in writing depends on their engagement with writing activities for a sufficient amount of time. Paker and Erarslan (2015), as well as Jabali (2018), state that attitudes play a direct role in student writing achievement. This positive attitude can be sustained by teachers' supportive roles while teaching writing skills. Teachers should be able to design engaging tasks without making students feel pressured.

In addition to writing attitudes, writing performance is strongly affected by students' motivation. Motivation fosters engagement in composing tasks, which leads to more practice in learning activities. Süğümlüa and Çinpolatc (2019) maintain that students' level of motivation is a determinist factor regarding students' writing performance. As students' motivation to write involves the whole process of writing, it is crucial to turn their writing performance into a real product. Hidi and Bascolo (2006) state that motivation for writing can be broken down into two parts: having something to say, which connect to both their identity and their interests, and experiencing a liberated state in which they have a range of easier topics to choose from. As a result of teachers' diligent support and regular feedback, students are encouraged to write to this effect.

Being such a broad concept, it is difficult for researchers to analyze the various aspects of motivation (Hidi & Bascolo, 2007). In writing, four constructs of motivation were identified by MacArthur et al. (2016) namely self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations, beliefs, and affect. Based on the factor analysis they conducted, the authors identified self-efficacy and affect are single factors while goal orientation involves three factors mastery goal, performance approach goal, and goal avoidance. Belief involves two factors

namely content and convention. Among these factors, writing achievement goals orientations is the only factor examined in this study This is because the researchers believe that it is one of the factors that contribute significantly to students' writing motivation. As a guide for future behavior, a goal is an objective one commits to (Wigfield & Cambria, 2010). Writing motivation has been studied using achievement goal theory in three ways: mastery goal orientations that focus on gaining knowledge and competence, performance approach goal orientations that focus on appearing competent compared to others, and performance avoidance goal orientations that focus on avoiding others' adverse judgments (Ling, et al, 2021).

Statement of the problem

Learning through reflection which is not a new concept has a positive contribution (Dewey, 1909). According to Colemer et al. (2013) and Hyeler (2015) reflection is a process of exploring experiences to develop understanding and appreciation, is a fundamental feature of transformative learning. Learning through reflection is not only a question of acquiring knowledge or skills; but a matter of redevising the relationship between knowledge, practice, and experience. Through reflecting on values, attitudes, and emotions learners transform their understanding of the subject matter in order to construct their own knowledge or conception. Reflective learning can be a very interesting learning experience since it actively engages learners in the learning process, which also serves as a tool for self-assessment. By reflecting on what they have learned, students can improve and learn in depth. Students can document their learning process, which provides suggestions and references for future students. Therefore, this study examined the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on students' writing attitude and writing achievement goals orientations. Teachers who use a reflective approach to teaching enable students to participate in the meaning-making process (Xhaferi & Xhaferi, 2017).

Several studies have shown that students in higher education in Ethiopia are weak in their writing skills (Zeleke, 2017; Yelay, 2017; Mandefro et al., 2018; Habtamu, 2018; Surur & Dengela, 2019; Mulgeta, 2021). If students in higher academic institutions are not efficient at writing, they will face difficulties in their educational career since most of their assessments are conducted in the institutions through writing. On the other hand, students' awareness of their weaknesses negatively affects their attitudes toward writing. Students' inability to write effectively further harms their motivation, which in turn reduces their energy to actively participate in writing activities.

According to the researchers' observation, students avoid writing activities at all costs because they perceive writing as more difficult than other language skills. Teachers of English complain about students' reluctance to write. For example, if teachers ask students to compose something, they either ask others to do it for them or copy published materials.. Even those students who appear to do better than their peers in writing activities seem to engage in them only because their instructor asks them to do so. This indicates that learners are ineffective in their writing performance because of their negative attitudes toward writing activities. They also have difficulty setting goals to improve their writing skills. The researchers were therefore motivated to investigate

if reflection-supported learning of writing has any positive effect on students' writing attitudes and their writing achievement goal orientations.

So far, no studies have been conducted in this particular area in Ethiopia. A few studies conducted in the international context. Hemmati and Soltanpour (2012) for instance compared the effects of reflective portfolio writing and dialogue journal writing on Iranian EFL students' grammatical accuracy and overall writing abilities. However, unlike this study which assigned participants to two experimental groups randomly, the current study used participants in the intact group. Moreover, the current study included a control group. Hemmati and Soltanpour's study did not examine the effect of reflection on students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goals orientations. Abbas (2016) conducted a study on the effect of reflection-supported process-based teaching writing on Iraqi EFL students' writing performances and attitudes toward writing. The findings of the Abbas's study showed that participant students' writing performance and writing attitudes improved due to their reflection on the essays they wrote. Although this study is similar in that it examined the effect of reflection on students' writing attitude, it is different in its context and the variable writing achievement goal orientations that the present study took into account. Therfore earlier studies are different in context, focus, method, and data analysis approach from present research in that the current research uses reflection guideline phases which Abbas (2016) adapted from Gibb's (1988) model of the reflective cycle to get the treatment group participants to deliberately reflect on their written paragraphs to find out if their writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations were affected (see the reflection guideline from Appendix 3). The study specifically intended to:

1. investigate the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on students' writing attitude;
2. find out the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on students' writing achievements goal orientations.

Regarding the specific objectives of the research, the following research hypotheses were formulated.

1. There is a statistically significant difference in writing attitude between students who learn writing through a reflection-supported approach and those who learn writing through the conventional method;
2. There is a statistically significant difference in writing goal orientations between students who learn writing through a reflection-supported approach and those who learn writing through the conventional method.

Review of related literature

Writing competence

Writing in a foreign/second language is a demanding skill that needs critical effort both from students and teachers (Duong & Trang, 2021). As Rusinovci (2015) reports, students' writing performance was poorer when compared to their improvement in other

language skills. Their low performance may be attributed to the fact that writers are not only interested in putting their ideas on paper or other platforms during the writing activities, also need to keep in mind how well they communicate their ideas in a manner that allows them to address target audiences in terms of language use and content.

Hyland (2003) further argues that writing is a socio-cognitive endeavor that needs skills like planning and drafting in addition to knowledge of language, context, and audience. In order to address specific audiences effectively, students need to be familiar with audience information. Moreover, they need to have relevant knowledge of writing and vocabulary. They should also evaluate their finished work and the process through which they produce a piece of writing. Additionally, more precautions must be taken since writing is a formal activity compared to speaking. In addition to linguistic competencies, writing requires the socio-cultural and cognitive competencies of the writers to produce an efficient piece of written work (Anwar & Ahmed, 2016).

Writing attitude

Students' writing performance can be affected by the attitudes that they have toward writing activities. Abbas (2016) and Jabali (2018) assert that, when students develop positive attitudes towards language learning, they are better able to improve their writing performance because positive orientation towards the language increases students' self-confidence and self-esteem. Akhtar et al. (2020) believe that students' apprehension or negative attitude towards writing affects their writing performance. ESL students mostly perceive writing as an uninteresting and challenging task and want to avoid whenever possible. Hence, it is necessary that teachers devise activities which boost students' attitudes towards learning writing skills.

Writing achievement goal orientations

Othman and Suhqair (2013) and Surastina and Dedi (2018) assert that motivation correlates positively with success in English language learning. Motivated students are enthusiastic, keen to take learning assignments, focus on the tasks assigned to them, do not need regular incitement, happily confront learning challenges, play the role of motivating others, and facilitate collaborative learning (Othman & Shuqair, 2013). Hardere et al. (2007) argue as well that motivation is one of the most indisputable factors for students' success at school. Elias et al. (2010) insist that motivation influences students' engagement in learning tasks while positive engagement improves students' motivation.

Motivation can be explained from multiple dimensions. Academic goals which students set for learning of writing and other subjects are one of the many factors that affect their educational success (Dehghan & Rasamjoo, 2015; Soylu et al., 2017). Paul et al. (2021) argue that having different achievement goal orientations influence the use of self-regulation strategies in writing. The ability to acquire, accomplish, or display competence is known as goal orientation. It has an impact on how students approach learning, produce outcomes, and may also have an impact on how students behave in the classroom (Suprayogi et al., 2019).

Gafoor and Kurukkan (2015) assert that goal orientation is an inclination to demonstrate ability in an achievement-oriented context. Goal orientation affects students' cognitive strategies, affective responses, and achievement behavior. In most theoretical

approaches to educational settings, goal orientation is explained in terms of two perspectives, mastery orientation, and performance orientation. Pajares and Cheong (2003) and Geitz et al. (2015) suggest that instead of the least resistance approach of performance goal orientation, mastery goal orientation which represents students' acquiring materials and concepts, is more effective for deep learning.

Deghan and Razzmajoo (2015) point out those students with a mastery goal orientation tend to improve their knowledge and skills regarding the activities at hand. Those with performance goal orientations focus on outperforming others or are more cautious about completing tasks to avoid failure. Consequently, researchers sometimes categorize performance goal orientation into performance approach and performance goal avoidance. Students with performance goal avoidance try to hide their inability of doing something from others. Regarding writing achievement goal orientations, MacArthur et al. (2016) use a trichotomies model consisting of mastery, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals.

Constructivism and learning through reflection

The learning/teaching process is guided by a variety of assumptions. Constructivism is a theory of learning that explains how students acquire knowledge (Kouicem & Nachoua, 2016). Students learn by constructing meaning and understanding based on information presented to them and their prior experiences. To gain understanding, they must take responsibility for how they receive information and how they apply it and in order to dothis, they must reflect on previous experiences as well as newly acquired information. During the process of developing new knowledge, learners come across relevant information that they compare to their previous ideas or beliefs and, consequently change their beliefs or reject the updated information as irrelevant (Mugambi, 2018; Aljohani, 2017; Kouicem & Nachoua, 2016).

Olusegun (2015) argues that the assumption that teachers are sources of knowledge and transmit their knowledge to their students is no longer valid for constructivists. Through discovering and transforming information, by checking newly discovered information against the old and by revising rules when they are no longer applicable, students construct their own knowledge. Since constructivists view students as active agents in the process of acquiring knowledge, they advise the instructional developers that learning outcomes ought to emphasize the knowledge construction process. Furthermore, learning goals should be derived from authentic tasks with specific learning objectives. Learning is not a simple stimulus–response phenomenon but involves self-regulation by students and also the development of conceptual structure, deep reflection, and abstraction. Through reflection on their experiences, students develop their understanding and knowledge of the world. To positively influence students' attitude and writing achievement goal orientations, these assumptions about constructivism and reflection may be applied to the teaching of writing.

Constructivism theory views learning as an individual activity for a learner in the sense that an individual learner tries to sense all information they receive. They construct their own meaning from information based on their prior knowledge of the subject. The way a learner handles information is subjective. Learning takes place when students actively deduce and prove principles and rules. Problem solving is at the heart

of learning, thinking, and development. When people engage in problem solving and discover the significance of their actions through reflecting on experiences of the past and now, they can construct their own knowledge and profoundly understand what they have constructed (Juvova et al., 2015).

Thus, constructivism is a theory of knowledge and development through reflection. Learning through reflection and the constructivist paradigm are built on common basic assumptions about knowledge and learning: Both assume that ideas and actions are integral, interdependent, and critical to the learning process. In addition to this, both suggest that effective teaching strategies must actively engage learners in the learning process. Investigating personal beliefs, knowledge, and experiences are further critical elements of learning strategies. Questioning opinion, facilitating reconceptualization, and providing opportunities for experimentation and assessment are also necessary components of effective teaching. Since constructivism and reflection assume that learning starts with a personal desire to acquire knowledge, teachers need to activate students' interest.

As a result of constructivism and reflective practice, teaching strategies can ultimately lead to students' effective performance. Since the strategies reflect interpretations and assessments in a professional development setting, they facilitate the integration of theory and practice (Osterman, 1998).

Materials and methods
Research design and paradigm
The study adopted a quasi-experimental design. Two intact sections were selected from the first year Natural Sciences stream at Jimma University to become participants of the study. Post-positivism research paradigm was used in the hope that it would enable the researchers to establish the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing skills on students' writing attitude, and writing achievement goal orientations through the use of scientific methods. In addition, data collected from the study participants using questionnaires were quantitative.

Research context
Ethiopia is a nation in East Africa. The country has 11 regional states and two city administrations. One of the largest of them is the Oromiya regional state. Jimma Zone is located to the South West of the Oromiya regional state. Jimma University, which is a public university, is situated in Jimma town. The university is among the first generation universities in Ethiopia, teaching students in a variety of fields. The university has 7 colleges and an institute. Freshman students however are organized only in four streams which include Social Sciences, Social Sciences Teachers' Education, Natural Sciences, and Natural Sciences Teachers' Education. From these, students who were enrolled at Jimma University in the Natural Sciences Streams were selected using lottery method. Freshman students were purposely selected since Communicative English Language Skills-I is the course that is offered as a common course for all freshman entrants.

One of the objectives of the course is to enhance the first-year university students' English language skills, including writing effective paragraphs. Students are expected to listen to or read a variety of materials and by summarizing or responding to these materials, they write their own paragraphs. As part of Communicative English Language

Skills-I, students are also asked to relate their own personal experiences to the topics they have listened to or read. They are furthermore, advised to plan their paragraphs in advance in the course module and to gather information that they want to include in their paragraphs before they write their drafts. The course writers advise the students to edit and re-edit their paragraphs before they write their final drafts.

Data sources and study population

First- year students at Jimma University were population for the study. Of Ethiopia's 42 public universities, Jimma University was selected using the convenient sampling technique since one of the researchers works at Jimma College of Teachers Education which is close to the university and two researchers work at Jimma University itself. The researchers selected the Natural Sciences Stream through a lottery of the 4 freshman streams at Jimma University. A lottery was also drawn to select two from the total 25 sections in Jimma University Natural Sciences Stream. A coin was flipped to decide which section would be the experimental and which the control groups. There were 49 participants in the control group and 50 in the experimental group.

Data gathering instruments

To gather data about participants' writing attitude, a 30 item writing attitude questionnaire was adopted from Abbas (2016) see Appendix 1. The researcher used this questionnaire because it was among the recent writing attitude scales. The researchers felt also it was a more comprehensive scale for this study than other scales they came across. Study participants' writing achievement goal orientations were measured by 11 items adopted from MacArthur et al. (2016) writing motivation questionnaire see Appendix 2. The researchers decided to use it because it was one of the latest writing motivation scales. In addition to this, the questionnaire authors tested the scale's reliability but also conducted a factor analysis to further validate the motivation scale. Before using the questionnaires the researchers collected expert opinions on whether or not the items measure the full range of writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. The participants filled out the questionnaires both before and after the experiment.

A total of 99 students from both groups completed questionnaires on writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. Researchers instructed the participants to read all items carefully and indicate their responses based on their own experiences. Since the questionnaires were filled out in the classrooms, all copies were returned. Responses to items stated negatively, such as (I don't really like writing and whenever I'm writing, I try to hide how nervous I'm about writing), were reversed from 1 to 5, 4 to 2, and similarly, 5 to 1, 4 to 2, and 3 were retained, after which data was entered into SPSS software and cleaned…. A few missing values were identified and corrected by entering the mean score of the item whose value was missed before reliability testing was conducted. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated in SPSS to determine if the questionnaires for the study were reliable. The questionnaires were reliable at an alpha level 0.827, and 0.737 for writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations respectively. Pallant (2016) suggests that Cronbach's alpha result of a questionnaire should be above 0.7 for a study to be reliable and used as a data gathering tool. Thus, the questionnaires were reliable.

Experimental group training

The experimental group received 50 min of training on the reflection guideline adopted as a treatment for the study. The participants were informed of the importance of writing reflections on paragraphs that they wrote while taking the Communicative English Language skills I course. Later the researchers gave a reflection guideline sheet to each participant and asked them to read through all the points and encouraged them to figure out useful elements. Then, the researchers discussed the reflection guideline, by raising each point separately. The participants were invited to ask questions and give comments on the processes of writing learning through the reflection-supported approach. In response to the invitation, some participants asked questions while others provided constructive feedback. Afterwards the researchers cleared up confusion by answering all the study participants' questions.

Schedule for the study

The study participants had to attend the Communicative English Language Skills-I for 3 h per week. Eight weeks from the total 10 weeks assigned to the course were used by the researchers as a schedule to conduct the treatment. Within these 8 weeks, both the experimental and control group composed 6 paragraphs. All the writing topics were taken from the course module for Communicative English Language Skills-I. The groups were taught composing through the process approach in which participants were asked to plan their content, prepare the first draft, edit language, and content and finally write their final draft. The study experimental group participants wrote reflections on every paragraph they wrote using the reflection guideline at the end of their writing and submitted them with their paragraphs to the researchers. The control group however wrote only paragraphs but did not write reflections on the paragraphs. Both experimental and control groups were given 50 min to write each paragraph. Three paragraphs written by both groups were scored using a rubric adopted from Santa Cabrera et al. (2017), I to provide similar feedback for both groups. Prior to writing the next reflection, the researchers evaluated each participant's reflection and discussed the common mistakes they found regarding participants' reflections. Please see Appendix 4.

Data collection procedure

Data were collected from the study participants using writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientation questionnaires. The participants filled out the questionnaires pretreatment to find out if the experimental and control groups had similar mean scores for writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. For posttreatment data gathering, the procedures undertaken during pretreatment period were followed. The purpose of this was to determine whether there were any differences in the mean scores of the dependent variables in questions due to the experimental group being exposed to the reflection supported- learning of writing. During the treatment schedule, experimental group participants wrote their reflections according to Abbas' (2016) guidelines adapted from Gibb's (1988) reflective cycle model which the present researchers borrowed and applied.

Data analysis

The researchers collected quantitative data using questionnaires that needed statistical analysis. They used SPSS version 24 computer software to calculate inferential statistics. A one- way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed to test the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on the combined dependent variables namely: writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. This is because MANOVA provides better control of type I errors and allows simultaneous comparisons of two or more related dependent variables (Tabachnick et al., 2013). In addition to this, a paired samples t-test analysis was conducted to investigate the mean score differences before and after treatment for both dependent variables in the experimental and control groups. Means and standard deviations obtained from MANOVA and paired samples t-test outputs were also used to explain the study results.

Ethical considerations

Creswell (2012) and Marczy et al. (2005) argue that data gathering should be done ethically in a way that respects the rights of the study participants. Getting permission to collect data is not only a matter of consent; but also an issue of ethical practice. Participant privacy is ensured by assigning numbers rather than names to returned research instruments and keeping them confidential. As a result, the researchers informed the study participants of the purpose of the study and obtained their informed consent. The researchers have also obtained the approval of the Research Review Committee for Social Science and Humanities at Jimma University.

Results of the study

Data were collected before and after treatment. Data collected before the treatment was used to know if the control and the experimental groups were similar in their writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations and after treatment data were gathered to check out the aftermath of reflection-supported learning on students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations.

Pretreatment results

A one- way between groups Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was carried out to test the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. Preliminary assumptions testing were conducted to inspect normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliners, multicollinearity, and the homogeneity of variance matrices. No serious violations were noted.

The MANOVA analysis revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the control and experimental groups on the combined variables namely: writing attitude, writing self-efficacy, and writing achievement goal orientations. Wilks' Lambda $= .990, F(2, 96) = 500, p > .01$, partial eta.$= .010$ (Table 1). On the basis of the results, the two groups were comparable in terms of writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations.

ANOVA follow up was conducted separately on both dependent variables and no statistically significant difference was observed between the control and experimental groups. As shown in Table 2 writing attitude $F = (1, 97) = 0.313$, p $= 0.577$, eta partial

Table 1 Pretreatment multivariate test

Multivariate tests						
Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Groups						
Wilks' Lambda	.990	.500[a]	2.000	96.000	.608	.010

[a] Exact statistics

square = 0.003, and writing achievement goal orientations $F = (1, 97) = 0.716$, $p = 400$ partial eta square = 0.007 Hence, the control and experimental groups participants are corresponding in their writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations when inspected separately.

By the same token the mean score of writing attitude for the control group ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.546$) was matched with that of the experimental group ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.359$) and similarly the mean score of writing achievement goal orientations in the control group correspond ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.793$) to that of the experimental group ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.591$). Prior to the treatment, the experimental group and the control group had similar writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations (Table 3).

Posttreatment study results

MANOVA results

A one-way between groups Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed to test the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on the students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. Initial assumptions

Table 2 Pretreatment separate tests of dependent variables

Source	Tests of between-subjects effects						
	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig	Partial eta squared
Corrected Model	Writing Attitude	.067[a]	1	.067	.313	.577	.003
	Achievement goals	.349[b]	1	.349	.716	.400	.007
Intercept	Writing Attitude	1077.169	1	1077.169	5067.469	.000	.981
	Achievement goals	1099.072	1	1099.072	2255.050	.000	.959
Groups	Writing Attitude	.067	1	.067	.313	.577	.003
	Achievement goals	.349	1	.349	.716	.400	.007
Error	Writing Attitude	20.619	97	.213			
	Achievement goals	47.276	97	.487			
Total	Writing Attitude	1098.136	99				
	Achievement goals	1146.413	99				
Corrected Total	Writing Attitude	20.685	98				
	Achievement goals	47.625	98				

[a] R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = −.007)

[b] R Squared = .007 (Adjusted R Squared = −.003)

Table 3 Descriptive statistics

	Descriptive statistics			
	Groups	**Mean**	**Std. deviation**	**N**
Writing Attitude	Control Group	3.27	.546	49
	Experimental Group	3.32	.359	50
	Total	3.30	.459	99
Achievement goal	Control Group	3.39	.793	49
	Experimental Group	3.27	.591	50
	Total	3.33	.697	99

Table 4 Posttreatment multivariate test

Effect	Multivariate tests					
	Value	**F**	**Hypothesis df**	**Error df**	**Sig**	**Partial eta squared**
Groups						
Wilks' Lambda	.654	25.421[a]	2.000	96.000	.000	.346

[a] Exact statistics

Table 5 Posttreatment dependent variables separate test

Source	Tests of between-subjects effects						
	Dependent variable	**Type III sum of squares**	**Df**	**Mean square**	**F**	**Sig**	**Partial eta squared**
Corrected Model	Writing Attitude	5.436[a]	1	5.436	34.463	.000	.262
	Achievement goals	11.691[b]	1	11.691	36.019	.000	.271
Intercept	Writing Attitude	1265.453	1	1265.453	8023.443	.000	.988
	Achievement goals	1359.157	1	1359.157	4187.647	.000	.977
Groups	Writing Attitude	5.436	1	5.436	34.463	.000	.262
	Achievement goals	11.691	1	11.691	36.019	.000	.271
Error	Post Writing Attitude	15.299	97	.158			
	Achievement goals	31.483	97	.325			
Total	Writing Attitude	1287.993	99				
	achievement goals	1405.017	99				
Corrected Total	Writing Attitude	20.734	98				
	Achievement goals	43.173	98				

[a] R Squared = .262 (Adjusted R Squared = .255)

[b] R Squared = .271 (Adjusted R Squared = .263)

testing were conducted to examine normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliners, multicollinearity, and homogeneity of variance matrices. No serious violation was found.

The analysis of one-way between the groups MANOVA produced statistically significant differences between the control and the experimental groups on the combined dependent variables writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations (Wilks' Lambda = .654, F (2, 96) = 25.42, p < 0.001, partial eta square = 0.346) (Table 4). Based on

Table 6 Descriptive statistics

	Descriptive statistics			
	Groups	**Mean**	**Std. deviation**	**N**
Writing Attitude	Control Group	3.34	.447	49
	Experimental Group	3.81	.342	50
	Total	3.58	.460	99
Achievement Goals	Control Group	3.36	.581	49
	Experimental Group	4.05	.558	50
	Total	3.71	.664	99

Table 7 Experimental group paired samples statistics

		Paired samples statistics			
		Mean	**N**	**Std. deviation**	**Std. error mean**
Pair 1	Pre Writing Attitude	3.34	50	.479	.068
	Post Writing Attitude	3.82	50	.438	.062
Pair 2	Pre Achievement goal-	3.27	50	.591	.084
	Post Achievement goal	4.05	50	.558	.079

the result reflection-supported learning of writing has statistically significant effect on students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. Hence, the alternative hypotheses were accepted.

A follow up ANOVA adjusted to the Bonferroni method was conducted ($p = 0.01/2 = 0.005$) to test the two dependent variables separately. There were statistically significant differences between the control and the experimental groups with $F_{(1, 97)} = 34.463$, $p < .001$, eta partial square $= 0.262$ for writing attitude and the result of writing achievement goal orientations was also statistically significantly different with $F_{(1, 97)} = 36.019$, $p < 0.001$, partial eta square $= 0.271$. Consequently, it can be said that reflection-supported learning of writing has a positive effect on students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. The alternative hypotheses were therefore accepted (Table 5).

The mean score of writing attitude for the control group ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.447$) was significantly lower than that of the experimental group ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.342$). A similar assessment of writing achievement goal orientation revealed that the control group had a lower mean ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.581$) score than the experimental group ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 558$). Thus, it could be concluded that reflection-supported learning of writing enhances students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations (Table 6).

Paired samples t-test results

Based on the paired samples t-test results, there were statistically significant differences between pretreatment and posttreatment writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations for the experimental group. The pre-treatment score of the experimental group's writing attitude ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.479$) was substantially less than the post treatment score of writing attitude ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.438$) $t_{(49)} = -5.527$, $p < 0.01$ (two tailed)

Table 8 Experimental group paired samples t-test

		Paired samples test						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Paired differences								
		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pre Writing Attitude– post Writing Attitude	− .480	.614	.087	− .655	− .305		− 5.527	49	.000
Pair 2	Pre Achieve- ment goals Post Achieve- ment goal	− .776	.637	.090	− .957	− .595		− 8.613	49	.000

Table 9 Control group paired samples statistics

		Paired samples statistics			
		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	Pre writing Attitude	3.27	49	.546	.078
	Post Writing Attitude	3.34	49	.447	.064
Pair 2	Pre Achievement Goals	3.39	49	.793	.113
	Post Achievement Goals	3.36	49	.581	.083

see Tables 7 and 8. Similarly, the mean score of pretreatment of the experimental group in writing achievement goal orientations (M = 3.27, SD = 0.591) was to the great extent less than the posttreatment mean score of the experimental group (M = 4.05, SD = 0.558) t(49) = − 8.613, p < 0.01(two tailed).

The mean score difference of writing attitude was − 0.480 with a 95% confidence of interval ranging from lower − 0.655 to upper − 0.305. The eta square statistics 0.38 indicated large effect size. The mean score difference of writing achievement goal orientations on the other hand − .776 with a 95% confidence of interval ranging from the lower − .957 to upper − 0.595. The eta square statistics 0.60 indicated a large effect size. The hypotheses were therefore accepted (Table 8).

As with the experimental group, a paired samples t-test was conducted on two occasions to evaluate the mean score differences of the control group. Both groups filled out questionnaires before and after the treatment schedule was conducted for the experimental group. The mean value of writing attitude before taking the course (M = 3.27, SD = 0.546) was comparable with the mean score of writing attitude after taking the course (M = 3.34, SD = 0.447) t(48) = −707 p > 0.01 (two tailed) (Table 9) see also Table 10 below. The mean score of writing achievement goal orientations pre taking the course (M = 3.39, SD = 793) was proportionate with the mean score of the control group after taking the course (M = 3.36, SD = 0.581) t(48) = 207, p > 0.01(two tailed).

The mean score difference for writing attitude was − .068 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from the lower −.263 to upper .126. The mean score difference for writing achievement goal orientations was only 0.030 with a 95% confidence interval

Table 10 Control group paired samples t-test

		Paired Samples test								
		Paired differences						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pre writing Attitude– Post writing Attitude	− .068	.677	.097	− .263	.126		− .707	48	.483
Pair 2	Pre Achievement goals– Post Achievement goals	.030	1.002	.143	− .258	.318		.207	48	.837

ranging from the lower − .258 to upper 0.318, The alternative hypotheses were therefore accepted.

Discussion

The study's aim was to investigate the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. For the study to achieve its objectives, both control and experimental group participants were selected from the same cohort. Further, they were taught using the same method, similar materials and activities were used, received similar feedback, were taught by the same teacher, and were taught for an equal length of time. In addition to these, before intervention was conducted assessment of the participants regarding their writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations indicated participants in both groups were comparable.

According to the study results, there were statistically significant differences between the control and the experimental groups on the combined dependent variables: writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientation. Based on the findings reflection-supported learning of writing could improve students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. In addition to the MANOVA results, the paired sample t-test indicated that there were significant differences before and after treatment for the experimental group participants. In contrast based on the paired t-test conducted for the control group, there were no statistically significant difference in the test conducted in the two occasions regarding writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations.

From the questionnaires both group participants filled out before and after the treatment, it may be possible to argue: As for positive attitudes towards writing, the experimental group's mean score was considerably better than that of the control group while negative attitudes they had towards writing were significantly smaller. As an example, experimental group participants substantially exceeded the control group in their mean scores for seeing writing as an enjoyable task, feeling confident when writing assignments, writing ideas on their own, believing that they are competent writers, believing writing is their favorite language class, believing writing is an essential skill that they should master, believing putting their thoughts down on paper helps them to clarify their thinking, and thinking clearly about what they want regarding writing.

In contrast, the control group's mean score exceeded that of the experimental group's mean score in those participants in the control group: are not very interested in writing; they do not think writing is easy; they feel frustrated when writing; they are upset when engaging in writing activities so writing is not a necessary skill; do not enjoy completing assignments at school; dislike writing and are relieved when they finish any writing assignment; have difficulty organizing their thoughts when writing; avoid the task of writing whenever possible; cannot develop their ideas quickly when given a topic, do not possess a wide vocabulary; and cannot meet deadlines efficiently.

Scant studies have been conducted as to whether reflection- supported learning of writing has an effect on students' writing attitudes. Scholars however generally agree that students' positive attitudes towards writing are directly correlated with their writing performance while their negative attitudes are correlated with weak writing performance (Jabali, 2018; Parker & Erarslan, 2015). Abba's (2016) study indicates that the reflection-supported process approach of teaching writing skills has a positive effect on students' writing performance and writing attitude. The present study results also correspond with Abbas's study in that it found out that reflection-supported learning of writing has a positive contribution in helping students develop positive writing attitude.

In contrast to the control group, the experimental group's mean score on writing achievement goal orientation was significantly higher than that of the control group's mean score having specific goals they were pursuing. From the posttest, control group participants revealed that they were trying: to conceal they had difficulty writing; avoid being thought of as poor writers, and hiding their nervousness about writing.

These were contrary to the experimental group participants whose responses were opposite. Whenever they write, they try to: get a high grade in class; complete all assignments for class; want to become a better writer; persuade others by writing; organize their texts: and improve how they express their ideas. From the post-treatment assessment results, achievement goal orientation significantly changed for the experimental group participants Dehghan and Razmajoo (2015) believe that students' goal orientations towards writing have different influences on writing performance. Kucsera et al. (2011) also assert that the goals which a person sets have a profound effect on achievement goal orientation. Supporting students' learning of writing with their reflections is necessary to help them set better goals.

Though studies show that students' positive attitudes and setting desired achievement goals contribute to students' learning, this study's result adds to the existing literature that supporting students' writing learning with guided reflections significantly improves students' writing achievement goal orientations. The study's finding is also of interest as it provides relevant inputs to alleviate students' writing problems that are caused by students' negative writing attitudes and undesired writing achievement goal orientations. For curriculum designers and course writers, this study's finding gives valuable information regarding the effect of reflection–supported learning writing on students' writing attitudes and goal orientations. The study results also inspire researchers to conduct similar studies on reflection-supported writing learning and other skills. By having students reflect on every piece of writing they produce, English language teachers can help them transform their writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. This will lead to better writing performance. To this effect, students need regular feedback

from their teachers on their reflections since criticizing oneself can be both challenging and exciting.

Conclusion

The study examined the effect of reflection-supported learning of writing on students' writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations. According to the results, reflection-supported learning of writing positively affects university students' writing attitudes, such as seeing writing as an enjoyable task, feeling confident when completing writing assignments, seeing writing as an enjoyable task, believing that they are capable writers, believing writing to be an essential task and so on. In addition to these, the study results revealed reflection-supported learning of writing improved students' writing goal orientations, which include: getting a high grade, completing all assignments, organizing texts, persuading others by writing, etc.

It is important to note that this study was not without limitations. In this quasi-experimental design, the study participants were not randomly selected, so both groups may not be assumed perfectly equal. Because the study's paradigm did not allow participants to express their views in an open-ended way, the researchers were not able to triangulate quantitative and qualitative data. This article also lacks an exhaustive literature review of reflection supported-learning and concepts of writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn from the results the following recommendations have been made:

1. ELT in higher educations in Ethiopia are requested to support students' learning of writing with their deliberate reflections to improve their writing attitudes and writing achievement goal orientations.
2. Researchers are encouraged to follow this example and conduct further studies on reflection-supported learning of writing skills and other language skills.
3. As part of curriculum design, the Ministry of Education urged to use reflection-supported-learning of writing, as students in higher education must develop positive attitudes toward writing and set appropriate writing goals in order to be effective writers both in university and at work.
4. To enhance their attitude and goal orientations towards writing activities in higher education, students are requested to support their learning of writing by their reflections.

Appendix 1: Writing attitude scale

No.	Items	Scales				
		disagree Strongly (1)	Disagree (2)	Some what agree (3)	Agree (4)	Agree strongly (5)
1	I see writing as an enjoyable task					
2	I am not very interested in writing					
3	I work hard to do well on each writing assignment even if I don't like the topic					
4	I feel confident when I complete written assignments					
5	I write ideas of my own					
6	I do not think it is easy to write					
7	Writing is something that comes naturally to me					
8	I often feel frustrated writing and don't like doing it					
9	Most of the time I like writing and think that I am good at it					
10	I have an uneasy, upset feeling when I write					
11	Writing is my favorite language class					
12	I feel my heart beating fast when I have to write, especially for a graded assignment					
13	Writing is something that makes me happy					
14	Writing is not a necessary skill for me to know					
15	I am very interested in becoming a better writer					
16	I would never willingly choose to do a writing assignment at college					
17	Writing is an essential skill that I should master					
18	I dislike writing, and I am always relieved to finish any writing assignments					
19	Putting my thoughts down on paper helps me to straighten out my thinking					
20	I have difficulty organizing my ideas when I write					
21	Each time that I write, I know clearly what I want to accomplish					
22	I do not like to have other students read my papers					
23	I enjoy creative writing					
24	I avoid the task of writing whenever possible					
25	I can generate ideas to write about easily					
26	I cannot think of ideas rapidly when given a topic to write about					
27	I can easily use structures I have learned in my class accurately					
28	I cannot use a wide range of vocabulary in my compositions					
29	I can easily cover all the information that should be dealt with in a given topic					
30	I cannot manage my time efficiently to meet a dead Line on a piece of writing					

Appendix 2: Writing achievement goal orientation

No.	Items	Items scale				
		Almost never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Almost always
1	Whenever I am writing, I am trying to hide that I have hard time writing					
2	Whenever I am writing I am trying to avoid making mistakes in front of my classmates					
3	Whenever I am writing, I am trying to hide how nervous I am about writing					
4	Whenever I am writing I am trying to keep people from thinking I'm a poor writer					
5	Whenever I am writing, I am trying to get a good grade in the class					
6	Whenever I am writing I am trying to complete all the assignments for the class					
7	Whenever I am writing I am trying to pass the writing course					
8	Whenever am writing I am trying to become a better writer					
9	Whenever I am writing I am trying to persuade others with my writing					
10	Whenever I am writing I am I trying to better organize my ideas					
11	Whenever I am writing, I am trying to improve how I express my ideas					

Appendix 3: Reflection guideline

Phase No. 1

1.1   What was the topic and type of the writing text I was supposed to write on?
1.2   What was my personal aim for writing on this topic?

Phase No. 2

2.1   How did I feel during the process of writing?
2.2   How did I feel about the final version of my writing?.

Phase No. 3

3.1   How do I evaluate my writing performance?
3.2   What was well in my performance and what was not so well?

Phase No. 4

4.1   How did I do in each phase of writing separately?
4.2   What were the shortcomings of my performance in each phase?

Phase No. 5

5.1   Was my overall writing performance satisfactory?

5.2   What areas in my performance need to be improved?

Phase No. 6

6.1   What would I do differently if I were asked to write on the same topic again?

Appendix 4

The Writing Reflection Sheet

Phase No.1

1.1. What was the topic and type of the writing text I was supposed to write on?

...."Health and fitness." was the topic...

1.2. What was my personal aim for writing on this topic?

my personal aim for writing about this topic is to understand what I learned from the text that we read in a class room from the textbook.

Phase No.2

2.1 How did I feel during the process of writing?

After during the process of writing we felt satisfied more than we felt before on our writing performance.

2.2. How did I feel about the final version of my writing?.

our final version of writing was better than the previous one.

Phase No.3

3. 1 How do I evaluate my writing performance?

It was good: and we made a hopeful progress for the future

1.2 What was well in my performance and what was not so well?

The making our ideas coordinated was the good part that we did in our performance, and also our use of punctuation mark our grammar use was not well.

....
....

Phase No.4

4.1. How did I do in each phase of writing separately? (During outlining, drafting, editing and writing the final version/draft)

Durng outlining and drafting I felt like It was easy because we I did It with my friend. but

4.2 What were the shortcomings of my performance in each phase? (During outlining, drafting, editing and writing the final version/draft)

Shammat usage was the Short coming of our performance.

Phase No.5

5.1. Was my writing overall writing performance satisfactory?

Considering our past Performance on whiting Passage Individ we were good and it is Satisfactory.

5.2. What areas in my performance need to be improved?

we need to Improve on Shamar Part.

Phase No.6

6.1. What would I do differently if I were asked to write on the same topic again?

we will give more attention for the Shammar that we use in whiting Passage

Authors information
Taddese Deti is an EFL instructor at Jimma Teachers College. At present he is a Ph.D. candidate at Jimma University, Ethiopia. Dr. Tekle Ferede is an EFL instructor at Jimma University, Ethiopia. Many of his articles have been published in international journals. Dagne Tiruneh is an EFL instructor at Jimma University and has published many articles in international journals as well.

Author contributions
TD wrote the whole manuscript. TF was the main advisor while DT was the co-advisor.

Availability of data and materials
Provided up on request.

Declarations

Ethical approval and consent to participate
The researchers obtained the approval of the Research Review Committee for Social Sciences and Humanities at Jimma University.

Deti *et al. Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ.*   (2023) 8:29

Page 22 of 23

References

Abbas, S. H. (2016). The effect of reflection-supported process-based writing teaching on Iraqi EFL students' writing performance and attitude. *Arab World English Journal*. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no4.4

Abedianpour, S., & Omidvari, A. (2018). Brainstorming strategy and writing performance: Effects and attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 9*(5), 1084–1094.

Akhtar, R., Hassan, H., & Saidalvi, A. (2020). The effects of ESL student's attitude on academic writing apprehensions and academic writing challenges. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 24*(05), 5404–5412.

Al Othman, F. H., & Shuqair, K. M. (2013). The impact of motivation on English language learning in the gulf states. *International Journal of Higher Education, 2*(4), 123–130.

Aljohani, M. (2017). Principles of constructivism in foreign language teaching. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies, 7*(1), 97–107.

Al-Rawahi, N. M., & Al-Balushi, S. M. (2015). The effect of reflective science journal writing on students' self-regulated learning strategies. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 10*(3), 367–379.

Anwar, M., & Ahmed, N. (2016). Student difficulties in learning writing skills in second language. *Science International, 28*(4), 735–739.

Barkaoui, K. (2007). Teaching writing to second language learners: Insights from theory and research. *TESL Reporter, 40*, 14–14.

Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M. A., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: Tertiary students' perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 4*(1), 61–73. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i1.2371

Colomer, J., Pallisera, M., Fullana, J., Burriel, M. P., & Fernández, R. (2013). Reflective learning in higher education: A comparative analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*, 364–370.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative research and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Defazio, J., Jones, J., Tennant, F., & Hook, S. A. (2010). Academic literacy: The importance and impact of writing across the curriculum—A case study. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(2), 34–47.

Dehghan, F., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2015). Goal orientation in an EFL academic writing context. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(1), 149–162.

Dewey, J. (1909). *How we think*. Heath. https://books.google.com.et/books/about/How_We_Think.html?id=Shgdz wEACAAJ&redir_esc=y.

Duong, V., & Trang, N. (2021). Effects of extensive reading of EFL learners writing performance. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i5.3878

Elias, H., Noah, S. M., & Roslan, S. (2010). A proposed model of motivational influences on academic achievement with flow as the mediator. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 7*, 2–9.

Gafoor, K. A., & Abidha, K. (2015). Development of academic goal orientation inventory for senior secondary school students of Kerala. *Online Submission, 3*(1), 352–360.

Geitz, G., Brinke, D. J. T., & Kirschner, P. A. (2015). Goal orientation, deep learning, and sustainable feedback in higher business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business, 26*(4), 273–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2015. 1128375

Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods*. Oxford University Unit.

Habtamu, S. A. (2018). The practice of process approach in writing classes: Grade eleven learners of Jimma preparatory and Jimma University community preparatory school in focus. *International Journal of English and Literature, 9*(5), 39–49.

Hapsari, E. (2018). Second language instruction: A recent practice in Indonesia. *Journal of Linguistics and English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 24–48.

Hardré, P. L., Crowson, H. M., Debacker, T. K., & White, D. (2007). Predicting the academic motivation of rural high school students. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 75*(4), 247–269.

Helyer, R. (2015). Learning through reflection: The critical role of reflection in work-based learning (WBL). *Journal of Work-Applied Management, 7*(1), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-10-2015-003

Hemmati, F., & Soltanpour, F. (2012). A Comparison of the effects of reflective learning Portfolios and dialogue journal writing on Iranian EFL learners' accuracy in writing Performance. *English Language Teaching, 5*(11), 16–28.

Hidi, S., & Boscolo, P. (2006). Motivation and writing. *Handbook of Writing Research, 144*(157), 304–310.

Horkoff, T.(2015). *Writing for success*, 1st Canadian Edn. BCcampus. https://opentextbc.ca/writingforsuccess/.

Hussain, S. S. (2017). Teaching writing to second language learners: Bench-marking strategies for classroom. *Arab World English Journal*. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.15

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217–230.

Jabali, O. (2018). Students' attitudes towards EFL university writing: A case study at An-Najah National University, Palestine. *Heliyon, 4*(11)

Juvova, A., Chudy, S., Neumeister, P., Plischke, J., & Kvintova, J. (2015). Reflection of constructivist theories in current educational practice. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 3*(5), 345–349.

Kouicem, K., & Kelkoul, N. (2016). *Constructivist theories of Piaget and Vygotsky: General teaching implications*. http://dspace. univ-eloued.dz/bitstream/123456789/2775/1/Constructivist%20Theories%20of%20Piaget%20and%20Vygotsky.pdf.

Kucsera, J. V., Roberts, R., Walls, S., Walker, J., & Svinicki, M. (2011). Goal orientation towards teaching (GOTT) scale. *Teachers and Teaching, 17*(5), 597–610.

Ling, G., Elliot, N., Burstein, J. C., McCaffrey, D. F., MacArthur, C. A., & Holtzman, S. (2021). Writing motivation: A validation study of self-judgment and performance. *Assessing Writing, 48*,

MacArthur, C. A., Philippakos, Z. A., & Graham, S. (2016). A multicomponent measure of writing motivation with basic college writers. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 39*(1), 31–43.

Mandefro, F., Asnakech, D., & Alemayehu, N. (2018). Investigation of university students' writing problems: Two public universities in South West Ethiopia in focus. *International Journal of Sciences Basic and Applied Research, 42*(4), 83–95.

Marczyk, G. D., DeMatteo, D. D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of research design and methodology*. Wiely.

Mugambi, M. (2018). Linking constructivism theory to classroom practice. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 5*(9), 96–104.

Mulugeta, F. (2021). Addis Ababa University students' strategy use in a reading-to-writing Task. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education, 41*(1), 75–111.

Olusegun, B. (2015). Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching Learning. *Journal of Research Method in Education., 5*(6), 66–70.

Osterman, K. F. (1998). *Using constructivism and reflective practice to bridge the theory/practice gap*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED425518.pdf.

Pajares, F., & Cheong, Y. F. (2003). Achievement goal orientations in writing: A developmental perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research, 39*(4–5), 437–455.

Paker, T., & Erarslan, A. (2015). Attitudes of the preparatory class students towards the writing course and their attitude–success relationship in writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 11*(2), 1–11.

Pallant, J. (2016). *Spss survival manual (6 uppl.)*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Paul, N., Lin, T. J., Ha, S. Y., Chen, J., & Newell, G. E. (2021). The role of achievement goal orientations in the relationships between high school students' anxiety, self-efficacy, and perceived use of revision strategies in argumentative writing. *Journal of Writing Research, 12*(3), 657–684.

Rao, P. S. (2019). Teaching of writing skills to foreign or second language learners of English. *ELT Vibes: International E-Journal for Research in ELT, 5*(2), 136–152.

Rusinovci, X. (2015). Teaching writing through process-genre based approach. *US-China Education Review, 5*(10), 699–705.

Santa Cabrera, J. R., Castillo, P., & Jimenez, J. (2017). Implementing rubrics to assess writing skills in an adults advanced EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Class at ICDA (Instituto Cultural Dominico Americano). *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies, 20*(2), 681–710.

Sarkhoush, H. (2013). Relationship among Iranian EFL learners' self-efficacy in writing, attitude towards writing, writing apprehension and writing performance. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 4*(5). https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.1126-1132.

Süğümlü, Ü., Mutlu, H. H., & Çinpolat, E. (2019). Relationship between writing motivation levels and writing skills among secondary school students. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 11*(5), 487–492.

Suprayogi, M. N., Ratriana, L., & Wulandari, A. P. J. (2019). The interplay of academic efficacy and goal orientation toward academic achievement. In *Journal of physics: Conference series* (Vol. 1175, No. 1, p. 012132). IOP Publishing.

Surastina, & Dedi, F. S. O. (2018). Examining academic writing motivation of prospective Indonesian language teachers using exploratory factor analysis. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(2), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1122a

Surur, A. N., & Dengela, S. T. (2019). The relationship between writing anxiety and students' writing performance at Wolkite University first-year English major students. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, *4*(6).

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Wigfield, A., & Cambria, J. (2010). Students' achievement values, goal orientations, and interest: Definitions, development, and relations to achievement outcomes. *Developmental Review, 30*(1), 1–35.

Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi, G. (2017). Enhancing learning through reflection: A case study of SEEU. *Seeu Review, 12*(1), 53–68.

Yelay, B. (2017). Assessment of the qualities of academic writing in senior essays of English graduates: The case of Dire Dawa University. *International Journal of English and Literature, 8*(8), 102–114.

Yilmaz Soylu, M., Zeleny, M. G., Zhao, R., Bruning, R. H., Dempsey, M. S., & Kauffman, D. F. (2017). Secondary students' writing achievement goals: Assessing the mediating effects of mastery and performance goals on writing self-efficacy, affect, and writing achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1406. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01406

Zaid, M. (2011). Effectiveness of organized e-mail exchanges and online reading/writing on college students' literacy development and their attitudes towards English: A study from Saudi Arabia. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly 13*(1).

Zeleke, A. (2017). Ethiopia public university entrants writing skill s in English language: The case of Hawasa University entrants. *International Journal of Development Research, 7*(09), 15089–15092.

Zen, D. (2005). Teaching ESL/EFL writing beyond language skills. Online Submission.

Publisher's Note