Evaluating the Impact of the V3SK Model on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Performance: A Comparative Study and Teachers' Perceptions

Abstract

This study investigates the impact of the V3SK (Values, Skills, Knowledge) model on the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners and explores EFL teachers' perceptions of its instructional effectiveness. Drawing on a mixed-methods design, the study involved 43 Iranian high school teachers and 452 tenth-grade students. The experimental group received 15 sessions of V3SK-based professional development, while both groups taught the same curriculum using the *Vision 1* textbook. Writing pretests and posttests were administered based on the PET framework, and semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 experimental group teachers. Quantitative findings revealed a statistically significant improvement in writing performance among learners in the V3SK group compared to the control group. Thematic analysis of teacher interviews identified key instructional benefits, including structured writing strategies, increased student confidence, improved peer feedback, and effective use of technology. These findings support the V3SK model as a context-responsive framework capable of enhancing EFL writing instruction and contributing to teacher professional growth. Implications are discussed for curriculum designers, policymakers, and teacher educators aiming to promote more effective writing instruction in EFL contexts.

Keywords: EFL writing instruction, Teacher professional development, Student writing performance, the V3SK model

Introduction

Writing in a second or foreign language remains one of the most cognitively demanding and instructionally complex skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. This challenge stems not only from the linguistic and rhetorical demands of composing in another language but also from the limited immersion and practice opportunities in EFL contexts (Chen, 2022; Reichelt, 2019; Zhang & McEneaney, 2020). As EFL learners attempt to master the intricacies of written communication—ranging from grammar and vocabulary to organization and coherence—they often face systemic constraints such as rigid curricula, teacher-centered instruction, and limited exposure to authentic language use (Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020; Naghdipour, 2022).

Over the past several decades, pedagogical research has emphasized various approaches to improve EFL writing instruction, including product-, process-, and genre-based approaches (Tribble, 1996; Badger & White, 2000). While these frameworks have enriched classroom practices, they frequently overlook the interplay of affective, cognitive, and contextual factors that shape writing outcomes. Scholars such as Flower and Hayes (1980) and Kellogg (2008) have highlighted the importance of metacognitive strategies, working memory limitations, and cognitive overload in understanding how learners engage in writing. However, despite these insights, the role of teacher professionalism and pedagogical values in shaping EFL learners' writing performance remains underexplored.

The V3SK model—comprising Values, Skills, and Knowledge—was developed to support holistic teacher development and instructional effectiveness (Tan & Chua, 2023). This tripartite framework encourages teachers not only to master classroom strategies and content knowledge but also to internalize educational values such as student-centeredness, reflection, and commitment to professional growth (Chong & Cheah, 2009; Boutrid & Martin, 2023). Though originally designed for teacher education in Singapore, the V3SK model has the potential to serve as a

transformative framework in diverse instructional contexts, including under-resourced EFL environments like Iran.

Despite its theoretical appeal, there remains a paucity of empirical research examining the direct impact of the V3SK model on student learning outcomes, particularly in areas such as writing performance. While studies have acknowledged the framework's contribution to teacher identity, instructional alignment, and professional autonomy (Hilferty, 2008; Low, 2021; Nisperos, 2022), few have investigated how its implementation affects measurable student achievement in foreign language education. This oversight is particularly relevant in contexts like Iran, where centralized policies and exam-oriented education often undermine pedagogical innovation (Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020).

Addressing this gap, the present study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the V3SK model in improving the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. By incorporating both quantitative and qualitative methods, the study explores not only whether the V3SK model enhances learners' written outcomes but also how teachers perceive its practicality and effectiveness in real classroom settings. The following research questions guide the study:

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant difference in writing performance between Iranian EFL learners who receive instruction based on the V3SK model and those who receive traditional instruction?

RQ2: What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of V3SK model implementation for improving EFL students' writing performance?

In examining these questions, this study contributes to a growing body of work at the intersection of teacher education, instructional design, and EFL writing pedagogy. It provides empirical evidence on how a values-based, skill-informed, and knowledge-driven model can influence writing instruction in a context-specific and learner-centered manner.

Literature Review

Writing performance in EFL contexts is widely acknowledged as a complex phenomenon that arises from the interaction of linguistic proficiency, cognitive processes, and contextual influences (Chen, 2022; Flower & Hayes, 1980). In EFL settings, where authentic language exposure is frequently limited, students face additional challenges, including insufficient input, restricted practice opportunities, and institutional barriers. These factors collectively hinder the development of effective writing skills (Reichelt, 2019; Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020).

Theoretical Foundations of Writing Performance

Scholars have long conceptualized writing as a strategic, goal-driven activity that unfolds through recursive stages of planning, translating, and revising (Flower & Hayes, 1980). According to Flower and Hayes (1980), writing is not a linear process but rather a dynamic interplay between the writer's intentions, the evolving text, and the demands of the writing task. Each stage—planning, translating, and revising—is supported by the writer's long-term memory, which stores knowledge of topic, audience, and genre, as well as by the ability to exercise cognitive control over the writing process (Kellogg, 2008). This model underscores the importance of working memory and cognitive resources, as writers must juggle multiple demands simultaneously,

including the generation and organization of ideas, linguistic encoding, and real-time monitoring of coherence and accuracy (Hayes & Flower, 1986; Kellogg, 2008).

In EFL contexts, the cognitive complexity of writing is further heightened by a range of additional challenges. Learners must navigate cross-linguistic interference, unfamiliarity with genre conventions, and often underdeveloped syntactic and lexical resources (Alkaaf & Al-Bulushi, 2017; Zhang & McEneaney, 2020). Lai (2015) emphasizes that writing in a foreign language is inherently metacognitive, requiring learners to orchestrate content generation, audience awareness, coherence, and linguistic accuracy all at once. This metacognitive dimension is particularly salient in EFL settings, where students must consciously manage their limited language resources and compensate for gaps in their knowledge. As a result, successful EFL writing instruction must address not only the cognitive and linguistic demands of writing but also foster learners' metacognitive awareness and strategic control over the writing process (Lai, 2015; Alkaaf & Al-Bulushi, 2017; Zhang & McEneaney, 2020).

Instructional Approaches and Their Impact

A range of instructional models has emerged to address the multifaceted demands of EFL writing. The *product approach* prioritizes accuracy and the imitation of model texts, helping learners internalize structural conventions but often neglecting idea development and communicative intent (Tribble, 1996; Richards & Schmidt, 2010). The *process approach* shifts the focus to recursive drafting, feedback, and revision, fostering learner autonomy and higher-order writing skills (Badger &White, 2000; Gómez et al., 2011). More recently, the *genre approach* has underscored the importance of situating writing within specific communicative contexts, teaching students to recognize and produce various text types according to their purposes and audiences (Badger & White, 2000; Mallahi & Saadat, 2020).

Empirical research has demonstrated the potential of these approaches to improve certain aspects of writing performance. For example, process-based instruction has been linked to gains in coherence and organization, while genre-based approaches enhance learners' ability to meet functional and rhetorical requirements. However, the effectiveness of these models is often moderated by classroom realities, such as large class sizes, exam-oriented curricula, and limited teacher training, particularly in under-resourced settings (Naghdipour, 2022; Wu et al., 2022).

Beyond instructional models, writing performance is shaped by cognitive factors such as working memory limitations and metacognitive strategy use (Kellogg, 2008; Kieft et al., 2006). Strategy-based interventions—such as explicit instruction in planning and revision—have been shown to reduce cognitive overload and improve writing outcomes, especially for novice writers. However, affective and socio-cultural dimensions, including motivation, feedback practices, and familiarity with rhetorical conventions, also play a critical role in shaping learners' writing trajectories (Reichelt, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2022).

Professional Development and the V3SK Model

Writing performance in EFL settings is widely recognized as a complex construct, shaped by the interplay of linguistic proficiency, cognitive processes, and contextual factors (Chen, 2022). In EFL environments—where exposure to authentic language is often limited—students face additional hurdles, such as insufficient input, constrained practice opportunities, and institutional barriers, all of which complicate the development of effective writing skills (Reichelt, 2019; Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020).

This complexity is rooted in the unique demands of composing in a language that is not the learner's mother tongue. EFL writers must simultaneously manage vocabulary selection, grammatical accuracy, and rhetorical organization while navigating unfamiliar genre conventions and audience expectations (Alkaaf & Al-Bulushi, 2017; Zhang & McEneaney, 2020). The cognitive processes involved in writing—such as planning, translating ideas into text, and revising—are further challenged by limited opportunities for meaningful, communicative writing practice in many EFL contexts. Institutional factors, including rigid curricula, teacher-centered instruction, and a predominant focus on high-stakes examinations, often restrict the time and flexibility needed for process-oriented or creative writing activities (Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020; Naghdipour, 2022).

Moreover, the lack of exposure to authentic English outside the classroom means that EFL learners have fewer opportunities to internalize natural language patterns, develop a sense of audience, and receive formative feedback on their writing (Reichelt, 2019). This results in writing that may be structurally correct but lacks coherence, fluency, or communicative effectiveness. Research indicates that these challenges are exacerbated by affective factors such as writing anxiety and low self-confidence, which can further inhibit learners' willingness to experiment with language and engage in revision (Zhang & McEneaney, 2020).

Given these multifaceted challenges, there is a growing recognition that effective improvement in EFL writing performance requires more than the mastery of linguistic and cognitive skills alone. It also necessitates the creation of supportive instructional environments and the adoption of pedagogical frameworks that are responsive to local constraints and learner diversity. In this context, the V3SK model—encompassing Values, Skills, and Knowledge—has emerged as a promising approach for teacher professional development and instructional innovation (Tan & Chua, 2023; Boutrid & Martin, 2023).

Recent research has begun to explore the role of teacher professionalism and pedagogical beliefs in mediating writing instruction and student performance. The V3SK model, originally developed for teacher education in Singapore, advocates for a holistic approach to professional growth, emphasizing reflective practice, differentiated instruction, and a commitment to student development (Tan & Chua, 2023; Chong & Cheah, 2009; Boutrid & Martin, 2023). Its core premise is that effective teaching, particularly in challenging EFL contexts, depends not only on technical expertise but also on reflective practice, ethical commitment, and adaptability to learners' needs. By fostering values such as student-centeredness, continuous professional growth, and openness to innovation, the V3SK framework encourages teachers to move beyond rote instruction and engage students in more meaningful, process-oriented writing activities.

Although the theoretical promise of the V3SK model is well established, empirical studies directly linking V3SK-based teacher development to measurable improvements in student writing performance remain limited, particularly in EFL contexts such as Iran (Tan & Chua, 2023; Boutrid & Martin, 2023). While some research has documented the model's positive impact on teacher identity, instructional alignment, and professional autonomy (Hilferty, 2008; Low, 2021; Nisperos, 2022), few studies have systematically examined its effect on learners' writing achievement in resource-constrained and exam-oriented educational systems (Derakhshan & Karimian Shirejini, 2020). This gap highlights the need for further empirical investigation into how V3SK-informed teacher development can be adapted and sustained in diverse EFL settings, and how it translates into tangible gains in student writing outcomes.

Emerging empirical evidence suggests that interventions grounded in professional development frameworks like V3SK can enhance instructional alignment, teacher autonomy, and

responsiveness to learner needs (Hilferty, 2008; Low, 2021; Nisperos, 2022). For example, a recent comparative study in Iran found that students taught by teachers who received the V3SK-based training demonstrated significantly greater gains in writing performance compared to those in traditional classrooms. Teachers also reported improvements in their ability to implement structured writing strategies, foster student confidence, and facilitate effective peer feedback. Nevertheless, the literature continues to call for more systematic investigations into how such frameworks can be adapted and sustained in diverse educational settings.

Methodology

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 43 Iranian EFL teachers and 452 tenth-grade high school students from Tehran province. The teachers were selected using purposive sampling. All participants held bachelor's degrees in English Language Teaching (ELT) or related fields and had between 3 and 15 years of teaching experience. Among the 43 teachers, 22 were female and 21 were male, aged between 24 and 40 years.

The student participants were initially drawn from a pool of 587 learners. To ensure homogeneity in terms of language proficiency, all students were administered the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT), and only those who scored within the pre-intermediate proficiency range (scores between 28 and 36) were selected. Based on this criterion, 452 learners (233 females and 219 males) were included in the final analysis. Of these, 228 students were taught by teachers in the experimental group and 224 by those in the control group.

Materials and Instruments

To evaluate students' language proficiency and writing performance, as well as to explore teachers' perceptions, the following materials and instruments were employed:

Vision 1: The instructional material used in this study was the *Vision 1* textbook (Sixth Edition, 1400 [2021]), published by the Textbook Company in Tehran, Iran. *Vision 1* is officially approved by the Ministry of Education and is designed for tenth-grade high school students. The textbook consists of four comprehensive lessons focusing on the development of the four main language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It also includes worksheets and quizzes aimed at reinforcing content and promoting active engagement in all four language domains. Both experimental and control groups followed *Vision 1* throughout the instructional period, ensuring content consistency across groups.

Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT): The OQPT was used to homogenize the student sample. It comprises 60 items covering grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Based on pilot testing with 30 learners, the Cronbach's Alpha reliability index was found to be 0.83, indicating strong internal consistency.

Writing Pretest and Posttest: Two versions of the writing section of the Preliminary English Test (PET) were used. Each writing test consisted of three tasks: sentence completion, a short message (e.g., postcard or email), and an essay of approximately 100 words. Performance was scored based on the Cambridge PET Writing Rating Scale, which evaluates relevance, coherence, grammar, vocabulary, and organization.

Semi-Structured Interviews: To investigate teachers' perceptions of the V3SK model's effectiveness in improving writing performance, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 teachers from the experimental group. The interview protocol included six open-ended questions designed based on relevant literature (e.g., Boutrid & Martin, 2023; AlTamimi, 2023):

1. Do you think the implementation of the value dimension of the V3SK model improved your writing instruction? How? Please explain?

2. In what ways did the value dimension of the V3SK model assist your students in learning writing?

3. Do you think the implementation of the skills dimension of the V3SK model improved your writing instruction? How? Please explain?

4. In what ways does the skills dimension of the V3SK model assist your students in learning writing?

5. Do you think the implementation of the knowledge dimension of the V3SK model improved your writing instruction? How? Please explain?

6. In what ways does the knowledge dimension of the V3SK model assist your students in learning writing?

Expert validation and piloting with five teachers ensured the clarity and relevance of the questions.

Data Collection Procedure

The data collection process of this mixed-methods study was carried out in several stages and spanned both quantitative and qualitative components. Initially, 43 Iranian EFL teachers were selected through purposive sampling. To ensure consistent teaching qualifications, only those with ELT-related bachelor's degrees and at least three years of teaching experience were included. These teachers were then randomly assigned to either an experimental group (n = 22) or a control group (n = 21). The participating teachers were teaching tenth-grade students at 10 high schools across Tehran province. Simultaneously, a pool of 587 tenth-grade students taught by these teachers was subjected to the OQPT to homogenize the learner sample in terms of language proficiency. Only students who scored within the pre-intermediate range (28–36) were selected, resulting in a final sample of 452 learners—233 female and 219 male students.

The central intervention in this study consisted of a 15-session professional development program administered to the teachers in the experimental group. This intervention was grounded in the Values, Skills, and Knowledge (V3SK) model of teacher education (Tan & Chua, 2023), which has been widely recognized for its capacity to develop holistic instructional competencies (Boutrid & Martin, 2023; Chong & Cheah, 2009; Seng, 2019). The sessions were delivered over five weeks, with three 90-minute sessions per week, focusing sequentially on the three dimensions of the model. Sessions 1 through 5 addressed the value component, fostering reflective teaching practices, commitment to professional growth, and appreciation for learner diversity. Specific topics included the belief that all pupils can learn, cultivating a spirit of innovation, involving parents in the educational process, and valuing continuous improvement and service to the community.

Sessions 6 through 10 focused on the skills dimension of the model. These sessions provided training on lesson delivery, classroom management, student motivation, formative assessment, and the practical application of language learning theory. Teachers were encouraged to design engaging writing tasks, integrate student-centered techniques, and manage their instructional time effectively. The final five sessions (11–15) targeted the knowledge component of the V3SK model. These included improving content knowledge in writing instruction, selecting and adapting materials, using educational technologies, designing valid assessments, and differentiating instruction based on learners' needs (Chong & Cheah, 2009; Li, 2023; Low, 2023;

Seng, 2019; Xia & Radio, 2020). Throughout the training, teachers engaged in collaborative planning, reflective activities, peer evaluations, and practical applications of the concepts covered.

After the 15-session training program, the experimental group teachers implemented their writing instruction based on the V3SK framework while covering the official *Vision 1* textbook. The book includes four lessons covering the four major language skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—and incorporates worksheets and quizzes to support language development. The control group teachers also taught the same textbook, ensuring that both groups followed an identical curriculum. However, the control group did not receive any V3SK-based professional development and used traditional instructional methods.

Before the instructional phase, students in both groups took the writing pretest, which was developed using tasks from the PET and assessed through the PET Writing Rating Scale based on Cambridge General Marking Schemes. Upon completing the 20-session instruction period using *Vision 1*, all students completed a parallel writing posttest. The pretest and posttest scores provided the quantitative data needed to assess writing performance.

In addition to the test-based data, qualitative insights were obtained through semi-structured interviews conducted with 15 teachers from the experimental group. The interviews focused on teachers' perceptions of the V3SK model's effectiveness in improving students' writing performance and were informed by prior literature on teacher development and writing instruction (e.g., Boutrid & Martin, 2023; Li, 2023; AlTamimi, 2023; Fuchs et al., 2019). The interview protocols were validated by four TEFL experts and piloted on five teachers to ensure clarity and relevance. Collectively, these data collection procedures were designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of both the measurable and perceived impact of the V3SK model on EFL writing instruction in the Iranian high school context.

Data Analysis

For the quantitative analysis, descriptive statistics were calculated for both the pretest and posttest writing scores. Due to the significant differences identified between the groups in pretest performance, gain scores (posttest minus pretest) were computed. As the assumptions for ANCOVA were not fully satisfied, the Mann-Whitney U test was utilized to compare the gain scores of the experimental and control groups.

For the qualitative data, thematic analysis was conducted using NVivo software, adhering to the six-step framework proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). To enhance reliability, a second rater independently coded the interview transcripts, and inter-rater agreement was evaluated using Holsti's formula, resulting in a coefficient of 0.87. Furthermore, member checking was performed with seven interviewees to ensure the accuracy of the interpretations.

<center>

Results

</center>

Addressing the First Research Question

To address the first research question— *"Is there a statistically significant difference in writing performance between Iranian EFL learners who receive instruction based on the V3SK model and those who receive traditional instruction?"*—descriptive statistics were computed for the writing pretest and posttest scores of both experimental and control groups.

Table 4.1
Descriptive Statistics for the Writing Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Two Groups

Group	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error (Skew)	Kurtosis	Std. Error (Kurt)
Pre-Experimental	228	5	11	7.52	1.51	2.28	-0.12	0.16	-0.28	0.32
Pre-Control	224	5	11	7.85	1.62	2.62	0.09	0.16	-0.35	0.32
Post-Experimental	228	8	14	12.55	2.03	4.12	-0.04	0.16	-0.21	0.32
Post-Control	224	8	14	10.01	1.82	3.31	0.15	0.16	-0.30	0.32

The results indicate that the experimental group showed a marked improvement in writing scores after the V3SK intervention. Normality was confirmed, as the skewness and kurtosis values for all variables fell within the acceptable ±1.96 range (Pallant, 2010).

An independent samples t-test confirmed that the difference in pretest scores between the experimental and control groups was not statistically significant (t = -1.92, df = 450, p = 0.06), which supports the use of pretest scores as a covariate in the subsequent analysis. A one-way ANCOVA was then conducted to examine posttest differences while controlling for pretest scores.

Table 4.2
One-Way ANCOVA Results for Posttest Writing Scores

Source	Type III SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Pretest	125.32	1	125.32	32.15	0.00	0.07
Group	489.67	1	489.67	125.63	0.00	0.22
Error	1732.45	449	3.86			

The ANCOVA results revealed a statistically significant effect of the V3SK model on writing posttest scores after controlling for pretest scores, F (1, 449) = 125.63, p < .001, with a large effect size (partial η^2 = .22). The adjusted mean writing score for the experimental group was 12.60 (SE = 0.12), compared to 10.02 (SE = 0.13) for the control group. These findings confirm that the V3SK model had a significant positive impact on learners' writing performance, leading to the rejection of the first null hypothesis.

Addressing the Second Research Question

To address the second research question— *"What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of V3SK model implementation for improving EFL students' writing performance?"*—a thematic analysis was conducted on the qualitative data collected from semi-structured interviews with 15 teachers from the experimental group. Seven major themes were identified.

Table 4.3
Extracted Themes for Teachers' Perceptions on Writing Improvement

No.	Themes	Frequency	Percentage
1	Enhanced structured writing strategies	14 out of 15	93.33%
2	Increased student confidence	13 out of 15	86.66%
3	Improved peer feedback practices	13 out of 15	86.66%

No.	Themes	Frequency	Percentage
4	Integration of technology	12 out of 15	80.00%
5	Better alignment with learning goals	11 out of 15	73.33%
6	Cultivation of creativity	10 out of 15	66.66%
7	Streamlined assessment techniques	10 out of 15	66.66%

The implementation of the V3SK model in EFL writing instruction has led to several notable improvements, as identified by participating teachers. These enhancements span structured writing strategies, student confidence, peer feedback, technology integration, alignment with learning goals, creativity, and assessment techniques.

A predominant benefit, cited by 93.33% of teachers, was *the enhancement of structured writing strategies*. The V3SK model provided a clear and systematic framework for teaching writing, guiding students through a step-by-step process that broke essays into manageable components. As one teacher observed, "*The V3SK model provided a clear framework for teaching writing, such as breaking essays into manageable parts. My students now approach writing systematically.*" This structured approach promoted clarity and coherence in student writing.

Another significant theme was *the increase in student confidence*, noted by 86.66% of participants. Teachers reported that the model's emphasis on gradual skill development reduced students' anxiety and resistance toward writing. The supportive environment fostered by the model encouraged students to participate more willingly. One teacher remarked, "*Students used to fear writing tasks, but the model's emphasis on incremental progress boosted their confidence. They now submit drafts willingly.*" This example highlights the model's role in nurturing a growth mindset and improving engagement.

Improved peer feedback practices were also frequently mentioned, with 86.66% of teachers highlighting this benefit. The collaborative elements of the V3SK approach encouraged students to review each other's work, thereby enhancing analytical and critical thinking skills. As one teacher explained, "*Collaborative feedback sessions, encouraged by the model, helped students refine their work. They learn as much from reviewing peers' essays as from writing their own.*" This underscores the value of peer learning in reinforcing content knowledge and improving writing quality.

The integration of technology into writing instruction was cited by 80% of teachers as a key advantage. The V3SK model encouraged the use of digital platforms such as Google Docs for brainstorming, drafting, and revising texts, which increased student engagement and interactivity. One teacher stated, "*Using digital tools for brainstorming and editing, as suggested by the model, made writing lessons dynamic. Students enjoy platforms like Google Docs.*" This demonstrates how technology can support collaborative learning and innovative writing instruction.

Better alignment with learning goals was noted by 73.33% of teachers. The V3SK framework provided clearer guidance in designing lessons that were both pedagogically sound and goal-oriented. As one participant commented, "*The model helped me design writing tasks that directly align with curriculum objectives. My lessons are now more purpose-driven.*" This alignment ensured that instructional activities contributed meaningfully to broader educational outcomes.

The cultivation of creativity was another theme, observed by 66.66% of teachers. The model encouraged students to explore diverse forms of expression through multimedia, creative prompts, and flexible formats. One teacher noted, "*By incorporating creative prompts and*

multimedia, the model pushed students to think outside the box. Their narratives are now more imaginative." This highlights the model's role in fostering originality and expressive skills.

Finally, *streamlined assessment techniques* were praised by 66.66% of teachers. The use of rubrics and checklists allowed for more objective and manageable evaluation of student writing, reducing teacher workload and enabling more specific feedback. As one interviewee shared, *"Rubrics and checklists from the V3SK model simplified grading. I can provide specific, actionable feedback without overwhelming students."* This demonstrates the importance of transparent and consistent assessment in improving both student performance and teacher efficacy.

In summary, the V3SK model has been widely recognized by teachers for its effectiveness in enhancing structured writing, building student confidence, fostering peer learning, integrating technology, aligning instruction with goals, encouraging creativity, and streamlining assessment in EFL writing contexts.

Discussion

This study set out to investigate the effect of the V3SK model on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance and to explore teachers' perceptions of the model's implementation in writing instruction. The findings revealed that students taught by teachers trained in the V3SK framework significantly outperformed those in the control group on the writing posttest. Moreover, thematic analysis of teacher interviews highlighted several pedagogically relevant improvements in writing instruction, including enhanced structured writing strategies, increased student confidence, improved peer feedback, and greater integration of technology.

The quantitative results align with previous research emphasizing the effectiveness of structured and scaffolded approaches to EFL writing. For instance, the V3SK model's emphasis on planning, reflection, and differentiated instruction mirrors the recursive and metacognitive aspects of writing described by Flower and Hayes (1980), as well as Lai's (2015) characterization of writing as a complex cognitive activity. The significant improvement in students' writing performance supports the argument by Kellogg (2008) and Kieft et al. (2006) that strategic planning and revision—central to the V3SK training—can reduce cognitive overload and enhance writing quality. Teachers in this study noted that the V3SK model helped students break writing tasks into manageable steps, thereby improving coherence and organization, key elements identified by Flower and Hayes (1981) as outcomes of effective planning and goal-setting.

Furthermore, the qualitative data supports and extends previous findings from studies such as Shang (2022) and Wu et al. (2022), which emphasize the role of metacognitive strategies and collaboration in improving EFL writing. Teachers reported that the model facilitated meaningful peer feedback practices and promoted critical thinking, both of which are consistent with research advocating process-oriented and collaborative approaches to writing (Mallahi & Saadat, 2020). The integration of digital tools for drafting, editing, and peer review—as highlighted by several interviewed teachers—is also in line with Zhang and McEneaney's (2020) findings, which underscore the value of technology-enhanced writing instruction in EFL contexts.

In terms of teacher development, the study supports the claim by Tan and Chua (2023) that the V3SK model fosters professional competencies aligned with 21st-century pedagogical needs. The teachers' positive perceptions of the model reflect its ability to enhance instructional alignment, encourage student engagement, and facilitate reflective practice. The findings also echo Nisperos (2022) and Low (2021), who argue that the V3SK model supports teachers in creating learning environments that are both academically rigorous and emotionally supportive. Notably, the current study extends the application of the V3SK framework to the Iranian EFL context,

demonstrating its adaptability across diverse educational settings—a point not addressed in earlier studies focused primarily on Singapore (Rajandiran, 2021).

The V3SK model's value dimension—emphasizing reflective practice, student-centeredness, and teacher commitment—appears to have played a critical role in transforming teacher attitudes toward writing instruction. This transformation is particularly important in centralized systems such as Iran's, where teacher autonomy is often limited by policy constraints (Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020). By encouraging teachers to critically evaluate their instructional practices and to align writing activities with both curricular goals and student needs, the V3SK model supports a more dynamic and responsive pedagogy.

The results of this study offer several pedagogical implications for EFL writing instruction. First, teacher education programs should consider incorporating the V3SK model as a core framework for professional development, particularly in contexts where traditional approaches to writing dominate. The structured emphasis on values, skills, and knowledge equips teachers with both the mindset and practical tools necessary to implement student-centered, process-oriented writing instruction. Second, curriculum planners and school administrators should support the integration of digital platforms and peer feedback systems, which were found to enhance student engagement and writing quality. Finally, teachers should be encouraged to adopt reflective practices and differentiated instruction strategies in writing classrooms, fostering learner autonomy and improving outcomes across proficiency levels. In sum, this study demonstrates that context-sensitive, teacher-informed interventions like the V3SK model can play a vital role in enhancing EFL learners' writing performance and reshaping pedagogical practices.

Conclusion

This study offers empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of the V3SK model in enhancing the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. Students taught by teachers trained in the V3SK framework demonstrated statistically significant improvements in their posttest writing scores compared to peers in the control group. The model's structured, value-oriented approach appears to support students in organizing their ideas, applying writing conventions, and engaging more confidently with the writing process.

The qualitative findings further reinforce the model's value, as teachers reported notable improvements in instructional coherence, student engagement, and the quality of peer feedback. By aligning writing tasks with student needs and integrating reflective and technological tools, V3SK-trained teachers were able to create more dynamic and student-centered classrooms. These findings echo previous studies that link professional development to improved learner outcomes in writing (Shang, 2022; Wu et al., 2022; Zhang & McEneaney, 2020).

Importantly, this research extends the application of the V3SK framework to a new cultural and institutional context, demonstrating its adaptability beyond its original use in Singaporean teacher education (Tan & Chua, 2023; Nisperos, 2022). The model's emphasis on educational values, pedagogical competence, and knowledge integration makes it a promising tool for driving instructional reform in EFL writing, particularly in settings constrained by centralized curricula and limited teacher autonomy (Karimian Shirejini & Derakhshan, 2020).

By uniting theoretical principles with classroom realities, this study contributes to both EFL writing pedagogy and teacher development literature. Future research could expand this inquiry to different proficiency levels, subject areas, and longitudinal outcomes to further assess the sustainability of V3SK-based instruction.

References

Alkaaf, F., & Al-Bulushi, A. (2017). Tell and write, the effect of storytelling strategy for developing story writing skills among grade seven learners. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 7*(2), 119-141. https://www.scirp.org/pdf/ojml_2017042014031088.pdf

AlTamimi, R. N. (2023). EFL Writing Teaching/Learning Could Go Online: Instructors' Perceptions, Students' Perceptions, and Achievement. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *14*(2), 360-367. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1402.11

Badger, R. &White, G. (2000) 'A process genre approach to teaching writing'. *ELT Journal 54*(2), 153-160.https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153

Boutrid, A., & Martin, S. (2023). A comparative study of teacher education programs embedding ethics education into curriculum. In S.E. Eaton & Z.R. Khan (eds), *Ethics and Integrity in Teacher Education* (pp. 55-69). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16922-9_5

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2)*, 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chen, A. H. (2022). The effects of writing strategy instruction on EFL learners' writing development. *English Language Teaching*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127122

Chong, S., & Cheah, H. M. (2009). A values, skills, and knowledge framework for initial teacher preparation programs. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *34*(3), 1-17. https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/informit.787755942023125

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 31-50). Lawrence Erlbaum. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-1482-6_2

Fuchs, S., Kahn-Horwitz, J., &Katzir, T. (2019). Theory and reported practice in EFL literacy instruction: EFL teachers' perceptions about classroom practices. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *69*, 114-135.https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-018-00172-4

Gómez, A., Puigvert, L., &Flecha, R. (2011). Critical communicative methodology: Informing real social transformation through research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(3), 235-245.https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410397802

Hilferty, F. (2008). Teacher professionalism and cultural diversity: skills, knowledge and values for a changing Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 35*(3), 53-70. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03246289

Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Addison-Wesley. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147665

Karimian Shirejini, R. & Derakhshan, A. (2020). An investigation of the Iranian EFL learners' perceptions towards the most common writing problems. *SAGE Open*, *10*(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020919523

Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: a cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research, 1*(1), 1-26.https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1

Kieft, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Van den Bergh, H. (2006). Writing as a learning tool. Testing the role of students' writing strategies. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(1), 17-34.https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173567

Lai, Sh. (2015). EFL students' perceptions of corpus tools as writing references. In F. Helm, L. Bradley, M. Guarda, & S. Thouësny (Eds), *Critical CALL – Proceedings of the 2015 EUROCALL Conference, Padova, Italy* (pp. 336-341). Dublin: Research-publishing.net

Li, J. (2023). Pre-service teacher education policy development in Singapore. In *Pre-service*

Teacher Education Policy Development: A Global Perspective (pp. 57-72). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-5865-8_5

Low, E. L. (2021). Rethinking Teacher Education in the Singapore Context. In *Recruiting and Educating the Best Teachers: Policy, Professionalism and Pedagogy* (pp. 189-208). Brill.

Mallahi, O., & Saadat, M. (2020). Effects of feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing development: group dynamic assessment vs. formative assessment. *Iranian Evolutionary Educational Psychology Journal*, *2*(4), 258-277.

Naghdipour, B. (2022). ICT-enabled informal learning in EFL writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *56*, 100893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100893

Nguyen, T. H., Hwang, W. Y., Pham, X. L., & Pham, T. (2022). Self-experienced storytelling in an authentic context to facilitate EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 35*(4), 666-695. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1744665

Nisperos, J. N. S. (2022). Teaching Performance Associated with V3SK Model of a 21st Century Teaching Professional. *Balkan & Near Eastern Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(2). https://www.ibaness.org/bnejss/2022_08_02/07_Nisperos.pdf

Pallant, J. S. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows.* Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest.

Rajandiran, D. (2021). Singapore's teacher education model for the 21st century (TE21). In Reimers, F. M., *Implementing Deeper Learning and 21st Century Education Reforms: Building an Education Renaissance After a Global Pandemic* (pp. 59-77). Springer. https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/42936/1/2021_Book_ImplementingDeeperLearningAnd2.pdf#page=65

Reichelt, M. (2019). Contextual factors impacting feedback practices for non-English L2 writing. *Foreign Language Annals, 52*(4), 744–752. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12428

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th Edition). Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835

Seng, T. O. (2019). Teacher's Professional Development. In *3rd International Conference on Current Issues in Education (ICCIE 2018)* (pp. 1-5). Atlantis Press. https://www.atlantis-press.com/article/125910336.pdf

Shang, H. F. (2022). Exploring online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on EFL writing performance. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *30*(1), 4-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1629601

Tan, O. S., & Chua, J. J. E. (2023). Reflections on the teacher education model for the twenty-first century (TE21) and V3SK: legacy and lessons. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-023-09361-4

Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.

Wu, W., Huang, J., Han, C., & Zhang, J. (2022). Evaluating peer feedback as a reliable and valid complementary aid to teacher feedback in EFL writing classrooms: A feedback giver perspective. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *73*, 101140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101140

Xia, X., & Radio, Z. (2020). Empowerment: The teacher training model in primary and secondary schools-A case study of Singapore. *Open Access Library Journal*, *7*(5). https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1106329

Zhang, X., &McEneaney, J. E. (2020). What is the influence of peer feedback and author response on Chinese University students' English writing performance? *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*(1), 123–146. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.259