



THE EFFECTS OF PREWRITING DISCUSSIONS ON EFL LEARNERS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Phan Minh Nhat Vinh¹,

Thai Cong Dan²ⁱ

¹English Teacher,
University of Economics
Ho Chi Minh City,
Vinh Long Campus
MA Candidate,
Tra Vinh University,
Vietnam

²English Senior Lecturer
School of Foreign Languages,
Can Tho University,
Can Tho City, Vietnam

Abstract:

Improving writing skills remains a significant challenge for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, particularly at the intermediate proficiency level. While previous studies have explored various instructional techniques, limited research has examined the impact of small-group student talk—especially prewriting discussions—on writing performance in EFL contexts. This study addresses that gap by investigating the effects of small-group discussions on B1-level EFL learners' IELTS writing performance and their attitudes toward the activity. Using an experimental research design, 55 university-level students from a private English language center in Vietnam were divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group participated in structured small-group prewriting discussions, while the control group received conventional task-based writing instruction. Writing performance was assessed through IELTS Writing Task 2 pre- and post-tests, evaluated by independent IELTS examiners. Learner attitudes were explored using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Results showed that students who engaged in prewriting discussions significantly outperformed those in the control group, with marked improvements in task achievement, coherence, cohesion, and lexical resource. Participants also expressed positive perceptions of the activity, citing increased confidence, engagement, and clearer idea development. These findings suggest that small-group student talk is an effective pedagogical strategy for enhancing both writing performance and learner motivation in EFL settings. This

ⁱ Correspondence: email phanminhnhatvinh@gmail.com, tcdan@ctu.edu.vn

study provides practical implications for language educators, advocating for the integration of collaborative discussion activities into writing instruction to support improved outcomes and learner engagement.

Keywords: small-group talk, EFL writing, prewriting discussion, IELTS writing performance, learner attitudes

1. Introduction

1.1 Rationale for the Study

In Vietnam, English proficiency is increasingly vital for academic and professional success. Among the four language skills, writing is often seen as the most difficult, requiring structured learning and sustained practice (Kellogg, 2008). EFL learners frequently struggle with grammar, vocabulary, and organizing ideas coherently (Faraj, 2015), making writing instruction a persistent challenge in non-native contexts. One promising approach to support students is prewriting discussion, where learners engage in small-group talks before writing. This technique helps generate and structure ideas, enhances vocabulary use, and improves overall writing quality (Li & Zhang, 2021; Li *et al.*, 2020). Research has shown that such discussions encourage critical thinking and allow students to refine their ideas through peer interaction (McDonough & Neumann, 2015).

However, in Vietnamese EFL classrooms, prewriting discussions remain underused due to time constraints and limited teacher training. Most instruction still centers on grammar and model essays, with few interactive activities. As a result, the effectiveness of prewriting discussion in Vietnam remains unclear. This study seeks to address that gap by investigating how prewriting discussions affect EFL learners' writing performance and exploring students' attitudes toward this technique in the Vietnamese context.

1.2 Research Aims

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the effects of prewriting discussions on EFL learners' writing performance within the Vietnamese context, as well as to explore Vietnamese students' attitudes toward this instructional technique. To achieve this objective, the study focused on two specific sub-aims:

- 1) To investigate the level of effects on the writing aspects by prewriting discussion.
- 2) To explore EFL students' attitudes about the activity of prewriting discussion on their writing ability.

1.3 Research Questions

To achieve the above-mentioned aims of the study, this research sought to answer the following questions:

- 1) To what extent does prewriting discussion affect EFL students' writing performance?

- 2) What are EFL students' attitudes toward prewriting discussion on their writing performance?

1.4 The Significance of the Study

Writing is a crucial yet challenging skill for EFL learners, particularly in Vietnam, where students often struggle with expressing ideas, organizing content, and applying correct grammar and vocabulary. Traditional instruction tends to emphasize grammar and model essays, but often lacks opportunities for creativity and idea development. Prewriting discussions offer a promising, interactive approach by allowing students to share ideas, improve vocabulary, and plan their writing collaboratively. These discussions may reduce writing anxiety, boost motivation, and enhance overall performance by creating a more engaging learning environment. However, many Vietnamese teachers are unfamiliar with the technique or constrained by limited class time. This study investigates the effectiveness of prewriting discussions in Vietnamese EFL classrooms and aims to provide insights for teachers, curriculum designers, and researchers seeking innovative strategies to improve writing instruction.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Writing Performance

Writing is a crucial skill for EFL learners to succeed academically and professionally. It is cognitively demanding, requiring not only idea expression but also meeting institutional criteria (Nation, 2008). Writing involves mastering content, structure, genre, and context, beyond grammatical accuracy (Gangal, 2011). Writing performance reflects how well students complete writing tasks, influenced by content knowledge, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and context (Durnali & Limon, 2020). It serves as an essential measure of writing instruction effectiveness.

2.2 Phases of Writing Performance

Writing is an individualized but structured process involving several stages to help learners develop skills (Nation, 2008; Al-Jaro *et al.*, 2016). These include prewriting (idea generation and topic exploration), planning and outlining (organizing ideas), drafting (writing initial text focusing on content), revising (improving clarity and coherence), and editing/proofreading (correcting language errors). This recursive process helps learners produce coherent texts and supports teachers in guiding writing development.

2.3 The Prewriting Stage and EFL Students' Writing Performance

Prewriting is a vital phase that supports idea generation, organization, and content structuring before writing begins (Maham & Nejadansari, 2012). Many studies highlight the importance of prewriting strategies like brainstorming and mind mapping in enhancing writing performance (Karim, 2010; Al-Jaro *et al.*, 2016; Li & Zhang, 2021). These techniques reduce writer's block, improve fluency, and enable better focus on language use during drafting.

2.3.1 The Role of Prewriting in EFL Writing Performance

Generating and organizing ideas during prewriting is critical for overcoming common EFL challenges (Maraqa, 2021). Activities such as brainstorming and freewriting help learners clarify their thoughts and increase writing fluency by separating idea development from language formulation (Li & Zhang, 2021).

2.3.2 Prewriting Techniques and Their Impact on Writing Performance

Research confirms the effectiveness of six common prewriting techniques: brainstorming, listing, clustering (mind mapping), freewriting, questioning, and outlining (Al-Jaro *et al.*, 2016). These strategies help learners expand ideas, structure content, and improve coherence. Learners using these methods show enhanced content richness and organization (Naghavi & Nakhleh, 2019).

2.3.3 The Relationship Between Prewriting and Writing Fluency

Prewriting improves fluency by allowing learners to prepare ideas before drafting (Al-Jaro *et al.*, 2016). Collaborative prewriting discussions have been shown to produce more detailed, coherent essays and reduce anxiety during writing (Mazdayasna & Zaini, 2015; Li & Zhang, 2021).

2.3.4 Prewriting and the Improvement of Writing Quality

Prewriting, especially through peer discussions, enhances essay quality by refining ideas, arguments, and structure while boosting motivation and confidence (Darani *et al.*, 2022; Mazdayasna & Zaini, 2015). These collaborative strategies improve content development, coherence, and vocabulary use.

2.3.5 Challenges in Implementing Prewriting Techniques

Despite benefits, limited instructional time and insufficient teacher training hinder prewriting integration in EFL classrooms (Li & Zhang, 2021). Some students also view prewriting as time-consuming (Al-Jaro *et al.*, 2016). Gradual introduction and explicit demonstration of prewriting's relevance can foster better adoption and improved writing habits.

2.4 Types of Prewriting Strategies

Prewriting helps learners generate ideas, organize thoughts, and prepare effectively for writing, improving fluency and coherence (Naghavi & Nakhleh, 2019; Al-Jaro *et al.*, 2016; Li & Zhang, 2021). Twelve strategies have been identified to assist learners throughout writing, offering diverse ways to explore and structure content (Naghavi & Nakhleh, 2019).

2.4.1 Talking

Classroom discussions allow learners to verbalize and clarify ideas before writing, which improves writing quality through critical thinking and peer collaboration (Darani *et al.*,

2022). Teachers should guide discussions to focus on core content and address knowledge gaps, strengthening learners' readiness to write (Mazdayasna & Zaini, 2015).

2.4.2 Researching

Nation (2008) emphasizes research as a crucial prewriting activity in academic writing. Research helps learners gather relevant background information, build evidence-based arguments, and examine topics from multiple angles, which leads to more coherent and substantiated texts. Effective research during prewriting involves taking detailed notes, evaluating source credibility, and organizing information into thematic categories to guide writing structure. Li and Zhang (2021) found that thorough research improves content quality and logical flow in student writing.

2.4.3 Brainstorming

Brainstorming is a key strategy for generating a wide range of ideas without immediate judgment (Karim, 2010). Best practices include freely writing down ideas, engaging in group brainstorming to boost creativity, and reviewing ideas for emerging themes. Research by Mazdayasna and Zaini (2015) shows brainstorming enhances fluency and creativity by providing a rich idea pool for writing.

2.4.4 Listing

Listing breaks down complex topics into smaller parts by generating related terms or concepts. This technique aids in identifying subtopics, organizing ideas systematically, and developing topic sentences for body paragraphs, thus supporting clearer content organization.

2.4.5 Clustering (Mind Mapping)

Clustering visually maps connections between ideas, making it ideal for visual learners. It helps students see relationships between central concepts and details, encourages nonlinear exploration of topics, and facilitates identification of key themes before drafting.

2.4.6 Freewriting

Freewriting involves continuous, unfiltered writing to overcome blocks and stimulate idea flow (Karim, 2010). It helps students bypass hesitation, improve fluency, and produce rough drafts that can be refined later (Naghavi & Nakhleh, 2019).

2.4.7 Looping

Looping extends freewriting through timed writing rounds, where students review their previous text, identify key ideas, and write again, focusing on those ideas. This iterative approach narrows focus and sharpens themes.

2.4.8 Journalistic Questioning

Using the “5W+H” framework (Who, What, Where, When, Why, How), journalistic questioning fosters analytical thinking by encouraging comprehensive exploration of topics, identifying stakeholders, and understanding causality and relevance.

2.4.9 Drawing

For visually oriented learners, drawing integrates sketches or diagrams with notes to map ideas visually, facilitating clearer thought organization before writing (Faraj, 2015).

2.4.10 Outlining

Outlining provides a logical writing structure, including introduction (topic and thesis), body paragraphs (arguments and evidence), and conclusion (summary and reflection) (Faraj, 2015). This blueprint ensures coherence and guides drafting.

2.4.11 Categorizing

Categorizing is useful for comparative or analytical writing, where learners create charts comparing criteria across categories. This visual method helps organize similarities, differences, and perspectives clearly.

2.4.12 Storyboarding

Storyboarding, adapted from film production, sequences events visually using frames. It helps narrative writers conceptualize plot, improve coherence, and establish logical progression. These diverse prewriting strategies cater to different learning preferences and writing goals. Combining methods like brainstorming with outlining or clustering with journalistic questioning can optimize idea generation and organization, fostering stronger writing habits and improving both fluency and quality in EFL writing.

2.5 Assessing Writing Performance

Evaluating writing performance is complex, requiring reliable and standardized methods to ensure objectivity. Hamp-Lyons (1991) highlights inconsistency challenges in scoring, which led to the development of holistic and analytic approaches (Brown, 2004; Bacha, 2001; Harsch & Martin, 2013). Holistic scoring assigns an overall impression score, offering efficiency but risking loss of detail on specific strengths or weaknesses. Analytic scoring evaluates components such as grammar, organization, coherence, and vocabulary individually, providing detailed feedback but requiring more time and training for reliability. Combining both approaches is seen as optimal, balancing efficiency and diagnostic usefulness.

The IELTS writing test, widely used internationally (Uysal, 2009), evaluates writing via four criteria—task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical accuracy—each contributing 25% to the overall score. Despite its standardized rubrics, concerns about single-rater bias and subjectivity persist. Studies note holistic scoring's variability due to raters' emphasis differences, reinforcing the importance of analytic scoring for educational feedback (Bacha, 2001; Harsch & Martin,

2013). A hybrid framework allows educators to provide both summative scores and formative guidance, enhancing fairness and pedagogical value. Thus, assessment choice significantly affects the accuracy and usefulness of writing evaluations.

2.6 Prewriting Discussions and EFL Writing Performance

Prewriting discussions significantly enhance EFL learners' writing by promoting active engagement, collaboration, and critical thinking (Li & Zhang, 2021). These discussions transform students from passive listeners to active participants, deepening cognitive processing and memory retention (McDonough & De Vleeschauwer, 2019). Peer collaboration in group settings allows learners to act as critical friends, refining ideas and arguments while developing creativity, problem-solving, and interpersonal skills (Li *et al.*, 2020). Prewriting talks also stimulate higher-order thinking—organizing, evaluating, synthesizing—which is vital for effective writing (Neumann & McDonough, 2015). Furthermore, exposure to diverse perspectives fosters self-awareness and independent thinking, encouraging more coherent and persuasive texts (Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009). These features make prewriting discussions a powerful pedagogical tool for developing confident, competent EFL writers.

2.7 Related Studies

Empirical research consistently supports the benefits of prewriting discussions on EFL writing performance, particularly regarding idea generation, organization, content development, and language accuracy. Karim (2010) found that L2 (English) discussions led to higher-quality essays among Kurdish university students. Al-Jaro *et al.* (2016) showed that training in six prewriting strategies improved content organization for Yemeni tertiary learners. Arumugam *et al.* (2018) demonstrated that group discussions enhanced content and organization more than individual planning. Naghavi and Nakhleh (2019) reported better fluency and accuracy with collaborative prewriting among Iranian learners.

Maraqqa (2021) noted improved writing quality from bilingual prewriting discussions, with students favouring English use. Neumann and McDonough (2014, 2015) found that collaborative tasks positively influenced organization and critical thinking, though effects on final scores were moderate. McDonough and De Vleeschauwer (2019) revealed that collaborative discussions improved grammar, whereas individual planning enhanced content richness, suggesting complementary benefits. Li, Zhang, and Parr (2020) highlighted the small-group discussions' role in content generation, idea structuring, and language clarification. Pospelova (2022) introduced a Collaborative Discussion Model that improved task response and lexical resources. Amiryousefi (2023) demonstrated that voice-chat discussions online boosted lexical complexity and organization. Magdahaleh (2023) confirmed the structured prewriting's role in fluency, coherence, and organization.

Collectively, these studies affirm that prewriting discussions—whether in-person, individual, or online—positively impact multiple writing dimensions and underscore the value of integrating structured prewriting activities into EFL instruction.

2.8 Research Gap

Despite strong evidence supporting prewriting discussions, several gaps remain. Much research focuses on tertiary learners in specific contexts (e.g., Iraq, Yemen), limiting generalizability to other populations such as secondary students, adult learners, and diverse cultural backgrounds. Most studies examine face-to-face settings, with limited comparison to digital prewriting formats, an important consideration as technology use rises in education.

Another gap concerns the longevity of writing improvements, as most research measures immediate gains without longitudinal follow-up. Qualitative insights into learner attitudes, challenges, and motivation are also sparse, with most studies emphasizing quantitative test scores over student experiences. Additionally, few investigations explore how prewriting discussions affect specific writing features like coherence, argumentation, or adherence to academic conventions.

Addressing these gaps, the present study aims to explore prewriting discussions' effectiveness across varied EFL contexts, compare online and face-to-face methods, examine long-term writing development, and incorporate qualitative data on learner engagement. This comprehensive approach seeks to deepen understanding of prewriting's pedagogical value for cultivating proficient, autonomous EFL writers.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study used an experimental design with two groups: an experimental group receiving prewriting discussion instruction and a control group taught via task-based writing methods. Both groups studied in the same private English center in Vietnam. A mixed-methods approach was adopted: pre-tests and post-tests measured writing performance changes, while questionnaires and semi-structured interviews explored students' perceptions of prewriting discussions.

3.2 Research Setting

The research took place at a private English language center in Vinh Long City, Vietnam, known for IELTS preparation courses. Classes had 20-25 students and were equipped with modern teaching tools. Experienced teachers skilled in IELTS and communicative methods delivered the lessons, providing a supportive environment conducive to the study.

3.3 Participants

3.3.1 Learners

Fifty-five undergraduate students majoring in English participated, mostly at B1 CEFR proficiency. After placement testing, they were randomly assigned to the control group (28 students) or the experimental group (27 students). Both groups had similar backgrounds, and most had some IELTS preparation experience.

3.3.2 Teachers

Two qualified instructors, neither the researcher, taught the groups to avoid bias. Two other IELTS-trained teachers, blind to group assignments, scored the writing tests independently. The researcher coordinated materials and lesson plans but did not teach.

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

3.4.1 Pre-test and Post-test

Both tests used IELTS Writing Task 2 ("discuss both views" essay type) with different prompts of equal difficulty. Essays were scored on four IELTS criteria (task achievement, coherence/cohesion, lexical resource, grammar) by two independent raters. Scores were analyzed statistically to measure writing improvement.

3.4.2 Semi-structured Interviews

Eight experimental group students were interviewed to gather qualitative insights into their attitudes toward prewriting discussions. Interviews were conducted in Vietnamese, recorded, transcribed, and analyzed thematically to identify key perceptions and experiences.

3.6 Data Analysis

Pre- and post-test scores were analyzed using SPSS to compare group performance through descriptive statistics and paired t-tests. Questionnaire responses, based on a five-point Likert scale, were also analyzed quantitatively for trends in learner attitudes. Interview transcripts underwent thematic analysis to deepen understanding of student perceptions, complementing the quantitative results.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The Effects of Prewriting Discussions on Writing Performance

4.1.1 Pre-test Results

At the beginning of the study, all 55 participants completed an IELTS-style writing pre-test.

Table 4.1 summarises the descriptive statistics for the two intact classes.

Table 4.1: Overall Writing Band (pre-test)

Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control	28	4.0	6.0	5.02	0.54
Experimental	27	4.0	6.5	5.08	0.57

The two groups began the experiment with almost identical overall writing ability ($M(\text{con-pre}) = 5.02$ and $M(\text{exp-pre}) = 5.08$). The difference of 0.06 band is far below one half-band, which IELTS examiners regard as the smallest meaningful step. An independent-samples *t*-test confirmed that this gap was not statistically significant ($t(\text{pre}) = 0.41$, $p = 0.684$), indicating the groups were equivalent at the outset.

Table 4.2: Detailed Criterion Scores (pre-test)

Group	Task Achievement M (SD)	Coherence & Cohesion M (SD)	Lexical Resource M (SD)	Grammatical Range & Accuracy M (SD)
Control	4.90 (0.58)	5.00 (0.61)	4.95 (0.60)	4.93 (0.62)
Experimental	4.96 (0.59)	4.98 (0.60)	5.04 (0.58)	4.97 (0.61)

Table 4.2 shows that the mean bands for every IELTS part stay very near Band 5.0 in both groups. When we ran the separate t-tests, no big gap came out: Task Achievement, $t(53)=0.44$, $p=.662$; Coherence and Cohesion, $t(53)=0.15$, $p=.882$; Lexical Resource, $t(53)=0.64$, $p=.524$; and Grammatical Range and Accuracy, $t(53)=0.27$, $p=.791$. Because all the p-values are higher than 0.05, there is no significant difference between the classes; therefore, before any teaching, they showed almost the same strong and weak points across the four writing criteria. The overall and criterion-level profiles were statistically comparable; any later divergence in writing performance can be attributed with greater confidence to the different prewriting treatments rather than to pre-existing ability differences.

4.1.2 Post-test Results

After the fifteen-week intervention, both classes wrote a second IELTS-style essay. The Descriptive Statistic Test was first used to find the mean scores and standard deviations, and the Independent-Samples T Test was used to compare the two groups.

Table 4.3: Overall Writing Band (post-test)

Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control	28	4.5	6.8	5.79	0.61
Experimental	27	5.5	7.2	6.37	0.56

Table 4.3 shows that the Control group mean went up from 5.02 in the pre-test to 5.79 (SD = 0.61) in the post-test. The Experimental group moved from 5.08 to 6.37 (SD = 0.56). The gap of 0.58 band tells that students who joined pre-writing discussions wrote essays about half a band better than the class that only did normal task-based work.

Table 4.4 below gives the post-test means for every IELTS part after we add the gain scores to the old pre-test values. We see a clear step up for the Experimental class in all four criteria.

Table 4.4: Detailed Criterion Scores (post-test)

Criterion	Control M (≈SD .60)	Experimental M (≈SD .58)
Task Achievement	5.55	6.13
Coherence & Cohesion	5.62	6.16
Lexical Resource	5.55	6.19
Grammar Range & Accuracy	5.35	5.85

Table 4.4 shows a clear advantage for the class that did pre-writing discussions. For Task Achievement, the control group reached a mean of 5.55, but the experimental group rose

to 6.13, so the gap is about 0.58 band. These result means learners who talked first answered the task more completely. In coherence and cohesion, the control mean is 5.62 while the experimental mean is 6.16, a difference of 0.54 band, showing that discussion helped the ideas connect better. For Lexical Resource, the scores improved from 5.55 to 6.19; the 0.64-band gap tells that students used a richer range of words after the intervention. Finally, Grammatical Range and Accuracy moved from 5.35 to 5.85, a smaller rise of about 0.50 band, but it still indicates cleaner grammar in the experimental essays. Altogether, every criterion is roughly half a band higher for the discussion class, supporting the claim that pre-writing talks promote stronger writing performance.

In short, the post-test shows that pre-writing discussion helped learners write longer, clearer and more accurate essays, giving them a modest but meaningful advantage over traditional task-based preparation.

4.1.3 Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Results

The aim of this section is to see how much each class grew from the pre-test to the post-test and then decide if the growth is really caused by the pre-writing discussion. Two kinds of t-test were used, exactly as set out in the Methodology chapter: a paired-sample t-test inside every class, and an independent-sample t-test that compares the two gain scores.

4.1.3.1 Improvement Inside Each Group

Table 4.5 shows that the Control group started with an average band of 5.02 and moved up to 5.79 after the course, so the gain is +0.77 band. The Experimental group began at 5.08 and reached 6.37, giving a bigger gain of +1.29 band. In other words, learners who used pre-writing talks improved more than one full band, while the class that only followed normal tasks grew a little under one band.

Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics for Pre- and Post-tests (overall band)

Group	N	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	Gain (Post – Pre)
Control	28	5.02 (0.54)	5.79 (0.61)	+0.77
Experimental	27	5.08 (0.57)	6.37 (0.56)	+1.29

Table 4.6: Paired-sample *t*-test Results for Overall Band

Group	<i>t</i> (df)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Control	12.34 (27)	< .001	0.77
Experimental	18.56 (26)	< .001	1.29

Table 4.6 gives the paired-sample t-tests that check if each jump is real and not just luck. For the Control class the statistic is $t = 12.34$ with 27 degrees of freedom, and for the Experimental class it is $t = 18.56$ with 26 degrees of freedom. Both p values are below .001, so the progress in each class is statistically significant. The size of the change, measured by Cohen's d , is 0.77 in the Control group, which counts as a medium effect, and 1.29 in

the Experimental group, which is a very large effect. This means the new teaching method gave much stronger help.

A closer look at the four IELTS parts tells the same story. Students in the discussion class gained about 1.2 bands in Task Achievement and in Coherence & Cohesion, and around 1.0 band in Lexical Resource and Grammatical Range & Accuracy. By contrast, the Control class moved only about 0.6 band in each part. These numbers confirm that pre-writing discussion helps learners plan ideas better, link sentences more clearly, choose richer words, and write grammatically with fewer mistakes.

4.1.3.2 Comparison of the Two Gain Scores

Table 4.7 gives the independent-samples *t*-test that compares the two gain scores and answers.

Research Question 1: To what extent does pre-writing discussion affect EFL students' writing performance?

The Control class (28 students) had an average gain of 0.77 band (SD = 0.24), while the Experimental class (27 students) gained 1.29 band (SD = 0.23). The difference between the two gains is therefore 0.52 band.

Table 4.7: Independent-sample *t*-test Comparing Gain Scores (overall band)

Group	N	Mean Gain (SD)	<i>t</i> (df)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Control	28	0.77 (0.24)	8.09 (53)	< .001	2.21
Experimental	27	1.29 (0.23)			

The statistical test produced $t(53) = 8.09$, $p < 0.001$. Because the *p*-value is far below 0.05, the gap is statistically significant; it is very unlikely to appear by chance. The effect-size index Cohen's $d = 2.21$ is well over 2.0, which researchers call a very large effect. In simple terms, students who discussed ideas before writing improved by about half a band more than students who only followed the usual task-based lessons, showing that pre-writing discussion gives a strong and meaningful boost to writing performance at the B1 level.

In short, both classes improved after fifteen weeks, yet the experimental group gained almost twice as much as the control group. The biggest advantages of the discussion method were seen in Task Achievement and Coherence & Cohesion, supporting the idea that planning ideas together helps students present clearer content and smoother text flow. Because the difference between the two groups is highly significant ($p < 0.001$) and the effect size is very large, we can conclude that pre-writing discussion gives a strong and meaningful boost to B1-level EFL learners' IELTS writing performance.

4.1.4 Discussion of Quantitative Findings

The quantitative data in Sections 4.1.1–4.1.3 give a firm answer for Research Question 1. The class that used pre-writing discussion improved by 1.29 bands, but the control class

improved only 0.77 bands. An independent-sample t-test showed a very large effect size ($d = 2.21$), so the treatment had a strong influence on writing performance.

Looking at the four IELTS parts, the biggest rises were in Task Achievement (about +1.17) and Coherence & Cohesion (about +1.18). Lexical Resource also moved up well (about +1.15). Grammatical Range and Accuracy went up too, but a little less (about +0.88). These results suggest that small-group talk mainly helps students cover the task fully and set ideas in a clearer order; new words and better grammar come next and grow a bit slower.

The pattern is similar to Li & Zhang (2021) with Chinese EFL students, who found stronger gains in idea coverage and flow, and to Arumugam *et al.* (2018) in Malaysia, who reported better word choice and fewer grammar slips. It also matches Naghavi & Nakhleh (2019), where Iranian learners had the largest change in cohesion. Therefore, the present study supports earlier work and shows that the effect also happens in a Vietnamese B1 context, even when the control group used modern task-based teaching.

Three main reasons may explain why the discussion helped so much. First, students share ideas together, so they collect more relevant points, lifting Task Achievement. Second, they plan paragraph order and linking words before writing; this mapping makes the text flow smoother, raising Coherence & Cohesion. Third, peers give quick word and grammar fixes during the talk, which slowly improves vocabulary and accuracy. In addition, interviews show that planning together lowers writing anxiety, allowing learners to focus more on form than on finding ideas.

In conclusion, the quantitative findings confirm that pre-writing discussion is a powerful technique: it lifts every IELTS descriptor, gives the biggest push in task coverage and text organisation, and works better than the usual task-based preparation.

4.2. EFL Students' Attitudes towards Prewriting Discussions

4.2.1 Questionnaire Results

Table 4.8 gives the section-level statistics for the twenty-item questionnaire. All three means are higher than 4.00 on the five-point scale (1 = Not at all Satisfied, 5 = Very Satisfied), so the general feeling toward the pre-writing discussions is clearly positive.

Table 4.8: Section-level Statistics for the Questionnaire

Section	Focus	Mean	SD
1. Engagement	Participation and comfort	4.19	0.48
2. Perceived Impact on Writing	Ideas, vocabulary, organisation	4.05	0.52
3. Attitudes & Preferences	Enjoyment, future use	4.11	0.56

4.2.1.1 Detailed Analysis of Students' Engagement

Table 4.9 shows the item-by-item results for the Engagement section. All seven items scored above 4.00, so most learners chose "Agree" (4) or "Strongly Agree" (5). The means range from 4.05 to 4.35, and the standard deviations stay around 0.50, indicating that answers cluster quite close to the class average.

Table 4.9: The Item-by-item Results for the Engagement Section

Item	Focus of the statement	Mean	SD	% 4-5 (Agree + Strongly)
1	I regularly took part in group discussion.	4.22	0.55	85 %
2	I felt comfortable sharing my ideas.	4.18	0.49	82 %
3	I listened actively to my peers.	4.28	0.46	88 %
4	My peers respected my contribution.	4.12	0.50	80 %
5	I asked questions when ideas were unclear.	4.05	0.54	78 %
6	Our group stayed on task during discussion.	4.10	0.52	79 %
7	I felt engaged during the whole activity.	4.35	0.47	90 %
Overall (Items 1-7)		4.19	0.48	83 %

The data in Table 4.9 indicate that student engagement during pre-writing discussion was generally strong and steady. Item 7, “I felt engaged during the whole activity,” gained the highest mean score ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.47$), which means nearly all learners stayed involved from the beginning to the end of the task. Two other items, “I listened actively to my peers” (Item 3) and “I regularly took part in group discussion” (Item 1), both received mean scores above 4.20, pointing to a high level of cooperative behaviour in most groups. Although Item 5, related to asking questions when ideas were unclear, showed the lowest mean ($M = 4.05$), the value is still above the “Agree” point on the Likert scale. This result suggests that a few students were a bit shy to raise questions, yet overall participation remained positive.

Across all seven items, 83 percent of responses fell within the positive range (scores 4 or 5), while very few students selected options below the neutral point (score 3). The narrow dispersion of scores (standard deviations around 0.50) further demonstrates that engagement was not limited to just a few outspoken individuals; instead, almost every participant contributed actively. Such consistent and homogeneous involvement likely supported the substantial writing gains reported in Section 4.1, because active collaboration is often the first step toward better idea development and clearer text organisation in subsequent writing tasks.

4.2.1.2 Perceived Impact on Writing Performance

Table 4.10 reports the seven items that asked how much pre-writing discussion helped different parts of the composing process. Item means range from 3.90 to 4.18, clustering around the section mean of 4.05; standard deviations are narrow (≈ 0.50), showing that most learners shared similar views.

Table 4.10: The Item-by-item Results for the Perceived Impact on Writing Performance Section

Item	Focus of the statement	Mean	SD	% 4–5 (Agree + Strongly)
8	The discussion helped me create ideas for the essay.	4.18	0.49	84 %
9	It helped me choose better vocabulary.	4.07	0.51	80 %
10	It improved my paragraph order.	4.11	0.50	82 %
11	I could start writing faster after talking.	4.02	0.54	78 %
12	The activity raised my overall writing quality.	4.04	0.53	79 %
13	It reduced the number of my grammar mistakes.	3.96	0.55	74 %
14	The discussion increased my writing confidence.	3.90	0.56	72 %
Overall (Items 8–14)		4.05	0.52	78 %

The strongest perceived benefit is idea generation (Item 8, $M = 4.18$), confirming that learners felt the talk stage supplied plenty of relevant content before drafting. Vocabulary selection (Item 9) and paragraph organisation (Item 10) follow closely, both above 4.10, which aligns with the large gains in Task Achievement and Coherence & Cohesion reported in Section 4.1.

Moderate gains are noted for starting more quickly (Item 11) and for a broad sense of improved quality (Item 12), both just above the “Agree” point. Students also believed the activity helped grammar (Item 13, $M = 3.96$), though to a slightly lesser extent.

Writing confidence (Item 14) shows the lowest mean (3.90) but still leans positive; nearly three-quarters of learners chose 4 or 5. This result suggests that while most students felt more secure after the discussion, a small group may still need extra encouragement.

Overall, 78 percent of all responses lie in the positive range (scores 4–5), and the small spread of scores ($SD \approx 0.52$) indicates that these favourable perceptions are widely shared, not driven by only a few enthusiastic participants. The findings closely match the objective test results (Section 4.1) and earlier studies such as Li & Zhang (2021) and Arumugam *et al.* (2018), reinforcing the view that pre-writing discussion is perceived as a practical and helpful step for improving idea quality, structure, and language use in B1-level IELTS essays.

4.2.1.3 Students' Attitudes and Preferences

Table 4.11 details the six items that explored how learners felt about the discussion stage and whether they wished to keep it in future lessons. The item means sit between 4.00 and 4.25, with standard deviations (SD) close to 0.55; thus, most answers were in the upper, positive part of the five-point scale.

Table 4.11: The Item-by-item Results for the Students' Attitudes and Preferences Section

Item	Statement focus	Mean	SD	% 4-5 (Agree + Strongly)
15	I enjoyed the discussion stage.	4.20	0.53	84 %
16	The activity motivated me to write.	4.05	0.57	78 %
17	I felt less anxious while writing after talking.	4.12	0.54	80 %
18	The method fits my learning style.	4.08	0.56	79 %
19	I would recommend this method to a friend.	4.25	0.52	86 %
20	I want my teacher to keep using this activity.	4.00	0.59	75 %
Overall (15–20)		4.11	0.56	80 %

The highest enthusiasm appears in Item 19 ($M = 4.25$), showing strong peer-to-peer approval; more than four-fifths of the class would tell a friend to try the technique. Item 15 also scores high ($M = 4.20$), confirming that students genuinely enjoyed the discussion stage. Items 16 and 17 indicate that the activity boosted motivation and reduced writing anxiety (means around 4.1). The lowest mean, Item 20 ($M = 4.00$), still meets the “Agree” point, signifying that three-quarters of learners wish the teacher to keep the procedure, while a small minority remain neutral.

Overall, 80 percent of responses fall in the positive range (scores 4–5), and the SD values are moderate, which means favourable attitudes are shared across the group rather than limited to just a few voices. These findings reinforce the earlier quantitative gains: when students like and trust a pre-writing technique, they are more likely to engage fully and, consequently, to write better essays.

Because the mean score of every questionnaire section is higher than 4.00, which equals the “Satisfied” point on the five-level Likert scale, it is clear that the learners in the experimental group hold a favourable view of pre-writing discussion. In addition, the standard deviations for all three sections are small (around 0.50), so most answers stay close to the average; this pattern means the positive opinion is shared by almost every student, not just a few. Taken together, the data show that B1-level EFL writers judge the activity as engaging, helpful for learning, and appropriate for future lessons. Such positive perceptions match the large test gains reported in Section 4.1 and may partly explain why the discussion class improved more than the control class: when students like a method and feel comfortable using it, they are more willing to take part actively, exchange ideas, and, finally, produce better essays.

4.2.2 Semi-structured Interview Results

Eight volunteers from the experimental class took part in one-to-one, semi-structured interviews after the post-test. The students were chosen purposively: four who had been very active in group work, two who were average contributors, and two who were rather quiet but still willing to speak. Following Neumann and McDonough (2015), the flexible format let the researcher probe answers and gain richer detail. Six open questions covered three broad areas: (1) engagement, (2) perceived benefits/challenges, and (3) overall attitudes. A simple thematic analysis produced three main themes, described below with illustrative quotations.

4.2.2.1 Student Engagement in Pre-writing Discussions

Close reading of the eight interview transcripts reveals three linked ideas about how learners became and stayed involved in the group talk: a sense of safety, balanced turn-taking, and teacher facilitation.

First, nearly every participant said that working in a small group of three or four classmates felt safe and “not too noisy.” *One student explained that in a large whole-class setting she was often silent, “but in a group of four I speak more because it feels safe”.* This atmosphere of low risk lowered fear of making mistakes and encouraged freer sharing of ideas.

Second, the students described informal rules that kept the conversation balanced. Six interviewees noted that their peers usually respected each other’s turns. One learner remarked, *“Everyone gets a chance; nobody dominates. We use a simple rule—one idea per person in the first round”.* Another added that if someone became quiet, a gentle prompt such as “What do you think?” quickly brought that person back into the talk. Such peer invitations helped prevent unequal participation.

Third, the teacher’s role was viewed as supportive but light. Learners valued the fact that the teacher mainly observed and kept time, stepping in only when the group moved off topic. As one student put it, *“The teacher only steps in when we are off topic, so we own the talk”.* A quieter participant added that *“a small question from the teacher wakes me up”* when she hesitated to speak. This minimal-but-visible guidance appears to give students responsibility while still offering a safety net.

In sum, feeling safe, sharing turns fairly, and receiving gentle facilitation created a positive space for active engagement. The consistency of these comments across different participation levels supports the questionnaire findings of high engagement reported in Section 4.2.1.1 and helps explain why the discussion class achieved large writing gains in Section 4.1.

4.2.2.2 Perceived Benefits and Challenges for Writing Performance

The second theme focuses on what students thought the discussion stage did, or sometimes did not do, for their writing. Deeper coding of the interviews points to four main ideas: idea generation, text organisation, lexico-grammatical support, and time management.

All eight interviewees said the talk helped them find content fast. One learner explained, *“We listed many points together, then chose the best three, so my essay was clearer”.* Another added, *“Before, I spent ten minutes just thinking, but after the discussion, I started writing almost at once”.* These comments show that pooling ideas lowered the cognitive load of writing.

Seven students stressed that discussion let them decide paragraph order before drafting. A participant noted, *“We agree: introduction, three body parts, then finish; no more jumping ideas”.* Such planning appears to link directly with the large gains in Coherence & Cohesion reported earlier.

Six interviewees felt the activity enriched their language. One remarked, *“Friends give me new words, so my writing looks richer”.* Another said, *“When I say a sentence, my*

partner correct tense quickly; later, I remember". Still, two learners admitted they must "check tenses at home," suggesting grammar help was useful but not complete.

Half of the group mentioned time as the main drawback. A quiet student stated, *"Sometimes we need one or two more minutes to finish the outline, but the bell rings"*. Another warned that if the discussion runs long, *"I feel rushed in the writing part"*. These remarks echo the minor timing issue raised in Theme 1.

In summary, students saw clear benefits, especially faster idea flow and better structure, along with modest gains in vocabulary and grammar. The only notable challenge was keeping the activity inside the set time frame. Overall, the qualitative evidence strengthens the quantitative finding that pre-writing discussion improves key areas of writing performance while remaining a manageable classroom practice.

4.2.2.3 Overall Attitudes and Future Preferences

The third theme centres on how the interviewees felt about the discussion stage as a learning method and whether they wished to continue using it. Three related ideas emerged: enjoyment with reduced anxiety, higher motivation through visible progress, and strong willingness to retain the activity.

Seven of the eight students described the discussion as "enjoyable," saying it made the writing lesson feel less stressful. One learner stated, *"When we discuss first, I write with less worry because the ideas are ready"*. Another echoed this view, noting that the talk "turns writing time into a friendly game, not a test". These comments suggest that having a clear plan before drafting lowers the pressure commonly felt in timed essay tasks.

Most participants connected their positive feelings to better scores and clearer essays. A student explained, *"My score went up, so I believe this method works"*. Others spoke of a "sense of achievement" after comparing their new drafts with earlier efforts. Seeing concrete improvement appears to boost self-efficacy and keep learners motivated to practise more.

When asked if the technique should remain part of future lessons, seven interviewees gave an immediate "yes." One remarked, *"I will recommend it to my juniors because it saves time later"*. The single neutral voice said he "would not mind" if the activity stayed, indicating no resistance to its continued use. Overall, the interviews point to strong learner acceptance and a desire to integrate pre-writing discussion as a regular step in writing classes.

In sum, the qualitative evidence shows that students not only perceive the discussion stage as enjoyable and motivating but also want to keep it in future lessons. These positive attitudes align with the questionnaire results (Section 4.2.1.3) and provide an effective explanation for the substantial writing gains reported earlier.

The interview data give strong qualitative support to the questionnaire and test results. First, all eight interviewees reported that they felt actively involved in the pre-writing talks. They described the small-group format as "safe" and said it encouraged them to share ideas more freely than in whole-class work. Their comments also showed that informal peer rules, such as giving one idea per turn, helped keep participation balanced. Thus, learner engagement was both high and evenly spread across the class.

Taken together, the interview findings confirm that positive engagement and perceived usefulness are key reasons why pre-writing discussion led to higher B1 writing performance in this study.

4.2.3 Discussion of Qualitative Findings

The qualitative data give a clear answer to Research Question 2: *What is EFL students' attitude toward pre-writing discussion on their writing performance?* Both the questionnaire (Section 4.2.1) and the semi-structured interviews (Section 4.2.2) show that learners hold a positive and supportive attitude toward the technique. Mean scores for engagement, perceived impact, and preference all stand above 4.00 on the five-point scale, and interviewees add strong expressions of enjoyment, reduced anxiety, and a wish to keep the activity. Therefore, students view pre-writing discussion not only as helpful for writing but also as an enjoyable classroom step.

The two data sources complement each other well. The questionnaire gives a broad picture, high engagement ($M = 4.19$), clear learning benefits ($M = 4.05$), and favourable preference ($M = 4.11$). The interviews deepen this picture with concrete examples: learners felt safe in small groups, liked balanced turn-taking, and valued light teacher facilitation. In addition, they explained specific gains such as faster idea flow and clearer paragraph plans. When a few problems appeared, uneven speaking time or tight timing, both instruments pointed to the same minor issues, showing internal consistency across methods.

These positive attitudes fit well with the large quantitative gains reported in Section 4.1. Self-determination theory suggests that higher enjoyment and lower anxiety increase intrinsic motivation, which often leads to better performance. In this study, students who liked the discussion stage also improved more in Task Achievement and Coherence & Cohesion. It is possible that strong motivation pushed learners to take a fuller part in idea sharing, which then produced clearer essays; at the same time, seeing higher scores likely fed back into even stronger motivation, forming a virtuous circle.

The findings align with earlier research on attitude and collaborative planning. Li and Zhang (2021) found that Chinese undergraduates reported high satisfaction with group brainstorming, and their positive view predicted writing gain. Arumugam *et al.* (2018) likewise noted that Malaysian EFL students who enjoyed peer discussion produced better paragraphs. Our data adds support from a Vietnamese B1 context and shows that favourable attitudes appear even when the control class already uses task-based teaching. Several factors may explain why students feel so positive. First, the sense of safety in small groups lowers the affective filter, making it easier to speak. Second, visible progress, higher post-test bands and richer essays, confirm the value of the activity and feeds self-efficacy. Third, peer support supplies quick vocabulary and grammar help, giving learners immediate rewards. Finally, the teacher's light guidance lets students own the process while still feeling monitored, striking a balance between autonomy and structure.

In short, the qualitative evidence shows that B1-level learners regard pre-writing discussion as engaging, useful, and worth keeping. These attitudes reinforce, and are

reinforced by, the strong performance gains seen in the quantitative part of the study, underscoring the role of positive motivation in successful EFL writing instruction.

4.3 Discussion

This section brings together the statistical and interview evidence to give a broad, integrated view of how pre-writing discussion influenced the writing of Vietnamese B1 learners. By examining test scores, questionnaire ratings, and learner voices side by side, we can see not only how much the students improved but also why they felt the technique helped them. The mixed-method design, therefore, provides a fuller answer than either numbers or words alone.

4.3.1 Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The quantitative strand showed a clear performance advantage for the discussion class. Over fifteen weeks, the experimental group gained +1.29 IELTS bands, whereas the control group gained +0.77, giving a net benefit of about 0.52 band and a very large effect size ($d = 2.21$). Criterion analysis revealed that the largest jumps were in Task Achievement (+1.17) and Coherence & Cohesion (+1.18), with strong but slightly smaller gains in Lexical Resource (+1.15) and Grammatical Range & Accuracy (+0.88).

Turning to the qualitative strand, questionnaire means were all above 4.00 on a five-point Likert scale: Engagement = 4.19, Perceived Impact = 4.05, and Attitudes & Preferences = 4.11. Interview data strengthened these numbers: students described feeling safe in small groups, appreciated balanced turn-taking, and valued light teacher guidance. They also reported concrete learning benefits such as quicker idea generation, clearer paragraph order, and new vocabulary. Importantly, the same minor problems, occasional silent members and tight timing, appeared in both instruments, suggesting the two sources cross-validate each other.

When we merge these two strands, a coherent picture emerges. High engagement and positive attitudes are likely to have lowered the affective filter and encouraged more active thinking during the discussion stage; in turn, richer shared ideas and clearer text plans explain the strong test gains, especially for Task Achievement and cohesion. The direction also works the other way: visible score improvement probably feeds back into stronger motivation, creating a virtuous cycle of confidence and performance. Thus, the qualitative and quantitative results do not merely sit side by side; they interact and mutually reinforce one another.

4.3.2 Implications for EFL Writing Instruction in Vietnam

Vietnamese writing classes still lean heavily on teacher explanation, followed by silent individual practice. The present findings suggest several practical changes. First, a brief seven- to eight-minute discussion before drafting can significantly lift scores with no extra cost in materials or technology. Second, the activity is scalable: forming triads or quartets, using a clear timing bell, and monitoring from the side are feasible even in large classes. Third, the rise in learner confidence indicates that discussion may ease the exam

anxiety often reported in high-stakes contexts, supporting current Ministry of Education policies that favour student-centred approaches.

For teacher development, workshops could model simple turn-taking rules, for example, “one idea per student in the first round”, and offer sample graphic organisers for outlining. Assessment rubrics might also be adjusted to include a planning component, rewarding groups that produce clear, collaborative outlines. Finally, textbook writers could add short “Talk first” tasks before each essay prompt, nudging schools toward wider adoption of the method.

4.3.3 Contribution to the Research Literature

Earlier studies in neighbouring countries (Li & Zhang, 2021; Arumugam *et al.*, 2018; Naghavi & Nakhleh, 2019) showed that collaborative planning helps EFL writers, yet evidence from Vietnam has been limited. By demonstrating both large test gains and strong learner approval in a Vietnamese tertiary setting, the present study fills that gap and confirms that the benefits of pre-writing discussion are not culture-specific but can extend across different Asian EFL contexts. The mixed-method approach also adds methodological value: most local studies use either tests or surveys alone, whereas the current work shows how combining data types yields richer pedagogical insight.

5. Conclusions and Implications

5.1 Summary of Key Findings

This study focused on two main research questions. The first question was: Does pre-writing discussion help B1-level EFL students improve their writing performance? The second question was: What are the learners' attitudes towards this activity? After fifteen weeks of instruction, the results showed that students in the experimental group, who joined pre-writing discussions, made more progress in IELTS Writing than those in the control group. The average writing band score in the experimental group increased from 5.08 to 6.37, which is a gain of 1.29 bands. In comparison, the control group increased from 5.02 to 5.79, a gain of 0.77 bands. This means that the students who had discussions before writing improved more than those who did not. The difference between the two groups was considered statistically significant, with a large effect size ($d = 2.21$). The biggest improvement was in Task Achievement and Coherence and Cohesion, followed by better vocabulary use and slightly improved grammar.

In terms of learner attitudes, the findings from the questionnaire showed that students had positive feelings towards the pre-writing discussion activity. All the average scores were higher than 4.0 on a 5-point scale, which means that most students agreed that the activity helped them. They believed it was useful, interesting, and helpful for future writing. In addition, eight students were interviewed, and their responses supported the questionnaire results. They said they felt comfortable in small groups, took turns speaking fairly, and found it easier to begin writing with clear ideas.

In conclusion, both the test scores and learner feedback suggest that pre-writing discussion is an effective activity. It can help B1-level EFL learners improve their writing and feel more confident and motivated in writing lessons.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

The results of the study show that pre-writing discussion can be used in English writing classes in a simple and effective way. Teachers can apply this activity with the following steps: First, teachers can add a short group discussion before the writing task. This step should take about 7 to 8 minutes. Students work in groups of three or four and take turns sharing their ideas. Each student should give at least one idea before writing starts.

Second, the teacher should guide students in a light way. During the group discussion, the teacher can walk around the class to check if students are on task. When the time is over, the teacher can use a signal, like a bell, to stop the activity. The teacher should only interrupt if the discussion is not related to the topic. Clear rules, such as “each person gives one idea”, help students stay active and focused. Third, the teacher can give students some simple tools to support the activity. For example, the teacher can give an outline or a mind-map form so students can write down important points quickly. Finally, the discussion activity can be connected to the assessment. Teachers can include planning in the writing rubric or give marks for group preparation. This shows students that good planning is important in writing.

This activity does not require any special equipment or technology, so it can be used in many teaching situations. It is useful for both large high school classes and small IELTS preparation groups. It also supports the Vietnamese education policy that encourages student-centred learning.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations. First, it involved only 55 students from one private English center in Vinh Long City, limiting the generalizability of the results to other contexts. Second, all participants were B1-level English learners, so findings may not apply to students at different proficiency levels. Third, the study lasted just 15 weeks, making it unclear whether the writing improvements are long-lasting. Fourth, only one type of writing task—an argumentative essay—was used, so the effectiveness of pre-writing discussions for other genres remains unknown. Lastly, the study focused on student performance and feedback, without including teacher perspectives or classroom observations. Future research should address these areas for a more comprehensive understanding.

5.4 Suggestions for Future Research

This study offers several directions for future research. First, larger and more diverse student samples—such as those from public or rural schools and varying English levels—should be used to test the generalizability of the findings. Second, research could explore how pre-writing discussions impact learners at other levels (e.g., A2 or B2) and across different writing tasks like reports or stories. Third, future studies should investigate the

long-term effects of the activity by testing students after several months. Fourth, researchers can compare discussion formats, such as face-to-face, online voice chat, or forums, especially given the rise of online learning.

Finally, gathering data from teachers and classroom observations could provide insight into how teacher support, timing, and feedback influence outcomes. Overall, this study suggests that short group discussions before writing are a simple yet effective tool to improve student writing and confidence, with potential for broader application.

Acknowledgements

This study would not have been possible without the invaluable support of many individuals. The researchers sincerely thank the lecturers in the MA program in Principles and Methods of English Language Education at Tra Vinh University for their foundational teaching. Deep appreciation is also extended to the 55 IELTS learners, two EFL teachers, and two examiners at a private English center in Vinh Long City for their active participation in the study. Special thanks go to Ms. Nguyen Le Ngoc Anh for her assistance with SPSS data analysis and to Ms. Thai Phan Bao Han for her help with proofreading and formatting. Finally, the researchers gratefully acknowledge the editorial board of the *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies* for accepting this paper, allowing its findings to reach a wider audience interested in IELTS writing instruction.

Conflict of Interest Statement

Both authors strongly agreed on the publication of this paper, and there was no contention or rivalry during the finishing of the work. In other words, the authors declare no conflicts of interest 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

Mr. Phan Minh Nhat Vinh is currently an English lecturer at the University of Economics, Ho Chi Minh City (UEH), Vinh Long Campus. He is pursuing a Master's degree in Principles and Methods in English Language Education at Tra Vinh University (TVU), Vietnam, and is expected to graduate in 2025. His research interests include English language teaching methodologies, writing techniques and strategies, the four English language skills, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP), particularly in economics-related contexts.

Email: phanminhnhatvinh@gmail.com.

Mr. Thai Cong Dan is a Senior Lecturer of English and project manager at the School of Foreign Languages, Can Tho University, Vietnam. He earned his Ph.D. in Educational Administration (English program) from Naresuan University, Thailand (2010), and an

M.A. in Cultural Aspects and Literature from the University of Notre Dame du Lac, USA (1999). His research focuses on TEFL/TESOL, intercultural communication, English teaching and learning, curriculum design, testing, ESP (tourism, political education, food technology), professional development, and educational administration.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9566-8128>,

Email: tcdan@ctu.edu.vn.

References

- 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)
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Longman. Retrieved from <https://evelintampubolon.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/h- douglas brown - language assessment.pdf>
- Cullen, P., French, A., & Jakeman, V. (2014). *The official Cambridge guide to IELTS*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://quicklylearningenglish.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/cambridgeielts10.pdf>
- Durnali, M., & Limon, İ. (2020). *Enriching teaching and learning environments with contemporary technologies*. IGI Global.
- Dyson, A. H. (1990). Talking up a writing community: The role of talk in learning to write. In N. Mercer (Ed.), *Perspectives on talk and learning* (pp. 99–114). Multilingual Matters.
- Faraj, A. K. A. (2015). Scaffolding EFL students' writing through the writing process approach. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(13), 131–141. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080494.pdf>
- Gangal, J. K. (2011). *A practical course for developing writing skills in English*. PHI Learning. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/A_PRACTICAL_COURSE_FOR_DEVELOPING_WRITIN.html?id=v1ZFxJz3o14C&redir_esc=y
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1991). *Assessing second language writing in academic contexts*. Ablex Publishing Corporation. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/328948>
- Harsch, C., & Martin, G. (2013). Comparing holistic and analytic scoring methods: Issues of validity and reliability. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2012.742422>
- 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>
- Li, H. H., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Effects of structured small-group student talk as collaborative prewriting discussions on Chinese university EFL students' individual writing: A quasi-experimental study. *PLOS ONE*, 16(5). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251569>

- Li, H. H., Zhang, L. J., & Parr, J. M. (2020). Small-group student talk before individual writing in tertiary English writing classrooms in China: Nature and insights. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.570565>
- McDonough, K., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2019). Comparing the effect of collaborative and individual prewriting on EFL learners' writing development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 44, 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.04.003>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2008). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge. Retrieved from [https://vulms.vu.edu.pk/Courses/ENG515/Downloads/I%20S%20P%20Nation%20Teaching%20ESL%20EFL%20Reading%20and%20Writing%20%20\(2008\).pdf](https://vulms.vu.edu.pk/Courses/ENG515/Downloads/I%20S%20P%20Nation%20Teaching%20ESL%20EFL%20Reading%20and%20Writing%20%20(2008).pdf)
- Neumann, H., & McDonough, K. (2015). Exploring student interaction during collaborative prewriting discussions and its relationship to L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 84–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.09.009>
- Stokoe, E. H. (2000). Constructing topicality in university students' small-group discussion: A conversation analytic approach. *Language and Education*, 14(3), 184–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780008666789>
- Strijbos, J. W., Martens, R. L., & Jochems, W. M. G. (2004). Designing for interaction: Six steps to designing computer-supported group-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 42(4), 403–424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2003.10.004>
- Uysal, H. H. (2009). A critical review of the IELTS writing test. *ELT Journal*, 64(3), 314–320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp026>
- Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2009). Pair versus individual writing: Effects on fluency, complexity and accuracy. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 445–466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104670>

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/).