

## Effectiveness of guided writing in responding simple questions in daily life at 4<sup>th</sup> grade elementary students

Muhammad Andriana Gaffar, Wahyu Satya Gumelar, Nesyza Nurdiyani Syafitri\*

Universitas Islam Nusantara, Indonesia

**Submitted:**  
17-04-2025

**Accepted:**  
23-05-2025

**Published:**  
24-05-2025

**Abstract:** This study delves into the effectiveness of guided writing in enhancing fourth-grade students' ability to respond to simple questions in daily life contexts. Using a pre-experimental design with a one-group pre-test and post-test, the research was carried out at an elementary school in Pameungpeuk Bandung with 42 participants. The results demonstrated a significant improvement in students' writing skills. In the post-test, 21.4% of students reached an excellent classification, and 45.2% achieved a reasonable classification, a marked improvement from the pre-test, where none had done so. Students also showed better grammatical accuracy, sentence organization, vocabulary use, and confidence in writing. Guided writing emerged as a practical instructional approach, equipping young learners with the tools to strengthen their grammar, coherence, and motivation in writing. These findings underscore the practical implications of structured writing instruction, which can significantly enhance students' ability to communicate effectively in written English and it begins with effectively respond to simple questions in daily life.

**Keywords:** Grammar, guided writing, sentence coherence, writing skills

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini mengkaji efektivitas penulisan terbimbing dalam meningkatkan kemampuan siswa kelas empat sekolah dasar dalam merespons pertanyaan-pertanyaan sederhana dalam konteks kehidupan sehari-hari. Dengan menggunakan desain pra-eksperimental satu kelompok *pre-test* dan *post-test*, penelitian ini dilaksanakan di salah satu sekolah dasar di Pameungpeuk, Bandung, dengan jumlah partisipan sebanyak 42 siswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya peningkatan yang signifikan dalam keterampilan menulis siswa. Pada *post-test*, sebanyak 21,4% siswa mencapai klasifikasi sangat baik dan 45,2% mencapai klasifikasi cukup baik, peningkatan yang mencolok dibandingkan dengan hasil *pre-test*, di mana tidak ada siswa yang mencapai klasifikasi tersebut. Siswa juga menunjukkan peningkatan dalam akurasi gramatikal, organisasi kalimat, penggunaan kosakata, serta rasa percaya diri dalam menulis. Penulisan terbimbing terbukti menjadi pendekatan instruksional yang efektif, karena membekali peserta didik dengan keterampilan untuk meningkatkan tata bahasa, koherensi, dan motivasi dalam menulis. Temuan ini menegaskan pentingnya penerapan pembelajaran menulis yang terstruktur untuk secara signifikan meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam berkomunikasi secara tertulis dalam bahasa Inggris, dimulai dari kemampuan mereka dalam merespons pertanyaan sederhana dalam kehidupan sehari-hari secara efektif.

**Kata kunci:** Grammar, penulisan terbimbing, koherensi kalimat, keterampilan menulis

This is an  
open access  
article under  
the CC-BY-SA  
license



\*Corresponding author: [nesyzasyasya@gmail.com](mailto:nesyzasyasya@gmail.com)

## INTRODUCTION

Writing in English is a fundamental language skill with broad applications across educational, communicative, and professional domains (Purba et al., 2023; Rohmi & Wahyuni, 2024; Zekarias, 2023). It serves as a primary medium for expressing ideas and enhancing clarity in speech, presentations, and written interactions (Rashid et al., 2021; Yoel & Wibowo, 2023). Proficiency in writing not only strengthens students' overall language competence but also equips them with critical communication skills essential for academic success, professional growth, and effective engagement in an increasingly

interconnected global society (Husain et al., 2021; Husna & Isna, 2024; Sahmadan & Hasan, 2023; Saputra, 2023).

Moreover, the teaching and learning process encompasses multiple interacting factors as students strive to achieve their goals and integrate new knowledge, skills, and behaviors thus broadening their learning opportunities (Gaffar et al., 2024; Setyantoko et al., 2023). Writing also functions as a bridge for students to express their thoughts. The teaching English to children at a young age is an effective method for them to comprehend and apply the English language (Widyawati et al., 2024). Despite its importance, achieving writing proficiency requires consistent practice and guided instruction to effectively develop the necessary skills (Afrezah et al., 2024; Gaffar et al., 2025; Setiyorini et al., 2020).

Grammar mastery, as a core component of language acquisition, plays a crucial role in students' writing abilities (Sacal & Potane, 2023). Grammar facilitates the understanding of word forms, syntactic functions, and punctuation usage essential elements for constructing coherent sentences and paragraphs (Saengboon, 2022; Umukoro & Odey, 2020). For Indonesian elementary school students, common challenges include constructing grammatically correct sentences and understanding English syntactic rules (Perlin et al., 2021). These difficulties often stem from limited exposure to English and insufficient emphasis on foundational grammar concepts in early learning stages (Kitila et al., 2023). Grammar proficiency, particularly in constructing basic sentences, enables students to produce accurate and meaningful responses to both written and oral prompts (Mukarromah & Suryanto, 2022; Rezi & Al Hafizh, 2020).

Accordingly, effective grammar instruction not only enhances students' writing skills but also fosters their confidence and motivation to engage in English learning actively. Guided writing, as a structured instructional approach, effectively addresses these challenges. This pedagogical method involves step-by-step teacher support, enabling students to develop their writing skills gradually. The effectiveness of the techniques and strategies employed during the learning process significantly influences educational quality (Ruswandi et al., 2023). In other words, educators with a comprehensive understanding and careful planning are more likely to ensure the success of their instructional methods.

Through guided writing, students gain confidence in applying grammatical rules, such as the use of the simple present tense, which is essential for describing habitual actions, universal truths, and states of being (Listia & Febriyanti, 2020). Grasping the syntax of a language is essential for both understanding and expression (Ismahani et al., 2024). By fostering a structured learning environment, guided writing enhances both grammatical accuracy and students' ability to communicate their ideas effectively.

However, observations in elementary classrooms implementing the Merdeka curriculum reveal significant challenges in grammar comprehension. Common errors include the omission of -s/-es in verb conjugation, incorrect pluralization, and misapplication of auxiliary verbs (Guswita, 2024). These difficulties indicate incomplete mastery of basic, simple present tense rules, which may hinder students' ability to construct meaningful responses to simple questions in daily life. Studies highlight that omission errors are persistent, suggesting students struggle to understand the grammatical rules underlying the use of "to be" and verb suffixes in the simple present tense (Agustina et al., 2024). The issue of university students having low English grammar skills despite years of prior study is complex and has several potential factors (Prihatini et al., 2024). Addressing

these issues requires targeted intervention, such as guided writing, which teachers can start making a habit of as early as possible. Responding simple questions in daily life is one method.

A structured grammar-focused approach is essential, with special attention to subject-verb agreement and appropriate use of auxiliary verbs (Gumelar & Bangkit, 2024). As found in Rohana and Harahap (2022), junior high school students, writes “My father buy a new car,” which should be “My father buys a new car,” this is an error in answering the question with the correct word order. This approach not only reinforces grammatical accuracy but also encourages active student engagement and self-reflection, ultimately enhancing their ability to compose contextually appropriate responses.

Specific presentation and organizational techniques help students articulate their ideas clearly and effectively. Furthermore, Nation (2009) emphasizes the need for writing instruction to include diverse practical uses, such as filling out forms, making lists, composing friendly and business letters, taking notes, and academic writing. These functions fall under “writing to learn.” In fact, writing to learn and learning to write are interdependent processes. Writing is not merely a technical skill but a cognitive process involving planning, evaluating, and revising (Graham & Perin, 2007). This process encourages critical thinking and problem-solving skills essential for academic and personal success.

As Raimes (1983) states, guided writing serves as a progression from controlled writing, where guided composition is viewed as an extension of controlled composition. This approach aligns with Vygotsky’s Social Constructivist Theory, which emphasizes scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to enhance learning. According to Kozulin et al. (2003), learning is most effective when “more knowledgeable peers,” such as teachers or classmates, provide guidance during tasks that students cannot yet complete independently. Guided writing exemplifies this concept by breaking the writing process into manageable and structured steps, supporting students in developing grammar, vocabulary, and sentence construction skills.

Similarly, the sociocultural model described by Sabbah (2021) underscores that the development of effective writing relies on applying “appropriate” methodologies, where teachers not only support students as writers but also shape the writing process itself. This idea complements the structured nature of guided writing by reinforcing that teachers actively shape students’ writing journeys through targeted support. At the same time, this perspective highlights how guided writing and structured methodology empower students to transition from supported learning to independent writing, ultimately building their confidence and competence as writers.

According to Rusdin (2022), and Mulyati et al. (2024), students who struggle with the simple present tense are not limited to younger students; they can also struggle at higher educational levels. This proves that there are also many mistakes when answering simple questions in daily life. This skill involves understanding the context of the question, applying appropriate grammatical rules, and constructing clear and meaningful responses. Furthermore, the conversational aspect of writing conferences fosters a supportive learning environment for students, enhancing their metacognitive awareness of the writing process while also contributing to their writer identity development (Graham & Perin, 2007). For fourth-grade students, this often entails mastering the simple present tense, commonly

used to describe routines, preferences, and facts. Developing this skill requires not only understanding grammatical structures such as the use of auxiliary verbs (e.g., “do,” “have”) and verb suffixes (e.g., “-s” for third-person singular) but also applying them appropriately in context.

## METHOD

### Research design

The researcher employed quantitative research. In Quantitative research, the method used is pre-experimental design. According to Creswell (2014), pre-experimental designs involve a single group being studied and an intervention being given during the experiment; there is no control group in this design with which to compare the experimental group. In this experiment, the subject receives a treatment of some kind, after which the results are measured. Here is a table showing the design of the of the one group pre-test – post-test.

Table 1. One-group pre-test - post-test design

Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
O <sub>1</sub>	X	O <sub>2</sub>

Which are:

O<sub>1</sub> is pre-test

X is treatment

O<sub>2</sub> is post-test

### Research participant and sample

This research’s population was the fourth-grade students at an elementary school in Pameungpeuk Bandung, consisting of 42 students. The term used for quantitative sampling is purposeful sampling, where researchers deliberately choose individuals and locations to gain insight into or comprehend the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2012). The criterion for selecting participants and sites is their potential to provide rich and valuable information (Patton, 2002). The researcher opted for this technique as it was deemed suitable for application in a single class. The class was subjected to a pre-test prior to the implementation of the Guided writing treatment and a post-test following its completion, with the objective of evaluating the learning outcomes achieved through the intervention.

### Research instrument

An instrument is a tool used to measure, observe, or record quantitative data. Quantitative research seeks to test the influence of the independent variable on the outcome or dependent variable. This test is conducted based on prior research findings that suggest the existence of such a relationship (Creswell, 2012). The study employed pre-test and post-test methods to assess the effectiveness of guided writing in helping fourth-grade elementary students respond to simple questions in daily life. These assessments were administered before and after the instructional intervention to evaluate changes in students’ writing abilities and overall learning outcomes. The testing process was conducted twice: initially to measure baseline performance (pre-test) and subsequently to assess progress following the guided writing instruction (post-test).

The assessment in this study follows the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) A1 and A2 levels to evaluate students' writing performance. These levels were chosen because they align with the writing abilities of 4th-grade elementary students who are developing their basic English skills (Council of Europe, 2020). CEFR provides a structured approach to language assessment, making it a widely recognized and standardized framework.

The A1 level focuses on students' ability to write simple sentences using basic vocabulary and familiar topics, while the A2 level emphasizes writing coherent short texts with improved grammatical accuracy. Since this study measures students' ability to respond to simple questions in daily-life contexts using the simple present tense, these levels provide clear and relevant assessment criteria. The rubric evaluates students based on key aspects of writing, including grammar, response accuracy, organization, vocabulary use, completeness, and spelling.

The decision to use CEFR A1 and A2 levels ensures that students are assessed fairly and appropriately for their language development stage. Higher levels, such as B1 or B2, require more advanced writing skills, such as paragraph development and complex grammar, which may be beyond the capabilities of young learners. Therefore, using CEFR A1-A2 criteria allows for a more practical, structured, and objective evaluation of students' guided writing skills as described in this Table 2.

Table 2. Scoring rubric

Criteria	A2	A1+	A1	Below A1
Grammar & Tense Usage	Uses the simple present tense consistently, with few errors in auxiliary verbs and verb endings.	Uses the simple present tense correctly in most cases, with minor mistakes in verb forms.	Frequent errors in simple present tense, affecting clarity.	Very limited grasp of simple present tense, making responses difficult to understand.
Response Accuracy	Fully answers the question with a clear and complete response.	Answers the question but may lack clarity or completeness.	Partially answers the question, missing key information.	Does not properly address the question or response is unclear.
Organization & Coherence	Sentences are logically connected, forming a clear and structured response.	Responses are somewhat connected but may be repetitive or slightly unclear.	Some ideas are present but lack proper connection.	Ideas are disorganized, making it hard to follow.
Vocabulary & Context	Uses a range of basic vocabulary correctly and	Uses basic vocabulary correctly but has occasional	Uses very simple vocabulary, sometimes	Limited vocabulary, making

	appropriately for daily-life contexts.	awkward wording.	inappropriate or unclear.	responses hard to understand.
Completeness of Response	Provides a full response with relevant details and examples.	Provides an adequate response with some detail.	Gives minimal response, lacking key parts.	Gives incomplete or one-word responses.
Spelling & Punctuation	No spelling or punctuation errors.	Few minor errors that do not affect meaning.	Some errors that slightly affect readability.	Frequent errors, making it difficult to understand.

In this study, the researcher employs construct validity to evaluate the scale based Rohmi and Wahyuni (2024) on theoretically derived hypotheses regarding the underlying concept or construct. This evaluation includes analysing the relationship between the scale and other constructs, both similar ones to assess convergent validity and dissimilar ones to assess discriminant validity. Additionally, internal consistency is used to measure the extent to which the items in the scale reflect the same underlying concept and are well-correlated with each other. This consistency is assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, a reliable measure that ensures the average correlation among scale items, ranging from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating stronger reliability. The result of reliability in this study can be seen in this table:

Table 3. Result of reliability

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.889	0.895	16

The reliability analysis in this study was conducted using SPSS 27, employing Cronbach's alpha to assess internal consistency. The analysis yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.895 with 16 items, indicating good reliability. According to Pallant (2020), and Nasir et al. (2024) suggests a minimum acceptable reliability level of 0.7. This suggests that the items within the scale are correlated and consistently measure the same underlying construct. The results confirm that the instrument used in this study is reliable. Thus, the scale can be considered suitable for measuring the intended concept with consistency and accuracy.

Table 4. Grading Scale

Total Score	CEFR Level	Performance Level
57-64	A2 (Good Control)	Excellent
45-56	A1+ (Developing Control)	Good
30-44	A1 (Basic Control)	Satisfactory
0-29	Below A1 (Limited Control)	Needs Improvement

## Data analysis

The study analyses the results derived from the data collected during the research process. Researchers employ statistical methods to manage the data effectively. The data was exclusively gathered from the experimental group. Subsequently, the impact of the administered treatment will be evaluated using the Paired Sample t-test for data analysis and hypothesis testing. However, it is essential to conduct preliminary assessments, such as normality tests, prior to performing the t-test. To assess the theory, researchers develop purpose statements, research questions, and hypotheses that further clarify the anticipated relationships (Creswell, 2012). This study aimed to evaluate the hypothesis regarding the effectiveness of guided writing in helping fourth-grade elementary students respond to simple questions encountered in daily life.

In this study, the Shapiro-Wilk test, a method considered more accurate for small sample sizes (less than 50 participants), ensured the accuracy of the statistical analysis. This test, which evaluates whether the distribution of pre-test and post-test scores follows a normal distribution, was conducted using SPSS version 27, with a significance level of 0.05. The meticulousness of this procedure aligns the statistical analysis with the distribution characteristics of the data, providing reliable and accurate results for the study.

The effectiveness of guided writing in improving students' ability to respond to simple questions was determined using the Paired Sample t-test. This parametric statistical test, which compares the means of two related groups to identify statistically significant differences, is instrumental in evaluating the effect of an intervention in a pre-test and post-test design. The findings of this test play a crucial role in determining the potential impact of guided writing on educational interventions.

The test works by calculating the difference between each pair of observations and analysing whether the average of these differences is significantly different from zero. The analysis was conducted using SPSS version 27. Before applying the Paired Sample t-test, a normality test using the Shapiro-Wilk test was performed to ensure that the assumption of normality was met. The significance level was set at 0.05. If the p-value from the Paired Sample t-test was less than 0.05, it indicated a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores, suggesting that guided writing had a positive effect.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Result

The researcher analyzed the students' performance before and after the intervention. The pre-test scores as can be observed on table 5 below; ranged from 5 to 39, with an average of 23.69 and a standard deviation of 8.044, indicating noticeable variation in initial student performance. In contrast, the post-test scores showed a significant improvement, ranging from 20 to 62, with a mean of 47.26 and a standard deviation of 10.465.

Table 5. Descriptive statistic

Test	N	Range	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	42	34	5	39	995	23.69	8.044
Post-test	42	42	20	62	1985	47.26	10.465

These results indicate that students entered the study with varying levels of proficiency but, overall, demonstrated marked progress in their post-test scores. The increase in both the minimum and maximum scores reflects a positive trend on their learning outcomes. The higher standard deviation in the post-test also implies that while most students improved, the degree of improvement varied among individuals. This upward shift in scores supports the conclusion that the applied instructional approach had a beneficial impact on student performance.

Table 6. Frequency the percentage of pre-test and post-test

No	Score	Classification	Pre-test		Post-test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	57-64	-	-	9	21.4%
2	Good	45-56	-	-	19	45.2%
3	Satisfactory	30-44	7	16.7%	12	28.6%
4	Needs Improvement	0-29	35	83.3%	2	4.8%

Table 6 presents the results of the pre-test and post-test in writing proficiency. In the pre-test, no students achieved an excellent classification; however, this number significantly increased to 9 students (21.4%) in the post-test. Similarly, the good classification saw a notable rise, with 19 students (45.2%) reaching this level in the post-test, demonstrating a strong improvement from pre-test, where no students were in this category.

Meanwhile, the satisfactory classification increased from 7 students (16.7%) in the pre-test to 12 students (28.6%) in the post-test, indicating further progress. Most notably, the number of students in the needs improvement category drastically declined from 35 students (83.3%) in the pre-test to just 2 students (4.8%) in the post-test.

Table 7. Test of normality

Shapiro-Wilk			
	Statistic	df.	Sig.
Difference in post-test and pre-test	0.964	42	0.209

Table 7 displays the result of the normality test. Prior to conducting hypothesis testing, the normality test is performed to ascertain whether the collected data indicates that the data is normally distributed. Using SPSS version 27 for Windows, the Shapiro-Wilk test formula is used in this study to evaluate normality. If the significance value (Sig.) is greater than 0.05, the data is considered normally distributed in accordance with the criteria established for this normality test. On the other hand, the data is regarded as deviating from normalcy if the significance value (Sig.) is less than 0.05.

Table 8. Paired samples test

		Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-test - Post-test	-23.571	10.369	-14.732	41	0.000



The statistical analysis shows a meaningful difference between pre-test and post-test scores, confirming that guided writing effectively enhances students' ability to construct responses. A hypothesis is considered accepted if the significance value (p-value) is lower than 0.05. In this case, the p-value is 0.000, which is well below the threshold, supporting the conclusion that the intervention had a statistically significant effect on students' writing performance. These findings are significant and worth the attention of educators, researchers, and stakeholders in the field.

This hypothesis test aims to determine whether the guided writing approach impacts students' ability to respond to simple questions in daily life. It assesses this by comparing students' performance before and after receiving the treatment. The results indicate a significant improvement in students' writing skills following the intervention.

Table 9. Result achievement test in post-test

Statement	A2	A1+	A1	Below A1
What does your father/mother do?	26.2	59.5	7.1	7.1
What time do you wake up on weekdays?	33.3	52.4	9.5	4.8
What do you like to do after school?	40.5	40.5	11.9	7.1
How do you feel when you go to school?	45.2	28.6	7.1	19.0
What do you do when you feel happy?	42.9	33.3	4.8	19.0
What do you eat for lunch every day?	31.0	45.2	14.3	9.5
How do you go to school?	52.4	23.8	16.7	7.1
Where do you usually play with your friends?	23.8	38.1	19.0	19.0
What does your best friend like to do in their free time?	26.2	19.0	47.6	7.1
What do you do when you visit your grandparents?	33.3	31.0	33.3	2.4
How do you help your parents at home?	40.5	33.3	16.7	9.5
My father (wake) up early every morning.	73.8	9.5	0.0	16.7
She (like) to read storybooks before bed.	66.7	4.8	4.8	23.8
We (go) to the park every Sunday.	61.9	7.1	0.0	31.0
He (watch) cartoons on weekends.	54.8	9.5	0.0	35.7
My teacher (teach) us new things every day.	52.4	11.9	2.4	33.3
Average	45.2	29.3	11.0	14.5

Based on the post test results in Table 9, students with an A2 score saw an excellent increase, with 45.2% of them receiving a score with the CEFL Level category that included good control and a performance level that could be considered excellent. Students with an A1+ score produced 29.3% results with a CEFL Level that included developing control and a good performance level, followed by an A1 score of 11.0% with a CEFL Level that included basic control and a satisfactory performance level. The final student with a score below A1 received 14.5% with CEFL Level, which could be classified as having limited control and a performance level that requires improvement.

Focusing on research findings and data analysis utilizing one group pre-test and post-test, we found that the pre-test was conducted at the beginning of the class to assess students' skills before treatment. Most students scored low, and some were satisfactory, but none were good or excellent. Common error in basic words, basic sentences with limited

detailed, short and incomplete answers and frequent error included lack of vocabulary such as the question "What does your father/mother do?." Most students answered that just "Father mployee, mother housewaif," which should be written "My father is an employee and my mother is a housewife" or "I father driver," this should be written "My father is a driver."

However, most of the mistakes also occurred in the question, "What time do you wake up on weekdays?" The students answered that "06.00" should be written, "I wake up at 6 o'clock on the weekdays." Many simple questions asked are answered to with only one word. Another result similar to the question "What do you eat for lunch every day?," the students answered "Rais." That should be, "I eat rice for lunch every day." This is the reason, why no one has a good or excellent score. The pre-test results indicated that many students relied on limited vocabulary, as evidenced by the absence of students achieving A1+ or A2 scores. This limited lexical range constrained their ability to respond effectively to given questions.

Statistical analysis using the paired sample t-test revealed a significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores, confirming that the guided writing method effectively enhances students' writing abilities. The structured approach to responding to questions critically improved students' comprehension skills by helping them recognize the relationship between various question types and their corresponding answers (Gaffar et al., 2024). Following the guided writing intervention, students demonstrated an improved ability to use contextually appropriate vocabulary, enhancing both the clarity and accuracy of their responses. Students who received guided writing instruction produced texts that adhered to appropriate structural formats

One of the most prominent improvements observed was in students' grammatical accuracy, particularly in their use of the simple present tense. Prior to the intervention, students frequently made errors related to subject-verb agreement, auxiliary verbs, and verb suffixes, which hindered their ability to construct grammatically correct sentences. That include a rise in the response "My best friend like play Avatar Word Game," this should be written "My best friend likes to play Avatar Word Game." "We goes to the park every Sunday." Which should be written "We go to the park every Sunday". These findings align with those of Setiyorini et al. (2020), who emphasize that structured writing instruction supports young learners in understanding grammatical rules and applying them effectively in real-life communication. Addressing errors directly offers evidence of learners' developing proficiency and their ability to construct grammatically accurate sentences using the target language.

Another key area of improvement was in sentence organization and coherence. The guided writing process comprising step-by-step modeling, guided practice, and scaffolding techniques enabled students to organize their thoughts more clearly. As the result for this question "What do you feel when you go to school?," from just "Hepi" to be "I feel happy because I will study." This procedure ensured a deeper understanding of course material, moving beyond mere memorization to more complex levels of comprehension (Karuru et al., 2023). Additionally, Wendimu and Gebremariam (2024) found that collaborative guided writing significantly enhanced students' ability to elaborate on their responses by incorporating supporting details and transitional words, resulting in more structured writing. The researcher provided guidance in the form of targeted questions and prompts

within each writing structure to help primary students articulate their ideas (Wicaksono et al., 2024).

The study also found that students' confidence and motivation to write increased following the intervention. Prior to the treatment, students often showed hesitation and anxiety when asked to write, frequently producing incomplete sentences or avoiding more complex structures. However, post-test results indicated that students were more willing to engage in writing tasks and demonstrated greater confidence in composing complete responses. This finding is consistent with Sabbah (2021), who noted that guided writing fosters a supportive environment that reduces anxiety and encourages learners to experiment with language. A similar conclusion was drawn by Ashour (2022), who reported that students receiving guided writing instruction outperformed their peers in grammatical accuracy, fluency, and completeness of responses. These findings reinforce the argument that systematic writing guidance is essential in developing foundational language skills among young learners.

The gradual reduction of instructional support aligns with the principles of scaffolding, where assistance is adjusted according to learners' growing competencies (Wibowo et al., 2025). This result validated supports the work of Saengboon (2022), where the majority of participants acknowledged the value of grammar instruction. It suggests that implementing guided writing strategies significantly enhances students' writing performance (Sumarna & Rizqiya, 2023). As students gained more autonomy in their learning, improvements were observed across various aspects of their writing skills. Vocabulary development was another area of notable progress. Initially, students depended on a limited range of words, which restricted their ability to express ideas clearly. After participating in guided writing sessions, they showed increased confidence in using a wider range of vocabulary appropriately, resulting in more meaningful and accurate responses.

Despite these positive outcomes, some challenges remained. Several students continued to exhibit grammatical inconsistencies, particularly in using auxiliary verbs and verb suffixes. Many still overlooked the use of auxiliary verbs or the addition of -s and -es, a common issue that underscores the necessity of repeated and consistent exposure to foundational English writing instruction. Such repetition is essential in preparing Indonesian students to face future challenges and contribute to national progress as part of the country's envisioned "golden generation."

## CONCLUSION

The results of this research provide strong evidence that guided writing significantly enhances students' capacity to respond to everyday questions in written form. An apparent disparity observed between pre-test and post-test scores indicates a substantial improvement in students' writing abilities following the intervention. The highly significant statistical outcome ( $p < 0.001$ ) reinforces the conclusion that these improvements were not coincidental but rather a direct result of the guided writing methodology. This instructional approach, characterized by structured support, enabled learners to strengthen their grammatical precision, improve sentence flow, and gain greater confidence in their writing tasks. Beyond grammatical improvements, the study also documented progress in how students structured and connected their ideas. The use of techniques such as modeling, guided exercises, and scaffolded writing activities contributed to students' ability to express

thoughts more coherently. These outcomes highlight the crucial role of structured writing pedagogy in supporting young learners as they develop the skills necessary to compose organized, detailed, and logically connected written texts in English.

## REFERENCES

- Afrezah, N. N., Azizi, M. R., Alrian, R., Pratiwi, D., & Yulia, Y. (2024). Students' writing skills through collaborative writing and the tendency to work in a group. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 4(1), 100–110. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v4i1.318>
- Agustina, D., Sari, K. R., & Amalia, H. (2024). An Error Analysis in Using Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Writing at SMAN 1 Sumber Marga Telang, Banyuasin. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 7(1), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445>
- Ashour, E. A. H. E. (2022). The Effectiveness of Guided Discovery Strategy in Developing EFL Preparatory School Pupils' Writing Skills. *Journal of the Faculty of Education - Menoufia University*, 2022(3), 29–62. <https://doi.org/10.21608/muja.2022.260125>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion Volume*. Council of Europe.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications.
- Gaffar, A. M., Aini, Q. H., Hidayah, L., & Maulana, J. R. (2024). The Impact of the Question Answer Relationship (QAR) Strategy on Improving Students' Reading Comprehension. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(2), 883–892. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i2.10364>
- Gaffar, M. A., Novarita, P., & Hasanah, I. (2025). Improving descriptive writing skills of students through contextual teaching and learning: Exploring the theme of "Home Sweet Home." *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 5(2), 431–449. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v5i2.698>
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools*. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Gumelar, S. W., & Bangkit. (2024). The Analysis Of Students' Errors for Writing Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Text. *Journal of Teacher Training and Educational Research*, 2(2), 93–98. <https://doi.org/10.71280/jotter.v2i2.398>
- Guswita, P. (2024). An Error Analysis of Using Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Text Written by the Seventh Grades Students of SMP Utama Bekasi in the Academic Year 2017/2018. *Kampus Akademik Publishing*, 2(6), 259–264. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jipm.v2i6.546>
- Husain, B., Suhernita, S., Abasa, Z., & Djaguna, F. (2021). Task-based language teaching methods integrated with local wisdom: The impact on students' writing skills. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 1(2), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v1i2.22>
- Husna, J., & Isna, N. (2024). An Error Analysis in Writing English Essay at Junior High School. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and*

- Literature*, 12(2), 936–949. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i2.5260>
- Ismahani, S., Budiman, B., Azmi, K., Fikri, H., & Hizbullah, G. (2024). Syntax Aspects In Children Development Of Sentence Structure. *Fonologi : Jurnal Ilmuan Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris*, 2(1), 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.61132/fonologi.v2i1.420>
- Karuru, P., Muta'allim, M., Suparjo, S., Setiawan, F. A., & Junaida, S. (2023). Improving Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills Through a Question and Answer Method. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 9(3), 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.9.3.8874.340-349>
- Kitila, F., Ali, S., & Bekele, E. (2023). The Impact of Writing Through Integrated Skills Intervention on English Students' Writing Skills: Focus on Vocabulary and Grammar. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 297–303. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1402.04>
- Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. S., & Miller, S. M. (2003). *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Listia, R., & Febriyanti, E. R. (2020). EFL Learners' Problems in Using Tenses: An Insight for Grammar Teaching. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 9(1), 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2020.9.1.86-95>
- Mukarromah, M., & Suryanto, B. T. (2022). Error Analysis on Students' Writing in Using Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Text. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, 3(2), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v3i2.3119>
- Muliyati, Pinim, W., & Halim, A. (2024). The Effect of Using Student Team Achievement Division Learning Method on Students' Ability in Simple Present Tense on the XI IPA Class of SMA Negeri 2 Lawe Bulan in the Academic Year 2022/2023. *Tuwah Pande: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 3(1), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.55606/tuwahpande.v3i1.482>
- Nasir, N. I. R. F., Purwaningsih, E., Ekawati, R., & Yambi, T. D. A. C. (2024). An analysis of primary school students' scientific literacy. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 4(2), 623–634. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v4i2.544>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS Survival Manual A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3 ed). Sage Publications.
- Perlin, A., Sartika, D., & Nery, R. (2021). An Error Analysis on the Use of Simple Present Tense in Paragraph Writing of the Second Semester at English Language Education at Islamuc Univesity of Ogan Komering Ilir Kayuagung. *Edu-Ling: Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 4(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.32663/edu-ling.v4i1.1688>
- Prihatini, C., Prastiwi, S. D., & Kamiliya, Z. (2024). Grammar Problems Faced by Students in Using Simple Present Tense Task. *Journal of English Education Literature and Linguistics*, 7(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.31540/jeell.v7i1.2977>
- Purba, A., Pasaribu, A. N., Elfrida, R., & Pasaribu, T. K. (2023). Errors in Using English Verbs by EFL Students: Tenses and Aspects Analyses. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 137–142. <https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v7i2.16437>
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Rashid, Md. H., Ye, T., Hui, W., Li, W., & Shunting, W. (2021). Analyse and challenges of teaching writing among the English teachers. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 6, 199–

209. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v6nS2.2004>
- Rezi, P., & Al Hafizh, Muhd. (2020). Students' Ability and Difficulties in Comprehending Simple Sentence in English at First Grade of SMA Adabiah Padang. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT 2019)*. 7th International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT 2019), Padang, Indonesia, 145-150. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200306.026>
- Rohana, S., & Harahap, S. Y. (2022). An Error Analysis In Learning The Simple Present Tense By The 7th Grade Students Of SMP Swasta Al Washliyah 27 Medan. *Cybernetics: Journal Educational Research and Social Studies*, 3(1), 13-26. <https://doi.org/10.51178/cjerss.v3i1.361>
- Rohmi, F., & Wahyuni, S. (2024). English Teacher's Strategy in Teaching Writing Using Discovery Learning. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 11(2), 122-128. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v11i2.50812>
- Rusdin. (2022). Students' Difficulties in Using Simple Present Tense: A Case Study at Senior High School. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature (JELTL)*, 5(1), 90-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.47080/jeltl.v5i1.1800>
- Ruswandi, R., Gaffar, M. A., & Yuniarti, K. E. (2023). Teacher readiness and understanding in implementing teaching English speaking skills using an ecological approach. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning (J-REaLL)*, 4(2), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v4i2.20095>
- Sabbah, H. H. M. (2021). *Exploring the Impact of Guided Writing Strategies on Fifth-Grade EFL Students' Narrative Writing Skills* [Master's thesis, United Arab Emirates University]. UAEU Scholarworks. [https://scholarworks.uaeu.ac.ae/all\\_theses/870](https://scholarworks.uaeu.ac.ae/all_theses/870)
- Sacal, P. G. Y., & Potane, J. D. (2023). Students' Mastery of English Grammar towards Effective Writing and Speaking Competence. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(8), 2894-2904. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber04.08.27>
- Saengboon, S. (2022). The Roles of Grammar in English Language Teaching: Local Viewpoints. *PASAA*, 63(1), 179-204. <https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.63.1.7>
- Sahmadan, S., & Hasan, I. (2023). Direct and indirect written corrective feedback in learning writing: The students' perception. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 3(2), 139-146. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v3i2.250>
- Saputra, R. (2023). Students' Error Analysis in Writing Essay of English Language Teaching. *Dharmas Education Journal (DE\_Journal)*, 4(1), 252-260. <https://doi.org/10.56667/dejournal.v4i1.912>
- Setiyorini, T. J., Dewi, P., & Masykuri, E. S. (2020). The Grammatical Error Analysis Found in Students' Composition. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 10(2), 218-233. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.10.2.2020.218-233>
- Setyantoko, E., Nunaki, J. H., Jeni, J., & Damopolii, I. (2023). Development of human digestive system e-module to improve students' learning outcomes during pandemic. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2540, 020002. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0105782>
- Sumarna, A., & Rizqiya, S. R. (2023). Teaching Writing A Descriptive Text by Using Guided Writing Strategy. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 6(6), 1110-1115.

- Umukoro, M. G., & Odey, E. V. (2020). A Comparative Analysis of French and English Auxiliary Verbs. *LWATI: A Journal of Contemporary Research*, 17(3), 52–68. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/lwati/article/view/200087>
- Wendimu, S. G., & Gebremariam, H. T. (2024). Teacher-Students Collaboration: Using Guided-Writing Instruction to Assist Learners with Writing Difficulties and Low Motivation to Write. *Sage Open*, 14(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241258020>
- Wibowo, S., Wangid, M. N., & Firdaus, F. M. (2025). The relevance of Vygotsky's constructivism learning theory with the differentiated learning primary schools. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 19(1), 431–440. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i1.21197>
- Wicaksono, M. A., Zulaeha, I., & Purwati, P. D. (2024). Development of Guided Writing Teaching Materials Based on High Order Thinking Skills for Grade VI Elementary School Students. *Jurnal Pembelajaran, Bimbingan, Dan Pengelolaan Pendidikan*, 5(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um065.v5.i1.2025.2>
- Widayati, N. K. P. A., Padmadewi, N. N., & Artini, L. P. (2024). The Effect of Linguistic Landscape in Project-Based Learning on Students' Vocabulary Mastery: A Pre-Experimental Study. *Tamaddun*, 23(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.33096/tamaddun.v23i1.587>
- Yoel, M. V., & Wibowo, A. P. (2023). Translation of Auxiliary Verbs in Novel *The Fault in Our Stars* into Indonesian. *IJEAL (International Journal of English and Applied Linguistics)*, 3(1), 39–49. <https://doi.org/doi.org/ijeal.v3i1.2195>
- Zekarias, A. P. (2023). Contributions and controversies of self-assessment to the development of writing skill. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 3(1), 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v3i1.94>