



A STUDY ON THE EFFECTS OF EFL TEACHERS' USE OF THE BIG6 ON LEARNERS' ARGUMENTATIVE WRITINGⁱ

Nguyen Le Ngoc Anh¹,

Thai Cong Dan²ⁱⁱ

¹MA Candidate,

School of Foreign Languages,

Can Tho University,

Can Tho City, Vietnam

²Senior Lecturer, Dr.,

School of Social Sciences and Humanities,

Can Tho University,

Can Tho City, Vietnam

Abstract:

Information literacy has proved to be one of the factors that help learners increase their writing academic in higher education institutions around the world. Therefore, developing information literacy curriculum for learners who speak English as a foreign language is of critical concern for librarians and English as a Foreign Language: EFL educators. However, in general, there is limited research about learners' information literacy experiences in English writing educational contexts. Therefore, this research fills a gap in the research, as it focuses on investigating the effects of EFL teachers' use of the Information literacy model - Big6 on learners' argumentative writing. In this research, a mixed method combined both quantitative and qualitative designs was conducted to collect and analyze the data, including a pre-test and a post-test, questionnaires, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The findings show that there is a statistically significant difference between the writing performances at two time points of the experimental group who was taught English with information literacy skills. In addition, the findings indicate that EFL teachers and learners became more aware of the integration of information literacy skills into their teaching argumentative writing to learners. Key issues about training provision in this area were examined, and options of developing information literacy support for EFL learners were also discussed.

Keywords: Big6, EFL learners, EFL teachers, information literacy (IL), writing academic, argumentative writing, experimental research, ELTS

ⁱ NGHIÊN CỨU VỀ ẢNH HƯỞNG CỦA VIỆC SỬ DỤNG BIG6 CỦA GIÁO VIÊN EFL ĐỐI VỚI KHẢ NĂNG VIẾT LUẬN CỦA NGƯỜI HỌC

ⁱⁱ Correspondence: email tcdan@ctu.edu.vn; vikanhnguyen@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Information literacy (IL) helps learners to exploit the information provided from the Internet as well as libraries in an efficient way and optimize the time and money spent on extracting, synthesizing and evaluating the information into their study (Johnston, Partridge & Hughes, 2014).

The studies in Vietnam also show the same situation as those in other countries where learners have encountered a lot of difficulties in searching information on the Internet (Pham Hoang Xuan, 2012). Unlike some countries like Singapore or Korea where there are specialist subjects about information literacy for learners at an early age, Vietnamese learners only access information skills when they reach university and information literacy in some universities is only optional (MOET, 2014). Because of this drawback, a number of learners in Vietnam do not have enough information literacy skills to search and use valuable knowledge found in academic journals or conference proceedings (Nguyen Huynh Mai & Nguyen Le Ngoc Anh, 2015). This issue causes two main problems when Vietnamese learners try to write an argumentative essay in English. One of them is the deterrent against using the resources due to lack of experience or little perception (Nguyen Hong Minh, 2017), which makes their writing shallow and similar to each other. The other, which is also the serious one, is the unintentional plagiarism happening when the learners try to cite something from somebody's work (Ngo Thi Huyen, 2018). From the current situation, there is a great need to teach EFL learners information literacy skills. However, the fact that academic libraries only provide the IL training for their own learners has created a great barrier for EFL learners in general to learn these skills. This is because just some public libraries in Vietnam have information literacy training programs (Ngo et al., 2019), moreover, in order to take part in these programs, EFL learners have to register to the library services and it takes months for them to attend an information literacy training class. Therefore, the idea of providing EFL learners information literacy training outside library environment seems to be the most possible solution to this problem.

This current research tries to fill this gap in the research, as it tries to build an integration writing course which not only trains their writing performance but also provides basic information literacy skills. The primary purpose of this research is to investigate whether information literacy has positive affects to their EFL learners' argumentative writing performance and their scores in tests.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Argumentative writing

2.1.1 Definition of argumentative writing

Writing, unlike other language skills, can change significantly from this perspective to another one. To L1 learners, writing is a means of narrating feelings, thoughts, desires and events using specific symbols in accordance with certain rules (Berk & Ünal, 2017).

However, to L2 learners, writing is a demanding activity where students have to perform in courses and examinations in order to achieve an educational goal (Shehzadi & Krishnasamy, 2018). In this research, writing is treated as a subject from which EFL students have to learn all knowledge about content, process, structure, genre and context in a language class.

2.1.2 EFL learners' writing performance

In order to help teachers to have a better preparation for writing classes, it is necessary to know who their target learners are and what their characteristics are to choose a suitable teaching style. According to Tran Thi Ly (2007) opinion about the image of Vietnamese learners studying EFL writing, Vietnamese learners have some advantages and disadvantages when taking a writing class. To her, their potential of writing independently, creatively and passionately is the reflection of the learners who are able and ready to write with a sense of authorship in a foreign language when they are really motivated. This is different from how EFL teachers usually describe their learners in writing task, who appear to be in the routine of imitating the model and developing some preconceived ideas. This fact is also especially true to IELTS learners, who come from different ages and learning conditions. Therefore, teachers have to understand learners' needs and the factors that affect their writing performance.

2.1.3 Teaching argumentative writing

In the area of EFL teaching writing, there are a number of approaches for writing instructions. Aside from the traditional approach, which are predominantly concerned with knowledge about the pattern of language and the imitation of texts provided by the instructor (Ka-kan-dee & Kaur, 2015), the modern instructional approaches, including task-based, content-based, etc. have been applied more and more in writing courses and proved to be more efficient than the older one. With the activities which mainly focus on seeking out the topic, promoting support for the claim, drawing up, modifying, and finally editing the essays to ensure an effective, error free writing output (Sundari, Febriyanti, & Saragih, 2018), task-based teaching has provided an effective EFL argumentative writing instruction for the learners.

2.1.4 Assessing argumentative writing

Assessing writing is considered to be the hardest task to do. Bacha (2001) considers the issue of standard inconsistency in assessing writing as the major source of strenuousness because it engenders uneven evaluation. Holistic and analytic scoring instruments have been used in EFL programs to identify students' writing proficiency levels for different purposes (Bacha, 2001). The holistic scales are the type of scoring that involves assigning of the score to the whole text (Knoch, 2009) which are mainly used for a preconceived ordinal scale which corresponds to a set of descriptive criteria like IELTS or TOEFL (Knoch, 2009). On the other hands, analytic scales are rubrics that include explicit performance expectations for each possible rating, for each criterion (Williams, 2014)

which deals with the setting up of criteria prior to the production of a particular task (Galti, Saidu, Yusuf & Goni, 2018). Each scoring procedure has its own advantages and disadvantages, therefore, the best way to assessing writing performance is to combine these two scales and focus on two features of language use and content of the writing papers.

2.2 Information literacy

2.2.1 Definition of information literacy

The early definition of Information literacy by the American Library Association (ALA) in 1999 is a set of abilities requiring individuals to “*recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information*”. From that fundamental interpretation, Eisenberg (2008) adds some further features so that Information literacy is the set of skills and knowledge that allows people to find, evaluate, and use the information they need, as well as to filter out the information they do not need.

2.2.2 Assessing learners' information literacy

There are a lot of methods developed by various librarians and researchers to assess a person's information literacy. Some use multiple-choice questionnaire tests and some use rubric toolkits, which much depend on the purposes of the studies (Rozzi-Ochs et al., 2012). However, since the main purpose of this research is to find out whether information literacy has positive affects to learners' argumentative writing performance, more specifically, in their scores in English tests, the researcher decided to assess learners' information literacy through their scores in writing papers. This technique was also used by Shao and Purpur (2016) in their study about the effect of information literacy on university students' writing skills. It is shown to be ease of use, convenient and less time-consuming than other independent methods. Previous studies have proved that students' information literacy was directly proportional to their tests scores (Granruth and Pashkova-Balkenhol, 2018).

2.2.3 The use of information literacy skills on teaching writing

Improving the learners' writing and research skills has been, and continues to be, a concern for educators and librarians. From the result of recent research, there is a strong connection between learners' information literacy and their writing performance (Shao and Purpur, 2016). By teaching learners to evaluate sources and avoid plagiarism as well as taking them the next step into an interaction with the information that informs their disciplines and interests (Napier et al., 2018), information literacy skills help them to grow their own writing skills. The research of Granruth and Pashkova-Balkenhol (2018) again proves this theory by showing that the quality of student papers clearly has improved during the experience process. Students appreciate being required to deal with more specific questions about grammar and style, to make use of the writing tutors, and to

improve their use of APA style. It is clear that the increase in information literacy is allowing students to improve their writing skills.

2.3 The Big6

2.3.1 Definition of The Big6

According to Huynh Truc Phuong (2003), The Big6 is a process model of how people of all ages solve an information problem. It is developed by Mike Eisenberg and Bob Berkowitz (2000) to guide students through information problem-solving as well as providing a basic framework for teaching and promoting information literacy. This model has six stages: (1) Task definition: student determines exactly the information problem and the specific information related to the problem; (2) Information seeking strategies: information Seeking Strategies involves making decisions and selecting sources appropriate to the defined task; (3) Location and access: once students have decided on the appropriate strategy, they need to know where and how to access these resources; (4) Use of information: once students are able to locate and access a source, they must be able to read, view, listen or interact with the information and decide what is valuable for their particular situation; (5) Synthesis: synthesis can be as simple as relaying a specific fact. Synthesis can be very complex because it involves several sources such as a variety of media or presentation formats, and the effective communication of abstract ideas; and (6) Evaluation: evaluation determines how effectively and efficiently the information problem-solving process was conducted.

2.3.2 Why The Big6 is the best choice for language learning

In addition to beginning from the easy steps to follow and clearly instructions, the big6 also has some unique characteristics that distinguish it from other information literacy models. As Eisenberg, Johnson & Berkowitz (2010) pointed some key features of the Big6 as follows:

- The Big6 process can be applied with students of all ages and across all language levels: every information problem can be solved in the same general process that the big6 provides and the users can use different questions based on their levels to ask for appropriate strategies.
- Concerning the technology skills taking on meaning within the Big6 process: Eisenberg (2008) offer a fully integrated view of computer and related technology skills within the Big6 model. Therefore, students can easily apply these to their own searching process.
- The Big6 is adaptable and flexible: it can be applied to any information situations. This model is transferable to school, personal, and work applications, as well as all content areas.

3. Methods and Materials

In order to see the effects of EFL learners' argumentative writing performance through the use of Information literacy model - the Big6, an experimental design method was adopted. In this 'three-phase' design, a mixed method combined both quantitative and qualitative designs was conducted to collect and analyze the data before and after the treatment in the experimental group.

For the collecting and analyzing process, the quantitative method was used first to collect data about the application of the Big6 in writing classes. In this method, a pre-test and a post-test were carried out to compare the writing scores before and after the treatment of the experimental group. In addition to this, a questionnaire was implemented to measure the satisfaction of the learning process of the experimental group and an Information Literacy self-assessment questionnaire was delivered to help the researcher evaluate which level of information literacy they were at. During and after the teaching process, the qualitative methods were used to clarify the result of the quantitative methods. Both classroom observations and semi-structured interviews were used to help the researcher understand more about the attitudes and feeling of students toward this experiment as well as the difficulties that EFL teachers could face when integrating the Big6 into their teaching.

Table 3.1: The research aims, questions and instruments of the current study

Research objectives	Research questions	Research instruments
1. To study the effects of EFL learners' argumentative writing through the use of Information literacy model - the Big6.	1. To what extent does the use of Information literacy model - the Big6 affect EFL learners' argumentative writing?	1. A pre-test and a post-test 2. Information Literacy self-assessment questionnaire
2. To investigate the attitudes of EFL learners toward the use of Information literacy model - the Big6 in argumentative writing lessons	2. What are the attitudes of EFL learners towards the use of Information literacy model - the Big6 in argumentative Writing lessons?	1. Questionnaire (20 EFL learners) 2. Semi-structured interviews (n=6 EFL learners)
3. To explore the potential difficulties EFL teachers have when integrating the Big6 into their teaching for IELTS argumentative writing task 2	3. What are the potential difficulties EFL teachers have when integrating the Big6 into their teaching for IELTS argumentative Writing task 2?	1. Classroom observations (12 lessons) 2. Semi-structured interviews (n=4 EFL teachers)

3.1 The argumentative writing tests - IELTS Writing Task 2

In the field of writing assessment, there are a number of standardized tests of English language proficiency for non-native English language speakers, such as IELTS, TOEFL, CPE, TOEIC, etc. Among them, IELTS seems to be more favorable in Vietnam and has the increasing number of learners studying for this test every year. Because of the demand of this training course, it was much easier for researchers to conduct an

experiment course using this test. Therefore, the IELTS Writing Task 2 was chosen to measure the participants' performance in argumentative writing in this research.

In IELTS Writing Task 2, learners are given a topic to write about in an academic style. Their writing should be a discursive consideration of the relevant issues. They will be penalized for irrelevance if the response is off-topic or is not written as full, connected text. Moreover, they will be severely penalized for plagiarism. Learners are expected to spend no more than 40 minutes on this task. They are asked to write at least 250 words and will be penalized if their answer is too short. While they will not be penalized for writing more than 250 words, if they write a very long answer, they may not have time for checking and correcting at the end and some ideas may not be directly relevant to the question (Chong & Ye, 2020).

3.2 The course book

Unlike a typical IELTS training class, which covers all parts of the IELTS exam, including listening, speaking, reading and writing skills, this experiment course was an IELTS writing Task 2 course. Therefore, the researcher had to combine the lessons from different course books instead of using only one course book as a normal course. Based on her teaching experience and the advice from the teacher participants, the course book series used for instruction in the experimental group was "Complete IELTS" composed by Guy Brook-Hart & Vanessa Jakeman (2016). The "Complete IELTS" book series combine the best in contemporary classroom practice with stimulating topics aimed at young adults wanting to study at university (Motlaq & Egresh, 2016). The lessons in the books cover the writing task 2 in detail, providing information, advice and practice to ensure that learners are fully prepared for every aspect of the exam.

The researchers printed the lessons related to the writing task 2 in three books of the series, including 6 lessons in "Complete IELTS band 4-5", 4 lessons in "Complete IELTS band 5-6.5" and 2 lessons in "Complete IELTS band 6.5-7.5", as the form of handouts and delivered to the learners in every class meeting (see Appendix 9). They were taught as the instructional material. Twelve lessons from the course books were based on the process of approach to teaching writing, which includes pre-writing, during-writing and post-writing activities (Nunan, 2003). In the syllabus, the first three lessons were applied in the pre-writing tasks, then lessons 4 to 9 were designed for the during-writing activities and the final three lessons were taught for the post-writing activities.

3.3 Information literacy learning materials

Besides the course books, for the purposes of this study, different handouts, videos and task activities related to information literacy skills were also used in the course (see Appendix 10). These Information Literacy learning resources were collected from the University of Rhode Island Libraries, one of the institutions which had Information Literacy program selected as the standard case studies by the American Library Association (Lindauer, 2001).

The materials were the practical handouts and videos that provided learners enough knowledge to search, use and evaluate information from the Internet. They included 4 tutorials about searching strategies, 3 tutorials about extracting information from the sources, 4 tutorials about evaluating the information and 1 tutorial about citing the sources. These materials were designed to fit the six steps of the Big6 model and the three stages of teaching writing process.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Learners' argumentative writing performance before and after the intervention

The Descriptive Statistic Test was run first to explore the IELTS writing task 2 scores of the learners before and after the writing course. The results shown in Table 4.1 indicated that there was almost no difference in the pre- test scores between the participants since the Std. Deviation (SD) = .37258 < 1, which means the learners' writing performance in the pre-test was the same. Moreover, the results also pointed out the mean score of the post-test was higher than that of the pre-test (M post=6.62 > M pre=4.32). It can be seen that learners' argumentative writing performance after the intervention has changed.

Table 4.1: The results of the descriptive test of the learners' argumentative writing performance before and after the intervention

	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Pre-test	20	4.00	5.00	4.3250	.37258
Post-test	20	5.00	8.00	6.6250	.88667

4.2. The correlation between learners' writing performance and their information literacy (IL) levels

In order to find out the correlation between learners' writing performance and their information literacy levels, the Descriptive Statistic Test was first carried out to identify whether learners' information literacy levels had improved during the intervention. The results (see Table 4.2) indicated that the mean score of the Information Literacy skills self-assessment questionnaire before the intervention was higher than that after the intervention (M post-IL level=4.115 > M pre-IL level=2.415). This means learners' information literacy levels had improved after the course.

Table 4.2: The results of the correlation between learners' writing performance and their information literacy (IL) levels

	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Pre-test	20	1.81	2.88	2.4156	.34785
Post-test	20	3.63	3.63	4.1156	.32714

4.3 The components of argumentative writing at the two points of the intervention

The Descriptive Statistic Test and the Paired Sample T-test were both run on two time points of each criterion, including task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource and grammatical range and accuracy to analyze the mean sub-scores, and determine which components the participants have improved the most after taking the course. As shown in Table 4.3, the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores of the components at the two-time point were significant (Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000), therefore, it can also be stated that the learners' task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource and grammatical range and accuracy at the two-time point was different from each other in term of writing performance.

Table 4.3: Paired samples statistics of the components
 of argumentative writing at the two points of the intervention

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Pair 1	Pre - post Taskachievement	-8.543	19	.000
Pair 2	Pre - post Coherence and Cohesion	-12.352	19	.000
Pair 3	Pre - post Lexical Resource	-13.077	19	.000
Pair 4	Pre - post Grammatical Range	-10.299	19	.000

4.4 The findings of learners' attitudes

4.4.1 Learners' attitudes towards the use of Information literacy model - the Big6 in writing lessons

In this section, the answer for second research question will be presented to investigate the attitudes of EFL learners toward the use of Information literacy model - the Big6 in argumentative writing lessons. Data collected for this question come from two main sources, including the quantitative data of the questionnaire of the attitudes and the qualitative data of the semi-structured interviews with learners.

With the data collected from the questionnaire of the attitudes, the researcher used the SPSS software for deep analysis. A five-point Likert scale ranging from one (Not at all Satisfied) to five (Very Satisfied) was implemented to measure students' attitudes towards five aspects of the questionnaire, including the language, library, teacher, facility and overall satisfaction. First, the reliability of the questionnaire was checked and the result showed that with a highly acceptable internal consistency Cronbach ($\alpha=.830$), the questionnaire of the attitudes was a trusted research instrument to use. Then, a series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with six learners to gain more knowledge of their thinking about the use of this application in the learning process. Findings in relation to these five aspects will be presented in the sections that follow.

4.4.2 Learners' overall attitudes towards the experiment writing course

In order to have a general view of the learners' attitudes towards the use of the Big6 in writing lessons, a Descriptive Statistic Test was run to examine the total mean score of the questionnaire of the attitudes. The result shows that, in general, the total mean score

of EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of the Big6 ($M=4.407$, $SD=0.197$) is higher than the scale 3.4, the medium level in the 5-point Likert scale in the Jenkins (2014) framework. Apart from the total mean score of EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of the Big6 in writing lessons, the fifth cluster in the questionnaire also used to gather the learners' overall satisfaction with the course. Specifically, the researcher wanted to know the participants' attitudes towards the teaching method that integrated the information literacy into and the quality of the whole writing course. Both the Descriptive Statistic Test and the one sample t- test were carried out to compute the data. With the mean score was 4.75 ($SD=0.44$) > 3.4 (the medium level in the 5-point Likert scale) and $p=.021 < 0.05$ ($t=-2.517$, $df=19$), it can be inferred that learners have strong positive attitudes towards the teaching method and the quality of the experiment writing course.

This conclusion was again confirmed by the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews with the six learners. Through their answers for questions 10, 11 and 12, all the participants agreed that they overall satisfied with the quality of the experiment writing course. The evidence can be found in their transcriptions reported below:

"Generally, I enjoyed the course. It provided me a lot of helpful skills to write English fast and efficiently" (S1 – Line 12)

"It's great! I love the course very much. The steps in Big6 fits perfectly to the writing process from the beginning to the final stage." (S2 – Line 34)

"It was the most interesting course I have ever taken. The instructions from the Big6 are clear and easy to follow." (S3 – Line 49)

"Although I don't like learning by Google Meet a bit, I am still happy with the course. The Big6 make my writing process less painful than before." (S4 – Line 60)

"Yeah! I liked the course. The model is useful, too." (S5 – Line 74)

"I still like the kind of course that teaches all four skills but the course satisfied my expectation. The Big6 helps me a lot in the searching for ideas for the writing." (S6 – Line 95)

4.5 The founding of difficulties

4.5.1 Teachers' difficulties and suggestions in integrating the Big6 into their teaching lessons

This section presents the answers to Question three of the research by providing the data from the semi- structured interviews with the teachers and the classroom observations as the data triangulation. Since the research main focus is on the effects of EFL teachers' use

of the Big6, the difficulties they reported when integrating the Big6 into their teaching and their suggestions for improvement will be essential for the researcher.

The qualitative data from four interviews as well as the twelve observation sessions were divided into three sub-sections, including the difficulties teachers faced in conducting the integration, the difficulties happened when integrating the Big6 into the three stages of the writing process and the suggestions they gave to make the integration better in the future.

4.5.2 Teachers' difficulties in conducting the integration writing course

To begin with, the teachers were asked about their overall difficulties when integrating the Big6 into the whole writing course. The interviewees' responses focused on three main matters, including the experience of the EFL teachers in training information literacy skills, the support from the manager of the language center and the cooperation between teachers.

First of all, all the teachers stressed that the experience of the EFL teachers in training information literacy skills was the most crucial element which decided whether this kind of course could work. Teacher 1 and 2 explained that:

"EFL teachers were not trained for teaching information literacy. Even though we had some library instruction classes back in the university, most of us didn't pay attention to the knowledge. Therefore, it's hard for a normal EFL teachers to teach an integration course and even harder to find a quality one for the task." (Teacher 1 – Line 1)

"This type of course requires a lot of knowledge and experience from both teaching writing skills and information skills. You can easily find teachers and librarians that fit for one of them but hard to find teachers that have both the requirements." (Teacher 2 – Line 9)

Similarly, Teacher 3 and 4 answered that:

"Most of EFL teachers only pay attention on how to teach students vocabulary, grammar and essay outlines in order to help them get good marks. They won't waste time in training new skills just for one or two courses so they may not qualify to teach the information literacy skills in the course. For that reason, you won't scale this type of course if you can't solve that issue." (Teacher 3 – Line 17)

4.5.3 Teachers' difficulties when integrating the Big6 into the three stages of the writing process

To identify the specific difficulties teachers had faced when integrating the Big6 into each writing stage, the researcher asked them to present the problems in the structure of a classroom meeting in order to make comparison with the observation data much easier. Five aspects, including the introduction of the lesson, the explanation of teaching

subjects, the presentation of lesson, learners' participant and interaction and the ending of the lesson, were reported respectively with the three writing stages.

In the pre-writing stage, only one teacher said that she had problems in the explanation of the subject to learners. Teacher 2 explained that "Step 2 and 3 of the Big6 have some similarities so learners often got confused when doing the tasks related to these steps. They tended to skip step 3 and claimed that the activities in step 3 were for step 2" (Teacher 2 – Line 14). The data from the observation sheet only reported this problem in class meeting 2 where group 2, 3 and 4 presented the searching steps incorrect. Therefore, it can be concluded that the pre-writing stage did not cause many difficulties for the teachers.

4.6 Teachers' suggestions for improvement of the course

The final question in the semi-structured interviews focused about teachers' suggestions for improvement of the course in the future. Most of them agreed that the length of the integration course should be longer in order to make the teaching and learning more relaxing. In addition to that, the writing course should be combined with an integration reading course so that learners can use the input such as vocabulary, structures from the read classes for creating the output in the writing class.

The interview data showed the responds like "Making the course longer will be much better" (Teacher 1 – Line 8), "You should organize a read course along with this one ..." (Teacher 2 – Line 16), "You should divide the steps of the Big6 into two writing course so that learners can learn better ..." (Teacher 3 – Line 24) and "The course length needs to be adjusted longer for better studying..." (Teacher 4 – Line 32).

5. Conclusions

The main purpose of this research is to investigate whether information literacy had positive effects on learners' argumentative writing. Based on the General Linear Model test for repeated measures and correlation test, it can be concluded that learners' information literacy was directly proportional to their writing test scores. This finding is in line with a study by Shao and Purpur (2016) that information literacy skills were positively correlated with both learners' writing scores and final course grades. Besides, a new integrated information literacy training program has been developed to meet the new requirements of the teaching context outside the library environment. The value of the proposed model is that it moves collaboration a step further, making it more tailored to the specifications of EFL learners.

Research findings support the idea that integrated teaching information literacy in an EFL writing course is possible. The findings reveal that a private learning center can be a good place to provide this crucial training to learners. Therefore, the information literacy training outside libraries should be encouraged to organize so that EFL teachers may make a good combination between language skills and information literacy skills.

5.1 Pedagogical implications

Findings from the current research provide a number of implications for teachers who have opportunities to design and apply different teaching methods in their workplace. First, the main implication of this research is that teachers should integrate information literacy into their teaching in appropriate levels. The results of the research have proved that information literacy skills have positive effects on learners' vocabulary and idea arrangement, which can be applied in most of the lessons that involve these two elements not just only in augmentative writing only. Moreover, because the Big6 model is designed for training separated skills, it is suggested for teachers to choose suitable information skills from its six steps for their own teaching context instead of using the whole model. In teaching writing classes, EFL learners are usually found to be bored and afraid of learning this specific skill. Therefore, with the results about learners' attitudes towards the use of the Big6 in teaching writing, it is suggested that by using the activities based on the Big6, teachers can help learners overcome their fear about learning writing and motivate them to focus on learning. Besides that, from the learners' great satisfaction for the facility related items, the research suggests that teachers should create a strong teaching and learning materials for the course in order to provide learners with knowledge in a better way.

Another important implication for both teachers and managers are that the difficulties of teaching integration course rely not only on the process of teaching in classrooms but also on the process of preparation the lesson plans and materials. Therefore, the research suggests that in order to make the integration course work efficiently, EFL teachers and managers should consider making time for planning and preparation longer than the others.

5.2 Limitations

There is one major limitation in this research. The sample size is small; therefore, this cannot generalize the findings in other broader contexts of learning writing in the community. Also, due to the pandemic, covid-19, the arrangement for face-to-face meeting classrooms has been challenging and some meetings had to be taught online. Therefore, the data from the observation sheet may not cover all the aspects happened in the classrooms. Thus, readers are advised to read and interpret the findings of the study with an awareness of its bounded context.

5.3 Suggestions for the further research

Based on the limitations of the research mentioned above, followings are some directions for further research. It is therefore recommended that future researchers should examine a larger sample size to provide a more comprehensive view on how EFL learners utilize information literacy into their writing tasks. Secondly, further research might need to examine learners at different levels in order to have a broaden data about the effects of using the Big6 on EFL learners' augmentative writing. In addition, in most language centers, learners study English courses not only for one skill but also in a general course

with all four skills, including listening, reading, speaking and writing. Therefore, it is expected that further research will be conducted into the other skills of these general courses in order to investigate the effect of information literacy on different language skills.

Acknowledgments

As to get this study done, the researchers would, first and foremost, like to express their sincere thanks to lecturers at Can Tho University (CTU) Vietnam, especially those at School of Social Sciences & Humanities (SSSH), and School of Foreign Languages (SFL), CTU, from College of Foreign Languages-Hue University, Vietnam and for their teaching and supervisions towards the Master Program in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and the researchers' MA classmates of Cohorts 24, 25 and currently 26 (2019-2021). Secondly, their great thanks would come to 20 purposeful IELTS learners from an English center in Can Tho City, Vietnam for sampling in this research through classroom experimental study, the questionnaire, and interviews, and to Mr. Chau Vinh Thanh, Miss Thai Phan Bao Han and Ms. Vuu Thi Kim Phuong, English teachers for their read proofing and ideas to the article format. And last but not least, their respectful thanks would go to the *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies Board* for this paper to be published to the public, especially those interested in teaching and learning English in Vietnamese educational levels, particularly private English section, entering the regional and global integration.

Conflict of interest statement

Both authors strongly agreed on the publication of this paper and there was no contention or rivalry during finishing the work. In other words, the authors declare no conflicts of interests in this article. Both authors are fully and equally responsible for the benefits and harms after this article is published. The authors, moreover, declare that the material presented by us in this paper is our original work, and does not contain any materials taken from other copyrighted sources. Wherever such materials have been included, they have been clearly indented or/and identified by quotation marks and due and proper acknowledgements given by citing the source at appropriate places.

About the Authors

Miss **Nguyen Le Ngoc Anh** is an English teacher at Active Learning Center, Can Tho City, Vietnam. She has just received her Master degree at Can Tho University (CTU) since 2021 in Principles and Methods of English language education. Her main research interests are information literacy, information management, information resources, teaching methods, writing techniques, English literature and the importance of the library in learning English. She can be reached at vikanhnguyen@gmail.com.

Mr. **Thai Cong Dan**, Dean of School of Social Sciences & Humanities (SSSH), Can Tho University (CTU), Vietnam, is currently a lecturer of English. He has held his PhD at Naresuan University, Thailand since 2010 in Educational Administration- English

program. His main research interests are TEF/TESOL issues, intercultural communication, high school English learning and teaching, English program management, curriculum design, testing and evaluation and professional development. He can be reached at tcdan@ctu.edu.vn.

References

- American Library Association. (1999). Information literacy standards for student learning.
- Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4), 100–118.
- Bacha, N. (2001). Writing evaluation: what can analytic versus holistic essay scoring tell us? *System*, 29(3), 371–383. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x\(01\)00025-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(01)00025-2)
- Berk, R. R., & Ünal, E. (2017). Comparison of Writing Anxiety and Writing Dispositions of Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Grade Students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(01), 237–254. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.10115a>
- Brook-Hart, G., & Jakeman, V. (2016). *Complete IELTS*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chong, S. W., & Ye, X. (2020). Introduction to IELTS and IELTS Writing. *Developing Writing Skills for IELTS*, 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429290169-1>
- Conteh-Morgan, M. E. (2002). Empowering ESL students: A new model for information literacy instruction. *Research Strategies*, 18(1), 29–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0734-3310\(02\)00064-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0734-3310(02)00064-2)
- Eisenberg, M. B. (2008). Information Literacy: Essential Skills for the Information Age. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 28(2), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.28.2.166>
- Eisenberg, M. B., & Berkowitz, B. (2000). *Nuts and Bolts of the Big6*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenberg, M., Johnson, D., & Berkowitz, B. (2010). *Information, Communications, and Technology (ICT) Skills Curriculum Based on the Big6 Skills Approach to Information Problem-Solving*. Library Media Connection, 24–27.
- Galti, A. M., Saidu, S., Yusuf, H., & Goni, A. A. (2018). Rating scale in writing assessment: Holistic vs. Analytical scales: A review. *International Journal of English Research*, 4(6), 4–6.
- Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., & Hebert, M. (2019). *Best practices in writing instruction*. The Guilford Press.
- Granruth, L. B., & Pashkova-Balkenhol, T. (2018). The Benefits of Improved Information Literacy Skills on Student Writing Skills: Developing a Collaborative Teaching Model with Research Librarians in Undergraduate Social Work Education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 38(5), 453–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2018.1527427>
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language Learning and Perfectionism: Anxious and Non-Anxious Language Learners' Reactions to Their Own Oral Performance.

- The Modern Language Journal, 86(4), 562–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00161>
- Hammons, J. (2020). Teaching the teachers to teach information literacy: A literature review. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(5), 102196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102196>
- Huynh Truc Phuong (2003). *Information literacy: Textbook*. Can Tho University.
- Jaggars, S. S., Folk, A. L., & Mullins, D. (2018). Understanding students' satisfaction with OERs as course materials. *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 19(1), 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pmm-12-2017-0059>
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca: attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, N., Partridge, H., & Hughes, H. (2014). Understanding the information literacy experiences of EFL (English as a foreign language) students. *Reference Services Review*, 42(4), 552–568. <https://doi.org/10.1108/rsr-05-2014-0015>
- Ka-kan-dee, M., & Kaur, S. (2015). Teaching Strategies Used by Thai EFL Lecturers to Teach Argumentative Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 208, 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.191>
- Kafipour, R., Mahmoudi, E., & Khojasteh, L. (2018). The effect of task-based language teaching on analytic writing in EFL classrooms. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1496627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2018.1496627>
- Knoch, U. (2009). Diagnostic assessment of writing: A comparison of two rating scales. *Language Testing*, 26(2), 275–304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208101008>
- Lanning, S., & Mallek, J. (2017). Factors Influencing Information Literacy Competency of College Students. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 43(5), 443–450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2017.07.005>
- Li, Y. (2016). Task-Based Language Learning – Insights from and for L2 Writing. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(1), 237–242. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v8i1.28441>
- Lindauer, B. G. (2001). Selected Case Studies Using the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. ALA National Conference Program "Information Literacy: Connecting Standards and Objectives to Programs and Curriculum: Case Studies of Early Implementors", 23–26.
- McPherson, M. A. (2015). Library anxiety among university students. *IFLA Journal*, 41(4), 317–325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035215603993>
- Miller, C. (2016). TRAILS: Tool for Real-time Assessment of Information Literacy Skills. *The Charleston Advisor*, 17(3), 43–48. <https://doi.org/10.5260/chara.17.3.43>
- MOET (2014). *Education for All 2015 National Review Report: Vietnam*. MOET.
- Moore, T., & Morton, J. (2005). Dimensions of difference: a comparison of university writing and IELTS writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 43–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2004.02.001>
- Motlaq, H. S., & Egresh, N. (2016). The Relationship between Reading Ability and Writing Quality among Iranian EFL Academic Writers. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(2), 1270–1287.

- Napier, T., Parrott, J., Presley, E., & Valley, L. (2018). A Collaborative, Trilateral Approach to Bridging the Information Literacy Gap in Student Writing. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(1). <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.1.120>
- Ngo Thi Huyen (2018). Students and the morality in using information. *Vietnam Library Journal*, 73(5), 17–22.
- Ngo, H. T., Pickard, A. J., & Walton, G. (2019). Information literacy capabilities of upper secondary students: the case of Vietnam. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 68(6/7), 453–470. <https://doi.org/10.1108/gkmc-03-2019-0037>
- Nguyen Hong Minh (2017). Supporting users' information skills at the Library and Information Centre, National University of Vietnam, Hanoi. *Journal Information*, 2, 31–36.
- Nguyen Huynh Mai, & Nguyen Le Ngoc Anh (2015). Solutions to improve the frequency of using Proquest database, a fact-finding study at Can Tho University Learning Resource Center. *Vietnam Library Journal*, 56(6), 47–49.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. McGraw-Hill/Contemporary.
- O'Leary, M. (2014). *Classroom observation: a guide to the effective observation of teaching and learning*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- O'Leary, M. (2020). Classroom observation as a method for studying teaching and learning. *Classroom Observation*, 69–96. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315630243-4>
- Pearson, W. S. (2018). Written Corrective Feedback in IELTS Writing Task 2: Teachers' Priorities, Practices, and Beliefs. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 21(4), 1–32.
- Pham Hoang Xuan (2012). Student's Information Seeking Behaviors – Problems and Impacts. *Internationalization Studies*, 1, 1–9.
- Purnell, M., Royal, B., & Warton, L. (2020). Supporting the development of information literacy skills and knowledge in undergraduate nursing students: An integrative review. *Nurse Education Today*, 95, 104585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2020.104585>
- Ramage, J. D., Bean, J. C., & Johnson, J. (2020). *Writing arguments: A rhetoric with readings* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Rosell-Aguilar, F. (2004). WELL done and well liked: online information literacy skills and learner impressions of the web as a resource for foreign language learning. *ReCALL*, 16(1), 210–224. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s095834400400151x>
- Rosman, T., Mayer, A.-K., & Krampen, G. (2014). Combining self-assessments and achievement tests in information literacy assessment: empirical results and recommendations for practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(5), 740–754. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.950554>
- Rozzi-Ochs, J. A., Egelhoff, C. J., Jackson, H. V., & Zelmanowitz, S. (2012). Work in progress: Building information literacy assessment. 2012 *Frontiers in Education Conference Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/fie.2012.6462466>

- Saddler, B., & Graham, S. (2007). The Relationship between Writing Knowledge and Writing Performance among More and Less Skilled Writers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23(3), 231–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560701277575>
- Shang, H. (2013). Factors Associated with English as a Foreign Language University Students Writing Anxiety. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Shao, X., & Purpur, G. (2016). Effects of Information Literacy Skills on Student Writing and Course Performance. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(6), 670–678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.08.006>
- Shehzadi, K., & Krishnasamy, H. N. (2018). Dynamics of ESL Writing Performance: A Theoretical Framework. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 144–159. <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2018.0601.0039>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.119>
- Swapna, G., & Biradar, B. (2017). Information Literacy model for higher education institutions in India. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 7(3), 31–50.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).