

**Original Article**

## **A Comparative Study of the Effects of the TBLT Method and ENGAGE Model on Iranian EFL Learners' CAF in Writing Performance**

*Mohaddeseh Salimpoor Aghdam<sup>1</sup>, Javad Gholami<sup>2\*</sup>, Mahnaz Saeidi<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of English, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

Submission date: 27-09-2023

Acceptance date: 08-11-2023

### **Abstract**

The ever-growing needs for writing ability in English in the global context has given priority to finding more effective ways to teach L2 writing. A thorough analysis of the pertinent literature indicated a dearth of empirical research in ELT regarding the effect of applying the ENGAGE model on the writing skills of L2 learners. Therefore, the current study sought to ascertain how the ENGAGE Model and Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) method affected the complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. Sixty-seven Iranian female EFL learners aged 18 to 25 at Urmia University language center were chosen for the quasi-experimental study based on their level of proficiency on the standard Oxford Quick Placement Test (OPT) in 2022. The participants were randomly divided into three groups and instructed based on the principles of the ENGAGE model (n = 22), TBLT model (n = 24), and control group (n = 21). Pretesting, intervention, and post-testing were all the processes that the study participants underwent. The null hypotheses were tested after the data were analyzed by applying multivariate ANCOVA (MANCOVA) measures. The study of the post-test data revealed that the ENGAGE model, as opposed to TBLT, had a more significant effect on the overall L2 CAF in Iranian EFL learners' ability to write essays. The results of the present study can be applied by ELT experts and curriculum designers in EFL and ESL settings. English learners and instructors can use the ENGAGE model to address linguistic and metalinguistic issues.

\* Corresponding Author's E- mail: [j.gholami@urmia.ac.ir](mailto:j.gholami@urmia.ac.ir)

**Keywords:** Accuracy, Complexity, Fluency

## 1. Introduction

For many second or foreign-language learners, mastering the skill of writing in English is crucial (Santangelo & Graham, 2016). Learners frequently use their perceived improvement in spoken and written language proficiency to gauge their level of language learning achievement as well as the quality of their English course. Likewise, methodological discussion has long centered on the most effective way to teach this proficiency. Teachers and textbooks employ a range of strategies, from indirect approaches that foster interaction through group work, peer corrective feedback (CF) tasks, and other tactics, to direct approaches that concentrate on particular aspects of written interaction and teacher CF types (Healy & Mulholland, 2019).

Writing skills courses are now widely incorporated into language curricula worldwide. The importance of English as a worldwide language and the increasing demand for proficient English writing in various contexts have made it imperative to develop more efficient methods for teaching L2 writing. Recent years have brought about significant improvements in our knowledge of the nature of L2 writing, syntactic complexity, grammatical accuracy, and fluency. TBLT is one of the approaches that this study focuses on. Using TBLT-based teaching resources, this approach has been adopted by numerous institutions in the recent past. The communicative perspectives of syllabuses and methodology, which still influence how writing skills are taught today, lend credence to this approach (Willis, 2019).

Within the domain of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Prabhu, 1987) and its expansion manifested in task-based language teaching (TBLT) (Ellis, 2022), L2 writing development takes significance. Moreover, Brilliance by Design has focused on environmental factors affecting education (Halsey, 2011) and the way new curricula could be developed to meet the educational needs of learners in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Halsey et al., 2018). Regardless of how well writing tasks are received in L2 classrooms, EFL learners still require a more learner-centered approach that encourages group projects and peer tutoring for cooperative learning (Ellis, 2019). In this regard, the researcher has turned to a Halseyan (2011) approach to teaching and learning that is rooted in naturalism theories and expanded upon them, emphasizing the involvement of learners in the learning process on an active basis. Specifically, "the basic message of the ENGAGE model is that people learn best when they play an active, critical role in the learning process, apply what they have

learned, and are encouraged to discover their meanings to places and things" (Halsey & Halsey, 2017, p. 4).

Particularly, not much research has looked at how learners' writing abilities develop while using the ENGAGE paradigm. Teachers and learners frequently disagree with one another in ESL/EFL classroom interactions; teachers frequently talk incoherently, while learners either stammer and swallow their remarks or remain silent (Willis, 2019). Nearly all of these educators lament that their learners are reluctant to express themselves orally or graphically (Halsey, 2016; Hodge et al., 2009). Some of them may find this especially annoying, especially if they don't hear back from anyone or have their queries answered.

Second-language writing performance can be measured through different scale-based and rubric-oriented methods. In high stake exams, such as TOEFL and IELTS, specific rubrics have been created to measure the L2 writing performance of the examinees. Such rubrics consider grammatical accuracy, proper lexical usage, coherence, cohesion, and task-relatedness. The writing performance of EFL learners can also be measured with the help of notions of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) (Pallotti, 2009). Such notions developing CAF measures have been frequently employed in much research in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) domain," although they do not constitute a theory or a research program in themselves" (Pallotti, 2009, p. 1). In this respect, Seifoori and Birjandi (2008), who account for accuracy, complexity, and fluency as the notions occurring in order in exposure-limited EFL contexts such as Iran, stress the priority of accuracy and argue that performing accurately could pave the way for the development of L2 learners in producing more complex and fluent language.

Following Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), the CAF triad typically refers to complexity as the ability to employ more complex language. Plakans et al. (2016) hypothesized that complexity can be gauged by the ratio of clauses to T-units based on the theories of Foster and Skehan (1996). Accuracy, as a component of writing tasks, is "a criterion which focuses on the range and accuracy of the grammar which the test taker uses in the written or spoken language" (Brown, 2006, p. 12). The basis for measuring the accuracy can be the percentage of error-free T-units based on Plakans et al. (2016) derived from Skehan and Foster's (1999) study. According to Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005), "the production of language in real-time without undue pausing or hesitation" might be regarded as the third important concept in the

CAF triad. Fluency has also been measured using the average number of T-units per text (Wolf-Quintero et al., 1998).

Given that using ENGAGE model strategies has demonstrated success in other fields, including management, environmental protection, and medical education, it may be worthwhile to test the idea in an EFL context like Iran. According to Halsey (2011), "Teaching, in any forum, is the art and science of bringing out the brilliance that drives transformations" (p. xi). She also stresses that brilliance is within all the learners, and any successful educational system paves the ground for the learners to enhance their abilities and manifest their brilliance, representing individuals' mental power and energy.

## **2. Literature Review**

The present study has compared the impacts of the TBLT and ENGAGE model on the writing performance of EFL learners with respect to CAF. Accordingly, a sketch of the reported literature pertaining to the aforementioned variables will be presented through an analytical and critical lens.

### **2.1. TBLT Approach**

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) was initially implemented by Prabhu, an Indian researcher and educator who worked in Bangalore (Ellis, 2022). It is argued that the syllabus requirements for TBLT are based on communicative tasks rather than on notions, functions, or grammatical structures (Xia, 2023). Besides, second language writing courses ensuing from TBLT have proved effective in both EFL and ESL situations (Shomi, 2022). Moreover, Byrnes and Manchón (2014) provided insights into L2 writing within TBLT when they suggested that the goal of pedagogical tasks in L2 writing was considered as effective written communication. The influence of using task-based materials in teaching writing for EFL classes in Indonesia was examined by Sundari et al. (2018), who concluded that "a developed task-based material has been proved to improve learners' writing skill in the aspects of format, content, organization, and grammar" (p. 119). In addition, "TBLT has successfully developed EFL learners' writing performance in terms of its aspects, including vocabulary, grammar, coherence, and cohesion" (Chaouchi & Bahloul, 2023, p. 433).

Despite its many benefits, including its high competency in real-life circumstances, meaningfulness, authenticity, and group work, TBLT has certain drawbacks, some of which

are listed below. According to Seedhouse (1999), TBLT places an excessive emphasis on tasks and conveying meaning, which may have an impact on how to use the language with the appropriate form. Additionally, it's critical to understand that communication involves much more than just carrying out tasks (Ellis, 2022). TBLT lies in its less emphasis on accuracy while giving more room to fluency, which is likely to discourage learners from performing properly in the target language situations as a result of their inability to use well-formed sentences (Shomi, 2022). Furthermore, TBLT seems to be inadequate for weak learners who have not developed an appropriate level of grammatical competence and cannot communicate effectively (Xia, 2023). As a result, it is possible that some form of fossilization will take place within the learners and create obstacles to their continued learning.

## **2.2. The ENGAGE Model**

Though the ENGAGE model was found to use *fuler* in the educational context due to its naturalistic perspective and its emphasis on the social environment (Hodge et al., 2009), its main scopes were enhancing self-authorship and critical thinking skills in the learner believing that "self-authorship enables learners to evaluate information critically, form their judgments, and collaborate with others to act wisely" (p. 16). In addition, Prince (2004, as cited in Halsey & Halsey, 2017) hypothesized that active learning strategies demanding learner participation (such as conversations, presentations, and interactive projects) lead to better retention, more profound knowledge, and higher accomplishment. According to Halsey's (2016) theory, the brain is capable of anything when listening to lectures and regularly does so. Consequently, traditional teaching methods fall short of stimulating learner thought. Halsey and Halsey (2017) acknowledge that programs promoting naturalist education should include active learning techniques to engage learners' minds. With the use of readily available digital resources, learners actively acquire new information and skills as part of the ENGAGE paradigm. Halsey (2011) introduced a pedagogical framework known as the ENGAGE model in her book titled "Brilliance by Design." This model, rooted in naturalistic principles, encompasses six steps: Energizing, Navigating, Generating, Applying, Gauging, and Extending. Halsey's proposal has had a significant impact on educational program reforms in the United States, particularly in California. Subsequent works by Halsey and Halsey (2017) and Halsey et al. (2018) have utilized the ENGAGE

model to develop an educational program that places emphasis on addressing environmental issues specific to California.

The ENGAGE model has been recently used to enhance EFL learners' speaking ability (Abdollahzadeh et al., 2021; Esfandiari et al., (2021). Additionally, it has proved effective in developing EFL learners' speaking components in the Iranian context (Abdollahzadeh et al., 2023). The main argument in the aforementioned studies is that through its reliance on energizing and encouraging cooperation and social integration, ENGAGE can be used in the L2 classroom to enhance EFL learners' effective and dynamic communication. Moreover, as the model represented through teaching techniques such as navigating, generating, and assessment can pave the way for more meaningful learning among the EFL learners, it is absorbing to them. It can be concluded that in addition to its user-friendly atmosphere, the ENGAGE model of teaching enjoys novelty and is likely to bring about changes in the L2 classroom.

### **2.3. Analyzing Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency**

Many academics and language professionals (Ellis, 2022; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Skehan, 1998) held that L2 performance and competency concepts were multidimensional in nature. They also note that the notions of complexity, accuracy, and fluency covered the main aspects of these constructs. The CAF has identified performance descriptors for the oral and written evaluation of language learners alongside measures of learners' proficiency complementing their performance. They have also been used to gauge how well people are acquiring languages.

Complexity, accuracy, and fluency were each established by Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), along with guidelines for measuring each component. First, learners' readiness to use a variety of various structures might be referred to as their level of complexity. Depending on how prepared learners are to explore linguistically, complexity will vary (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). The CAF triad's smallest, internally coherent, transparent, consistent, and likely earliest concept should be accurate (or correctness). It relates to "how well the target language is produced concerning the rule system of the target language" (Skehan, 1998, p. 23) or "the degree of conformity to certain norms" (Pallotti, 2009, p. 591). Fluency refers to "the ability to use language in real-time, to emphasize meaning, possibly drawing on more lexicalized systems" (Skehan & Foster, 1999). In the words of Skehan

(2009), fluency is "the ability to produce speech at a normal rate and without interruption."

Studies on the impact of TBLT confirm the importance of tasks in helping learners develop their writing abilities as well as various language skills and components, e.g. (Aliakbari & Jamalvandi, 2010), complexity, accuracy, and fluency of EFL learners' written output under pre-task and online planning conditions (Ghavamnia et al., 2013), repetition of tasks and improvement of L2 writing (Nitta & Baba, 2014), Iranian EFL learners' improvement in accuracy and complexity in writing as a result of task repetition (Zohrabi & Abasvand, 2014), TBLT and EFL learners' writing abilities (Ahmed & Bidin, 2016), Iranian EFL learners' task-based activities along with their writing (Nemat Tabrizi & Hosseini, 2016), and task-based materials and teaching writing (Sundari et al., 2018). Although scant literature exists on the effect of TBLT on the nature of CAF, a plethora of research supports the role of different task features in improving learners' writing.

#### 2.4. ENGAGE Model and ELT

Only a few descriptions of the ENGAGE model have been discovered in the ELT literature because it is a novel idea in the educational context in general and the EFL context in particular (Abdollahzadeh et al., 2021, 2023; Esfandiari et al., 2021). The naturalistic-oriented educational view, namely the ENGAGE model (Halsey, 2011), has not only focused on the sociocultural issues but also the cognitive concepts. The paradigm was utilized by Halsey et al. (2018) to create a learner-centered instructional program. Emphasizing cognitive learning, Halsey (2016) proposed that the ENGAGE model intends to engage the learner's mind. Halsey (2011) relies on synergy as a critical concept in the ENGAGE model and contends that "synergy is all about working together and supporting each other's success" (p. 10). In this regard, cooperation is emphasized in the ENGAGE model.

Considering the ever-growing needs of L2 learners in terms of writing, the researcher attempted to compare the effects of the ENGAGE model and TBLT method on developing L2 writing components such as *syntactic complexity*, *grammatical accuracy*, and *fluency* within the EFL learners in the Iranian context. Therefore, the following research questions were posed:

1. Is there any significant difference in the effects of the TBLT method and ENGAGE model on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 writing *syntactic complexity*?



2. Is there any significant difference in the effects of the TBLT method and ENGAGE model on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 writing *grammatical accuracy*?
3. Is there any significant difference in the effects of the TBLT method and ENGAGE model on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 writing *fluency*?

### 3. Methodology

This section explains the study's design, context, participants, instruments, data collection procedure, and data analysis procedure to examine the impacts of the TBLT method and ENGAGE Model on Iranian EFL learners' development of L2 writing.

#### 3.1. Design and Context of the Study

Urmia University Language Center hosted this study in 2022. In the present study, a quasi-experimental design was implemented that considered quantitative data analysis measures. Despite not being randomly selected for this study, the experimental groups were distributed at random among the participants. Furthermore, pre-and post-tests were used in this investigation. The ENGAGE model and the TBLT method were used in the experimental groups. These methods were viewed as independent variables, and the writing's subcategories of complexity, accuracy, and fluency were accounted for as dependent variables. The participants' gender and language proficiency were also considered to be controlled variables.

#### 3.2. Participants

The study included approximately sixty-seven female intermediate EFL learners from Urmia University Language Center, Urmia, Iran, ages 18 to 25. The participants were chosen according to their standard Oxford Quick Placement Test (OPT) performance. Participants were selected as follows: At first, a standard version of OPT was given to 80 intermediate EFL learners enrolled in various institute classes. Following the OPT, 67 learners were chosen as the primary study subjects, whose scores ranged from 24 to 47. This number met the research sample size criteria (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The population of EFL learners in the available classes was 80 (N=80), and Krejcie and Morgan's sample size table recommended at least 66 participants. The lower intermediate learners (B1, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)) are represented by

scores between 24 and 39 on the scale that is offered in the last part of the OPT. In contrast, upper-intermediate learners (B2, according to the CEFR) are represented by a range of 31 to 47. From the selected EFL learners, three groups—the ENGAGE model group, the TBLT group, and one control group—were formed. Table 1 shows the demographic background of the participants.

**Table 1**

*Demographic Background of the Participants*

---

No. of Participants	67
Gender	Females
Proficiency Level	Intermediate
Age Range	18 to 25
Native Language	Turkish, Farsi, and Kurdish
Geographic Location	Urmia, Iran

### **3.3. Instruments**

The data for the present investigation were collected using three different instruments: an Oxford Quick Placement Test (OPT) was used to homogenize the study participants, a writing pre-test was used to measure the participants' L2 writing ability in terms of CAF prior to the study, and a writing post-test was utilized to measure the differential effects of the independent variables of the study on the L2 writing CAF of the particulates following the treatment.

#### **3.3.1. Oxford Quick Placement Tests (OPT)**

The OPT has been considered a reliable test of language proficiency since its development and validation in 1993 (Hill & Taylor, 2004). The test assesses the knowledge of English structure and also is considered a global measure of ability in a language or other content areas. The test enjoys high reliability ( $\alpha = .91$ ) based on Cronbach's alpha (Berthold, 2011, p. 674) and has also been reported to enjoy high construct validity (Motallebzadeh & Nematizadeh, 2011). It was used to evaluate the participants' homogeneity. All the test questions had multiple-choice options; responses were entered directly onto the answer sheet, which could be easily marked using the provided overlays. The test gauges one's understanding of English grammar and is viewed as a general indicator of proficiency in a language or other subject matter.

### **3.3.2 Pre and Post-tests of Writing**

As for pre- and post-tests, two narrative writing tasks were used. The subjects were given the writing pretest (see Appendix A) to examine the homogeneity of their writing abilities prior to the study, while the writing posttest (see Appendix B) was administered after the intervention phase. The learners' unique writing features, such as syntactic complexity, grammatical accuracy, and fluency, were also taken into account. The participants were assigned a topic to write on, and their essays were then scored using the CAF writing rubric, which considered factors including syntactic complexity, grammatical accuracy, and fluency.

### **3.3.3. Treatment**

Ten sessions made up the treatment time. The learners attended the instruction two times a week, and each group's session lasted 90 minutes. The teacher in experimental group A applied the ENGAGE model's tenets (Halsey, 2011). In experimental group B, the instructor attended TBLT. Conversely, the control group handled the L2 writing procedures by writing about a topic in a conventional manner.

### **3.3.4. Scoring Procedure**

The CAF writing band descriptors were used to grade the performance of the participants during the pretest and post-test stages, including writing sub-skills such as syntactic complexity, grammatical accuracy, and fluency. We counted grammatical errors, clauses, and T-units in their compositions to compute the learners' writing fluency, accuracy, and complexity. Hence, the two raters of the study used Plakans et al.'s (2016) analytical rubric to rate the participants' writing products.

Furthermore, the inter-rater reliabilities were computed using the Pearson Product-Moment coefficient correlation calculation to ensure the reliability of the two scores given to the homogeneity test as well as the participants' writings (by the two raters). Additionally, the number of content words in the writings was counted, and the mean scores of the learners' text length on the writing pre-and post-tests were calculated to estimate the text length of the learners' essays before and after the experiment. Complexity, accuracy, and fluency were calculated using the following quantitative measurements:

The evaluation of complexity was carried out by examining the proportion of clauses to T-units, a measurement method suggested by Plakans et al. (2016) as a more accurate estimate of the true extent of complexity. The utilization of this methodology, which is based on the ideas proposed by Foster and Skehan (1996), was implemented in order to measure the level of complexity. The measurement in question was widely recognized as a dependable indicator that exhibits a robust positive correlation with numerous other complexity indicators. The utilization of global units, more especially T-units, provides a more realistic measure of accuracy, as stated by Plakans et al. (2016). Skehan and Foster (1999) noted that the proportion of error-free T-units was used as the basis for the accuracy estimations that were performed in this experiment. In the studies conducted by Alghizzi (2017) and Plakans et al. (2016), the total word count, production units, and the word count in error-free production units were used to assess the participants' fluency. This was done based on the analytical approach.

### **3.3.5. Raters**

The researchers used a CAF measuring descriptor to estimate the participants' writing scores. Due to the inter-rater procedure used to score the writings, the essays had to be evaluated by two separate raters. A third rater was invited to grade the papers if there was a questionable disparity in the scores (i.e., more than 1). One of the raters was the researcher, who is knowledgeable in the scoring procedure for writing tasks; the other two raters were two renowned university lecturers who have been IELTS mock examiners and have received training from the British Council. They have also written and compiled a number of course books in English that have been distributed both domestically and internationally. Meanwhile, the researcher briefed them in terms of the CAF descriptor in estimating the participants' writing scores. Hence, the scoring system was based on CAF for the analytical concerns of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

### **3.3.6. Reliability Statistics**

The writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency pretests' inter-rater reliability indices revealed significant agreement between the two raters on the writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency pretests (indicating a large effect size,  $p < .05$ ). Furthermore, the outcomes of the inter-rater reliability indices for the post-tests on writing complexity, accuracy, and

fluency revealed that there is considerable agreement between the two raters on the post-tests of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (indicating a large effect size,  $p < .05$ ).

### **3.4. Data Collection Procedure**

The data collection in the current study encompassed three phases of pretesting, intervention, and post-testing, which are presented as follows.

#### **3.4.1. Pretest Phase**

First, 80 EFL learners were given the standard OPT to choose the learners who were homogeneous concerning their general English skills. From 67 intermediate EFL learners, three groups were formed at random: experimental and control groups, with 21 to 24 learners in each group. Both the TBLT and the ENGAGE models were used for instruction in one of the experimental groups. To compare the outcomes of the methods employed in the other groups, we set another group as the control group. The traditional approach to teaching L2 writing was used in this group.

To confirm their homogeneity with regard to their L2 writing performance, the study participants took part in a writing pretest (Appendix A) in the second phase. It is important to note that the effectiveness of the learners' performance on the writing task was evaluated using an inter-rater reliability index.

#### **3.4.2. Treatment Phase**

Ten sessions made up the treatment period. The learners took 12 sessions of the classes, which were held two times a week during the semester and lasted 90 minutes in each group. Each lesson began with 20 minutes of warm-up activities, followed by the teacher making a point about how to improve learning and testing the learners' understanding of previous tasks. The remaining time was spent practicing L2 writing. The time allotted was used to provide the learners with their initial writing instruction. It is noteworthy to point out that the amount of instruction and practice time in the classes for the experimental and control groups was the same. The three groups were also taught by the researcher herself.

The teacher applied the ENGAGE model's principles in experimental group A (the ENGAGE Model group) (Halsey, 2011). To engage the mind, this strategy used active

learning strategies through naturalist education programs (Halsey, 2016). Hence, in a language course, the following general viewpoints were observed.

**Step 1 (Energizing):** Step 1 (Energizing): Energizing learners at the start of every class by getting them involved in warm-up activities and icebreaker conversations, addressing common challenges in speech and writing, and energizing them with postures and gestures.

**Step 2 (Navigating):** Asking the learners to create a new topic and navigate the knowledge they had received during the energizing session. Different ideas were discussed, and a topic or content with which both learners and the teacher agreed was followed. Thus, the topic of the class was developed in collaboration between the teacher and the learners, with the teacher mostly serving as a listening partner while discussing their interests and concerns.

**Step 3 (Generating):** Helping learners reflect on their experiences, build personal meaning, and then apply what they learned to their lives. The learners were also urged to make connections between their prior knowledge and the new ideas and subjects covered in class. This was accomplished by having the learners submit written reports to the class regarding current affairs, personal experiences, opinions on recent occurrences in the locale, and so on.

**Step 4 (Applying):** Assisting learners in putting their knowledge into practice by having them write their thoughts and ideas in a coherent structure that considers complexity, accuracy, and fluency. This was achieved by instructing the learners to research the chosen topic in class, use the Internet and social media to research a topic, participate in online discussion forums, and then present their arguments to the class. Learners concentrated on what they might do in this way to improve their own lives and the societal situation.

**Step 5 (Gauging):** Making learners evaluate and acknowledge their development. This was made practicable by using self-assessment (SA) in the classroom setting. At the beginning of this step, the learners were first instructed in SA principles by explanations and examples, followed by classroom exercises, and after that, they were given the training to create self-evaluation checklists. Afterward, they worked on grammar and writing exercises to practice self-evaluation throughout the remainder of the semester. On the basis of the checklists they created, they graded their performance. They were then questioned about their preparedness for the forthcoming actions and processes. At the end of every period of

instruction, they were also asked to evaluate their understanding of what was instructed. Obviously, they also got feedback from the instructor that grew better through the enhancement of learners' skills for self-evaluation. The treatment sessions included a variety of quizzes and classroom talks. An illustration could help to clarify the situation:

For instance, the first lesson's primary focus was making friends, and the vocabulary words that were covered included school, the movies, parks, etc. Additionally, the learners read a brief passage about asking a close friend for help, consulting a friend about a particular issue in a class, or picking up a hobby, game, etc., from a friend. The researcher decided to utilize the topic as a writing prompt because she thought the learners would be interested in it. In addition, after one or two lessons on the fundamentals of paragraph structure and the distinctive features of a paragraph, the teacher instructed every learner to draft at least a paragraph about the subject and distribute it to their peers for comments. The learners were then instructed to ask each other questions to finish their exam papers using sentences from various sources, including the Internet. The researcher verified and refined the questions the learners had created. After submitting them, the learners examined their written responses to ensure they were accurate. Afterward, they gave themselves scores of excellent, good, bad, or in need of work.

**Step 6 (Extending):** Aiding learners in applying their learning by writing their ideas, opinions, and solutions to the challenges in their immediate environment and personal issues. This was accomplished by having them use what they had learned to write about certain topics, deliver lectures on different subjects, participate in talks in the English language, use what they had learned on social networking sites to interact with new friends abroad, watch movies, resolve lifestyle problems, and simply appreciate it.

According to the guiding principles of the ENGAGE model (Halsey, 2011), the feedback type that was mainly employed in this group started with the teacher feedback and then paved the way for peer feedback, which was gradually converted to a sort of self-feedback and self-assessment. Likewise, the learners relied on explicit feedback to improve the writing level of their peers. The teacher (the researcher) reviewed the final writing drafts for more clarity and to assist the learners in developing their L2 CAF writing skills. The instructor used written corrective feedback (WCF) to notify learners of errors and potential problems.

The TBLT Group's teacher in experimental group B worked on the TBLT. Concerning the TBLT group, the researcher explicitly used the steps and tasks suggested by Prabhu (1987) and Willis (2019). Since pedagogical tasks could be employed in the classroom more effectively, they were employed in the experimental group. Peer feedback was the main sort of feedback used in this group, and when the learners wrote in groups, they attempted to edit the ideas and sentences offered by the other group members to produce a more refined result in their final work. Although peer CF on content was also encouraged, learners mostly used explicit CF in grammar and vocabulary when it came to peer CF. The teacher (the researcher) reviewed the final writing drafts for more clarity and to aid the learners in developing their L2 CAF writing skills. The instructor used WCF to draw the learners to their potential errors.

In the current study, the TBLT group participated in pedagogical tasks. An illustration is as follows:

The teacher attempted to use an opinion gap task by asking the learners to share their opinions on various subjects related to their daily lives. The teacher occasionally used images to evoke the learners' views, and these images frequently dealt with situations from the learners' everyday lives. Therefore, an effective method for the current investigation was employing photographs to elicit learners' ideas. The learners examined the images and produced analyses of them. They were instructed to relate what they observed in the pictures to actual events, bring family photos, and write about them in class.

Pictures and charts were also used to engage learners in information gap tasks. Learners were instructed to either look at the chart and complete it or use the chart and picture together to finish the chart. Furthermore, they selected images from the newest newspaper article on a particular interesting happening, like an accident, and wrote a piece on it. This would enable people to concentrate on the causes of the events and express their opinions. The teacher, i.e., the researcher, got learners to write for a specific number of words and employ specific writing structures in each session to assess the learners' L2 writing more objectively rather than subjectively.

In the control group, the learners did not follow the ENGAGE model or the TBLT method. Instead, they dealt with the L2 writing procedures through the traditional method of writing about a topic, and their performance was checked by the teacher who provided them with the WCF. They relied on the teacher's training, the teacher's feedback, and their abilities



to write in English. The instructor in this group used the WCF to call the learners' attention to their potential mistakes.

### 3.4.3. Posttest Phase

Participants in the three groups conducted the writing post-test after the treatment. In reality, the writing post-test examined the learners' syntactic complexity, grammar accuracy, and fluency as the writing sub-categories, followed by the treatment (see Appendix B). The learners' performance on the writing test was graded using an inter-rater scoring system, after which the reliability of the scores was examined.

### 3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

To address questions 1 through 3 in the present research, the researcher used both descriptive and inferential statistics. The proficiency test's mean and standard deviation, which were employed to homogenize the participants, were calculated using descriptive statistics. The data analysis took the average of the two raters' scores into account, and Pearson Product-Moment correlation was applied to calculate the writing scores' inter-rater reliability. After adjusting for the impact of the pretests that probed the first, second, and third null hypotheses, a Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was applied in the inferential statistics to compare the means on the post-tests of writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency, as well as between the ENGAGE, TBLT, and control groups.

## 4. Results

Having scored the particulates' L2 writing performance through CAF, the researchers used MANCOVA to determine how TBLT, ENGAGE, and conventional models affected Iranian EFL learners' L2 CAF writing skills. As MANCOVA requires the homogeneity of variances as its requirements, in the first step, the results of Levene's test for homogeneity of variances were taken into account, which as shown in Table 2, the results of the post-tests for complexity ( $F(2, 64) = .06, p > .05$ ), accuracy ( $F(2, 64) = .31, p > .05$ ), and fluency ( $F(2, 64) = .74, p < .05$ ) confirmed this notion.

**Table 2**

*Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances Post-tests of Writing*

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Post-Complexity	.06	2	64	.93
Post-Accuracy	.31	2	64	.73
Post-Fluency	.74	2	64	.48

Moreover, Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5 check the assumption of linearity of relationships between pretests and post-tests of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. The linearity test's significant results ( $F(1, 66) = 71.48, p < .05$ , and a large effect size of  $\eta^2 = .68$  in Table 2) showed that the statistical null-hypothesis that the relationship between the complexity post-test and pretest was not linear was rejected. In other words, there was a linear relationship between pretest and posttest of complexity.

**Table 3**

*Testing Linearity of Relationship between Pretest and Post-test of Complexity*

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Post-Complexity * Pre-Complexity	Between Groups	(Combined) Linearity	570.20	16	35.63	6.80	.00
		Deviation from Linearity	374.17	1	374.17	71.48	.00
			196.02	15	13.06	2.49	.00
	Within Groups		261.73	50	5.23		
	Total		831.94	66			
Eta Squared			.68				

The linearity test's significant results ( $F(1, 66) = 72.36, p < .05$ , and a large effect size of  $\eta^2 = .60$  in Table 3) showed that the statistical null hypothesis that the relationship between the accuracy post-test and pretest was not linear was rejected. In other words, the accuracy pre- and post-tests showed a linear connection.

**Table 4**

*Testing Linearity of Relationship between Pretest and Post-test of Accuracy*

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Post-Accuracy * Pre- Accuracy	Between Groups	(Combined) Linearity	561.16	12	46.76	6.84	.00
		Deviation from Linearity	494.34	1	494.34	72.36	.00
			66.81	11	6.07	.88	.55
	Within Groups		368.86	54	6.83		
	Total		930.03	66			
Eta Squared			.60				

The linearity test's significant results ( $F(1, 66) = 43.76, p < .05$ , and a large effect size of  $2 = .53$  in Table 5) showed that the statistical null hypothesis that the relationship between the fluency post-test and pretest was not linear was rejected. Therefore, there was a linear relationship between the fluency tests taken before and after the intervention.

**Table 5**

*Testing Linearity of Relationship between Pretest and Post-test of Fluency*

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PostFluency * PreFluency	Between Groups	(Combined)	549.45	14	39.24	4.24	.00
		Linearity	404.43	1	404.43	43.76	.00
	Deviation from Linearity		145.01	13	11.15	1.20	.30
	Within Groups		480.48	52	9.24		
Total		1029.94	66				
Eta Squared					.53		

A further requirement of MANCOVA is that the linear associations between the complexity, accuracy, and fluency pretests and posttests are substantially equivalent across the three groups or that the regression slopes be homogeneous. The statistical hypothesis that the relationships between pretests and post-tests of writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency were linear across groups was supported by the non-significant interaction ( $F(9, 156) = .96, p > .05$ , Partial  $\eta^2 = .053$  indicating a weak effect size) between covariates (pretests) and independent variable in Table 6. In other words, there were linear connections between the three groups' pretest and posttest scores for complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

**Table 6**

*Test of Homogeneity of Regression Slopes of Post-tests of Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy with Pretests*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group *	Pillai's Trace	.15	.96	9	156.00	.47	.05
PreFluency *	Wilks' Lambda	.84	.96	9	121.83	.47	.05
PreComplexity	Hotelling's Trace	.17	.96	9	146.00	.47	.05
* PreAccuracy	Roy's Largest Root	.15	2.59 <sup>c</sup>	3	52.00	.06	.13

The results of the Box's test of the homogeneity of covariance matrices are shown in Table 7 as a last point. The relationships (correlations) between any two sets of dependent variables, i.e., complexity, accuracy, and fluency, must be nearly comparable across the three groups for MANCOVA to be valid. The Box's test's non-significant findings (Box's M = 28.93,  $p > .001$ ) showed that the assumption that covariance matrices are homogeneous remains valid.

**Table 7**

*Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices Post-tests of Writing by Groups with Pretests*

Box's M	28.93
F	2.24
df1	12
df2	19291.74
Sig.	.00

The key findings are shown below after disclosing the MANCOVA-related assumptions. The MANCOVA results are displayed in Table 8. After adjusting for the effects of the pretests, there were significant differences in the means of the ENGAGE, TBLT, and control groups on the overall post-tests of writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency, in line with the significant MANCOVA results ( $F(3, 59) = 16.60, p < .05$ , Partial  $\eta^2 = .45$  demonstrating a large effect size). The following tables contain detailed findings for each test.

**Table 8**

*Multivariate Analysis of Covance (MANCOVA) Post-tests of Writing by Groups with Pretests*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.70	46.90	3	59	.00	.70
	Wilks' Lambda	.29	46.90	3	59	.00	.70
	Hotelling's Trace	2.38	46.90	3	59	.00	.70
	Roy's Largest Root	2.38	46.90	3	59	.00	.70
PreFluency	Pillai's Trace	.63	34.27	3	59	.00	.63
	Wilks' Lambda	.36	34.27	3	59	.00	.63
	Hotelling's Trace	1.74	34.27	3	59	.00	.63
	Roy's Largest Root	1.74	34.27	3	59	.00	.63
PreComplexity	Pillai's Trace	.30	8.45	3	59	.00	.30
	Wilks' Lambda	.69	8.45	3	59	.00	.30
	Hotelling's Trace	.43	8.45	3	59	.00	.30
	Roy's Largest Root	.43	8.45	3	59	.00	.30

PreAccuracy	Pillai's Trace	.33	10.04	3	59	.00	.33
	Wilks' Lambda	.66	10.04	3	59	.00	.33
	Hotelling's Trace	.51	10.04	3	59	.00	.33
	Roy's Largest Root	.51	10.04	3	59	.00	.33
Group	Pillai's Trace	.90	16.60	3	59	.00	.45
	Wilks' Lambda	.13	34.54	3	59	.00	.63
	Hotelling's Trace	6.30	60.94	3	59	.00	.75
	Roy's Largest Root	6.25	125.14	3	59	.00	.86

After adjusting for the effects of the pretests, Table 9 displays the means on the post-tests of writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency for the ENGAGE, TBLT, and control groups. After adjusting for the impact of the pretests, the results revealed that the ENGAGE group had higher means on post-tests of writing sub-sections than the TBLT and control groups.

**Table 9**  
*Descriptive Statistics Post-tests of Writing by Groups with Pretests*

Dependent Variable	Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PostFluency	ENGAGE	22.39 <sup>a</sup>	.35	21.69	23.10
	TBLT	20.34 <sup>a</sup>	.33	19.67	21.00
	Control	17.19 <sup>a</sup>	.36	16.47	17.92
PostComplexity	ENGAGE	20.54 <sup>a</sup>	.38	19.77	21.30
	TBLT	17.72 <sup>a</sup>	.36	16.99	18.44
	Control	15.75 <sup>a</sup>	.39	14.96	16.54
PostAccuracy	ENGAGE	23.21 <sup>a</sup>	.25	22.69	23.73
	TBLT	20.60 <sup>a</sup>	.24	20.10	21.09
	Control	18.18 <sup>a</sup>	.267	17.654	18.72

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: PreFluency = 13.03, PreComplexity = 13.96, PreAccuracy = 14.84.

The results of the between-subject effects (Table 10) are reported together with a detailed discussion of these findings.

**Table 10**  
*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Writing by Groups with Pretests*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
PreFluency	PostFluency	37.49	1	37.49	14.25	.00	.18
	PostComplexity	4.29	1	4.29	1.37	.24	.02
	PostAccuracy	129.52	1	129.52	90.53	.00	.59
PreComplexity	PostFluency	47.18	1	47.18	17.93	.00	.22
	PostComplexity	20.47	1	20.47	6.57	.01	.09
	PostAccuracy	.41	1	.41	.29	.59	.00

PreAccuracy	PostFluency	.38	1	.38	.14	.70	.00
	PostComplexity	17.62	1	17.62	5.66	.02	.08
	PostAccuracy	28.33	1	28.33	19.80	.00	.24
Group	PostFluency	274.08	2	137.04	52.09	.00	.63
	PostComplexity	234.03	2	117.01	37.57	.00	.55
	PostAccuracy	253.63	2	126.81	88.64	.00	.74
Error	PostFluency	160.45	61	2.63			
	PostComplexity	189.98	61	3.11			
	PostAccuracy	87.27	61	1.43			
Total	PostFluency	27910.00	67				
	PostComplexity	22612.00	67				
	PostAccuracy	29643.00	67				

Table 11 presents the pairwise comparisons for post-tests of writing by groups with pretests. This post hoc comparison reveals the differences between ENGAGE, TBLT, and control groups' means on the post-tests of complexity, accuracy, and fluency after controlling for the effect of pretest.

**Table 11**  
*Pairwise Comparisons for Post-tests of Writing by Groups with Pretests*

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PostFluency	ENGAGE	TBLT	2.05*	.48	.00	.86	3.25
		Control	5.20*	.51	.00	3.94	6.46
	TBLT	Control	3.14*	.49	.00	1.91	4.36
PostComplexity	ENGAGE	TBLT	2.82*	.52	.00	1.51	4.12
		Control	4.78*	.55	.00	3.41	6.15
	TBLT	Control	1.96*	.54	.00	.63	3.30
PostAccuracy	ENGAGE	TBLT	2.61*	.35	.000	1.72	3.49
		Control	5.02*	.37	.000	4.09	5.95
	TBLT	Control	2.41*	.36	.00	1.50	3.31

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Based on these results, the descriptive statistics shown in Table 9, and posthoc comparison tests (Table 11), it is deduced that:

A: There were significant differences between ENGAGE (M = 20.54), TBLT (M = 17.52), and control (M = 15.75) groups' means on the post-test of complexity after controlling for the effect of pretest ( $F(2, 66) = 37.57, p < .05, \text{Partial } \eta^2 = .55$  signaling a large effect size). Thus, the first null hypothesis, "there was no significant difference in the

effects of the TBLT method and ENGAGE model on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 writing complexity," was rejected. Posthoc comparison test results (Table 11) showed the following:

The ENGAGE group ( $M = 20.54$ ) significantly outperformed the TBLT group ( $M = 17.72$ ) on the post-test of writing complexity ( $MD = 2.82, p < .05$ ).

The ENGAGE group ( $M = 20.54$ ) significantly outperformed the control group ( $M = 15.75$ ) on the post-test of writing complexity ( $MD = 5.20, p < .05$ ).

The TBLT group ( $M = 17.72$ ) significantly outperformed the control group ( $M = 15.75$ ) on the post-test of writing complexity ( $MD = 1.96, p < .05$ ).

B: There were significant differences between ENGAGE ( $M = 23.21$ ), TBLT ( $M = 20.60$ ), and control ( $M = 18.18$ ) groups' means on the post-test of accuracy after controlling for the effect of pretest ( $F(2, 66) = 88.64, p < .05$ , Partial  $\eta^2 = .74$  indicating a large effect size). Therefore, the third null hypothesis, "there was no significant difference in the effects of the TBLT method and ENGAGE model on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 writing accuracy," was rejected. Table 11's findings from the posthoc comparison tests revealed that

The ENGAGE group ( $M = 23.21$ ) significantly outperformed the TBLT group ( $M = 20.60$ ) on the post-test of writing accuracy ( $MD = 2.61, p < .05$ ).

The ENGAGE group ( $M = 23.21$ ) significantly outperformed the control group ( $M = 18.18$ ) on the post-test of writing accuracy ( $MD = 5.02, p < .05$ ).

The TBLT group ( $M = 20.60$ ) significantly outperformed the control group ( $M = 18.18$ ) on post-test of writing accuracy ( $MD = 2.41, p < .05$ ).

C: Finally, there were significant differences between ENGAGE ( $M = 22.39$ ), TBLT ( $M = 20.34$ ), and control ( $M = 17.19$ ) groups' means on the post-test of fluency after controlling for the effect of pretest ( $F(2, 66) = 52.09, p < .05$ , Partial  $\eta^2 = .63$  showing a large effect size). Hence, the third null hypothesis, "there was no significant difference in the effects of the TBLT method and ENGAGE model on Iranian EFL Learners' L2 writing fluency," was rejected. Table 11's findings from the posthoc comparison tests revealed the following:

The ENGAGE group ( $M = 22.39$ ) significantly outperformed the TBLT group ( $M = 20.34$ ) on the post-test of writing fluency ( $MD = 2.05, p < .05$ ).

The ENGAGE group ( $M = 22.39$ ) significantly outperformed the control group ( $M = 17.19$ ) on the post-test of writing fluency ( $MD = 5.20, p < .05$ ).

The TBLT group ( $M = 20.34$ ) significantly outperformed the control group ( $M = 17.19$ ) on the post-test of writing fluency ( $MD = 3.14, p < .05$ ).

## 5. Discussion

The current study's results demonstrated that there were significant differences between the means of the post-tests for complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) that were taken by the TBLT group, the ENGAGE group, and the control group. On the CAF post-tests, the ENGAGE group had a significant advantage over both the TBLT group and the control group. On the other hand, the TBLT group had a significant advantage over the control group. The preference for the ENGAGE-based L2 writing paradigm over TBLT is astounding and alluring, and this is the first point worth highlighting. This shows that the ENGAGE model has been successful, despite the fact that this type of instruction is very novel and there is no academic language underpinning to support it.

The findings of the current study are consistent with those of a prior investigation into the ENGAGE model in the ELT area. In reality, there are just a few accounts of this model in the ELT literature (Abdollahzadeh et al., 2021, 2023; Esfandiari et al., 2020, 2021). The ENGAGE model is a new concept in the educational field in general and in the EFL context in particular. The ENGAGE model (Halsey, 2011), which takes a naturalistic approach to education, focuses on both cognitive concepts and sociocultural concerns. The model was utilized by Halsey & Halsey (2017) and Halsey et al. (2018) to create a learner-centered instructional program. Additionally, Prince (2004, as cited in Halsey & Halsey, 2017) argued that active learning techniques that involve learners in the learning process (such as discussions, presentations, and interactive projects) lead to greater accomplishment, better retention, and deeper understanding. Halsey (2016) asserted that the ENGAGE model aims to engage the learner's mind by emphasizing cognitive learning. Halsey and Halsey (2017) advise naturalistic education programs to use active learning techniques to achieve this. According to Halsey (2011), who uses synergy as a foundational idea in the ENGAGE model, "synergy is all about working together and supporting each other's success" (p. 10). The ENGAGE approach emphasizes cooperation in this respect. On top of that, the other finding of this study, which showed the effectiveness of employing TBLT in teaching writing, is consistent with research from other studies, such as those by Aliakbari and Jamalvandi (2010), Ghavamnia et al. (2013), Nitta and Baba (2014), Zohrabi and Abasvand (2014), Ahmed and Bidin (2016), Nemat Tabrizi and Hosseini (2016), Sundari et al. (2018), and Chaouchi and Bahloul (2023).



The first step in *energizing learners* is to get them involved and excited about teaching beforehand (e.g., by creating a podcast about the subject and sharing relevant resources and study tools) (Kilbourne, 2011). Energizing involves thanking participants for attending and engaging them right away at the start of the session by posing a question, carrying out an interactive activity, or outlining essential goals for learning (Halsey et al., 2018). Warm-up activities, icebreaker conversations, encouraging learners to write about everyday problems, and inspiring learners by personalizing the target language themes were all taken into account in L2 writing classrooms.

The ENGAGE model's second stage, "*navigating content*," emphasizes the use of various strategies (such as visual, aural, and kinesthetic) to activate the brain's various areas. By using role-playing, games, or group activities, the trainer alternately teaches and reviews the material. In the L2 writing lesson, it was crucial to ask the learners to build the new subject and navigate the knowledge they had received during the prior session. Additionally, the teacher and the learners negotiated decisions regarding assignments and activities.

The third phase, *generating meaning*, encourages learners to describe the importance of the newly acquired information they now possess and how it will help them, such as helping them learn more successfully and identifying problems they may encounter while they study (Halsey, 2011). The learners were required to present written reports on themselves and current events to operationalize this step in the L2 writing course.

The fourth stage, *applying to the real world*, indicates that learners require chances to show that they have mastered the new skills (for example, by exploring lexical resources, intonation, pronunciation, or through practical application). This idea was implemented in the L2 writing class by instructing the learners to research the topic chosen in class, use the Internet and social media to learn more about a particular topic and express their own ideas in class through their assigned writing.

The fifth step of the ENGAGE model is called "*gauging and celebrating*," and it encourages learners to evaluate their progress and the amount of knowledge they have received through activities such as an exam, a crossword puzzle, or a presentation, and then to celebrate their accomplishments. Using SA principles and writing checklists, this idea has been introduced into existence in a classroom environment and made operational.

The sixth stage of the ENGAGE paradigm, *extending learning to action*, relates to the follow-up activities (such as e-mail updates or buddy systems) to make sure that learners

follow through on their plans to put their new information or skills to use. By asking the learners to apply what they had learned to write about various topics, this stage was implemented in the L2 writing course.

The present study's findings demonstrated that learners who received ENGAGE model instruction produced superior writing instructions than their TBLT-receiving peers. In this regard, the approach can promote greater development of strategic L2 writing in an EFL setting. Therefore, research suggests that, when compared to TBLT and conventional methods, ENGAGE-based teaching strategies offer a better learning environment for EFL learners' L2 writing.

## **6. Conclusion**

According to the data analyses of the current study, the complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of L2 writing were found to be more significantly influenced by the ENGAGE model than by the TBLT. As a result, the application of the ENGAGE model in the English language writing program for Iranian EFL learners has helped the participants to perform better than the TBLT group and the control group, where the learners depended on the traditional ways of education and task-based learning. It is possible to conclude that exposing EFL learners to various ENGAGE model strategies can improve their learning of L2 in general and their development of L2 writing-related sub-skills in particular.

The findings of this research can be used by ELT professionals, curriculum designers, and English language instructors in EFL and ESL settings. English teachers and learners can use the ENGAGE paradigm to tackle their linguistic and metalinguistic challenges meaningfully. This is consistent with the safe training concept put forth by Kilbourne (2011). EFL learners would also see the gaps and recognize a discrepancy between the input they get and what they are currently learning. In this approach, the interactions in the classroom can be improved, which will aid the learners' later L2 improvement.

The researcher in the current study had to deal with the following limitations: As a case in point, individual differences could not be controlled. It was challenging to manage the learners' degree of tolerance, patience, and interest in learning. As a result, these individual traits might have influenced the researcher's efforts to motivate learners to engage in classroom activities, particularly in the ENGAGE model group. Additionally, the research institute had established specific rules and regulations for educators, learners, and

researchers. The researcher had to perform the study in separate classes designed for a course in L2 writing, which made complying with the regulations to carry out the study a little challenging. However, because there were only female participants, the conclusions should not be broadly applied to other genders. Additionally, some of the study's participants had Turkish or Kurdish backgrounds; Persian was regarded as their second language; as a result, English was the third language they were learning. Because it was difficult to control, the expected effects of L1 and L2 on these learners' L3 writing development were purposefully overlooked to strengthen the study's credibility.

The same hypothesis can be put forth for those learning the Iranian language at various linguistic levels. A semi-longitudinal research of the ENGAGE model concept with a particular set of learners can show whether this theory increases information retention and linguistic growth in the learners' mentality. More research may be required to reproduce the results with different language components or skills, including listening, vocabulary, and grammar development. A new study of the same sort with a larger sample size may take the learners' age into account at various intervals to provide more generalizable results and findings. In conclusion, a replication of the current study is required to consider alternative approaches to determine the impact of the ENGAGE model on learners' acquisition of L2 writing sub-skills in their second language.

## References

- Abdollahzadeh, M., Barjesteh, H., & Biria, R. (2021). The impact of teaching through engage model on L2 speaking of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 5(2), 205-214.
- Abdollahzadeh, M., Barjesteh, H., & Biria, R. (2023). A study on the efficacy of ENGAGE model in improving speaking components of EFL learners: A comparative methodological approach. *Iranian Journal of Comparative Education*, 2(3), 56-64. doi:10.22034/ijce.2023.361770.1436
- Ahmed, R. Z., & Bidin, S. J. B. (2016). The effect of task-based language teaching on writing skills of EFL learners in Malaysia. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 6(03), 207-218.
- Alghizzi, T. M. (2017). *Complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) development in L2 writing: the effects of proficiency level, learning environment, text type, and time among Saudi EFL learners* (Doctoral dissertation), University College Cork.
- Aliakbari, M., & Jamalvandi, B. (2010). The impact of role play on fostering EFL learners' speaking ability: A task-based approach. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 15-29.
- Berthold, M. (2011). Reliability of quick placement tests: How much faith can we place on quick paper or internet-based placement tests. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 674-698.
- Brown, A. (2006). An examination of the rating process in the revised IELTS speaking test. *International English Language Testing System (IELTS) Research Reports*, 6, 1-16.
- Byrnes, H., & Manchón, R. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Task-based language learning-insights from and for L2 writing*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chaouchi, N., & Bahloul, A. (2023). The Impact of TBLT in Developing EFL Students' Writing Performance Case study: Third-year Students in the Department of English at Tebessa University. *Revue Académique des Études Sociales et Humaines*, 15(1), 433-447

- Ellis, R. W. (2019). Towards a modular language curriculum for using tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 454-475.
- Ellis, R. W. (2022). Task-based language teaching: Early days, now and into the future. In N. P. Sudharshana & L. Mukhopadhyay (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching and assessment: Contemporary reflections from across the world* (pp. 39-61). Springer Nature Singapore.
- Ellis, R. W., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford University Press.
- Esfandiari, S., Mahmoudi, A., & Davaribina, M. (2021). ENGAGE model as an innovation in teaching speaking: A case of cognitively more and less active EFL learners. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures* 13(4), 729-753.
- Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(3), 299-323.
- Ghavannia, M., Tavakoli, M., & Esteki, M. (2013). The effect of pre-task and online planning conditions on complexity, accuracy and fluency on EFL learners' written production. *Learning*, 12(3), 112-125.
- Halsey, R.W. (2016). The first ten things I learned in the wilderness. Stop talking at me. Retrieved from [www.californiachaparral.org](http://www.californiachaparral.org)
- Halsey, R. W., Halsey, V. W., & Gaudette, R. (2018). Connecting Californians with the chaparral. In E. C. Underwood, H. D. Safford, N. A. Molinari, & J. E. Keeley (Eds.), *Valuing chaparral: Ecological, socio-economic, and management perspectives* (pp. 295-322). Springer
- Halsey, V. W. (2011). *Brilliance by Design*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Halsey, V. W., & Halsey, R. W. (2017). Connecting Californians with the Chaparral through the ENGAGE Model. Retrieved from [www.californiachaparral.org/naturecenters.html](http://www.californiachaparral.org/naturecenters.html).
- Healy, K., & Mulholland, J. (2019). *Writing skills for social workers*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- Hill, N. E., & Taylor, L. C. (2004). Parental school involvement and children's academic achievement pragmatics and issues. *Current directions in psychological science*, 13(4), 161-164.
- Hodge, D. C., Baxter Magolda, M. B., & Haynes, C. A. (2009). Engaged learning: Enabling self-authorship and effective practice. *Liberal Education*, 95(4), 16-23.
- Kilbourne, C. (2011). Connect, inspire, and ENGAGE: A model for improving safety training. *New Learning Trends*, 2(3), 2021, from <https://ehsdailyadvisor.blr.com>
- Motallebzadeh, K., & Nematizadeh, S. (2011). Does gender play a role in the assessment of oral proficiency?. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 165-172.
- Nemat Tabrizi, A.R., & Hosseini, S. (2016). The effect of using task-based activities on writing performance of Iranian introvert vs. extrovert EFL learners. *International Journal of Modern Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(4), 159-167.
- Nitta, R., & Baba, K. (2014). Task repetition and L2 writing development. In H. Byrnes & R. M. Manchón (Eds.). *Task-based language learning: Insights from and for L2 writing* (pp.107-118). John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Pallotti, G. (2009). CAF: Defining, refining and differentiating constructs. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 590-601.
- Plakans, L., Gebiril, A., & Bilki, Z. (2016). Shaping a score: Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in integrated writing performances. *Language Testing*, 36(2), 161-179.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy* (Vol. 20). Oxford University Press.
- Santangelo, T., & Graham, S. (2016). A comprehensive meta-analysis of handwriting instruction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(2), 225-265.
- Seedhouse, P. (1999). Task-based interaction. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 149-156.
- Shomi, T. I. (2022). *The effects of task-based language teaching approach in teaching and learning of English reading and writing skills* (Doctoral dissertation), Brac University.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. (2009). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. In K. Van den Branden, M. Bygate, & J. Norris (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching* (pp. 121-132). John Benjamins.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning*, 49, 93-120.
- Sundari, H., Febriyanti, R. H., & Saragih, G. (2018). Using task-based materials in teaching writing for EFL classes in Indonesia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(3), 119-124.
- Willis, J. (2019). *A framework for task-based learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Longman.
- Xia, P. (2023). A Review on the International Task-Based Language Teaching in Recent Ten Years: A Scientometric Analysis Based on CiteSpace. *Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies*, 2(2), 34-42.
- Zohrabi, M., & Abasvand, Y. (2014). The effects of task repetition on improving Iranian EFL learners' accuracy and complexity in writing proficiency. *International Journal of English and Education*, 3(2), 156-165.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Writing Pretest

**Write the way you think you can best express yourself.**

*People attend college or university for many different reasons (for example, new experiences, career preparation, and increased knowledge). Why do you think people attend college or university? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.*

### Appendix B: Writing Post-test

**Write the way you think you can best express yourself.**

*A company has announced that it wishes to build a large factory near your community. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this new influence on your community. Do you support or oppose the factory? Explain your position.*