p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

p-ISSN 2252-7427 e-ISSN 2541-3635
Indonesian EFL Journal
AISEE
The Association of Indonesia Scholars of English Education

ENHANCING STUDENTS' ESSAY WRITING SKILLS THROUGH THE IELTS TASK 2 MODEL ESSAY APPROACH

Agus Supriyadi*[1], Indry Widyasti Anwar[2], Magvirah Octasary[3], Wang Xiaoqian[4], Eka Wahjuningsih[5]

[1,2,3]*English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Khairun, Ternate, Indonesia*
[4] *International Program Manger of Go Study Global Education, China*
[5]*English Language Education, Universitas Jember, Indonesia*

Corresponding author's email: agus_supriyadi@unkhair.ac.id

APA Citation: Supriyadi, A., Anwar, I. W., Octasary, M., Xiaoqian, W., & Wahjuningsih, E. (2025). Enhancing students' essay writing skills through the IELTS Task 2 model essay approach. *EFL Journal*, *11*(3), 777-788. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v11i3.52

Received: 11-08-2025 Accepted: 24-10-2025 Published: 30-10-2025

Abstract: This study investigates the effectiveness of using IELTS Task 2 model essays approach as a pedagogical tool to enhance students' academic essay writing skills. This research employed a quantitative pre-experimental design, specifically a one-group pretest-posttest format. This design involves measuring the same group of participants before and after an intervention to determine whether the treatment produced any significant changes. Recognizing the challenges many learners face in organizing ideas, developing arguments, and using appropriate academic language, this research explores how exposure to high-quality model essays can improve students' writing performance. A classroom-based intervention was conducted with undergraduate English language learners, incorporating model essay analysis, guided practice, and peer feedback. Pre- and post-intervention writing assessments, along with student reflections, were used to evaluate the impact. The results of this study indicate that using IELTS Task 2 as a model for essay instruction leads to a statistically and pedagogically significant improvement in students' writing abilities. The mean score for the pre-test was 3.95 (SD = 0.78), and the post-test mean rose to 4.70 (SD = 0.67). The difference was statistically significant with $p < 0.001$. The findings indicate that students demonstrated notable improvements in coherence, cohesion, vocabulary usage, and task response. Moreover, students reported increased confidence and better understanding of essay structure and argumentation techniques. The study concludes that integrating IELTS Task 2 model essays into writing instruction is an effective strategy for developing students' academic writing competence.

Keywords: *essay writing skills; IELTS Writing Task 2; model essay; academic writing; EFL learners.*

INTRODUCTION

Writing ability is vital for both academic and personal development. Writing is the ability to organize and convey ideas, concepts, and facts in a written passage. Writing ability is highly demanded, especially in academic settings and university contexts. In educational settings, writing is a means of communication. It demonstrates the knowledge, critical thinking, and problem-solving abilities of the students. Because university students are required to produce essays, research papers, and reports as part of their studies, writing abilities are therefore crucial (Noviantoro, Muslim, & Wirza, 2025; Meneses, et all,. 2023; Helm & Hesse, 2025; Falardeau, et all., 2024). For university students, mastering writing skills means effectively expressing ideas, engaging in discussions, and producing written content that demonstrates their understanding (Ismail, Anwar & Daud, 2025; Crossley & Van, 2025).

University students are required to finish many projects, assignments, and theses. Having a strong writing ability can help college students achieve success in university. Writing effectively helps students improve their ability to synthesize information, make logical arguments, and critically reflect on their subject of study practiced

(Enright, Toledo & Landau, 2023; Latif, 2024; Agustini, 2025; Aljafen, 2025).

Students also learn to strengthen their argumentation skills and make conclusions through writing. In order to write effectively, students must have adequate reading comprehension skills. Consequently, writing fosters critical thinking and analysis because reading comprehension skills are involved in the process before writing. Academic writing specifically enhances students' ability to organize their thoughts, analyze information, and express ideas logically (Haake, 2025; Carter & Townsend, 2022; Crossley, Tian & Wan, 2022; Tian, Kim & Crossley, 2023; Diep & Diep, 2024: Larsen, 2022; Lie, 2025; Li, 2024; Sun & Zhang, 2024).

Yet despite its significance, students still face a number of difficulties when it comes to writing. A lot of students have trouble structuring their ideas, coming up with logical arguments, and keeping an academic tone and style (Sandstrom, 2021; Routarinne, Juvonen & Pentikainen, 2023; Mombaers, Van & De, 2024; Yahia & Egbert, 2023).

Students must include a clear introduction, content, conclusion, and supporting elements in their writing. Moreover, students sometimes find difficulties in writing clear transitions between paragraphs, which can lead to disorganized paragraphs (Laston, et all, 2021; Tarchi, & Casado, 2024; Boillos, & Idoiaga, N, 2025; Tabari, 2023: Ye, et all, 2024; Zhang, 2025).

Especially writing in English is a great challenge for non-native English speakers. Students often struggle with writing with efficient grammar, punctuation, word choice, and vocabulary (Alston, et all, 2021; Aitken & Graham, 2023; Pander et al, 2023; Tian, Crossley & Van, 2025; Ulasik, Mahlow & Piotrowski, 2025).

Inaccurate English writing patterns might make it difficult to fully understand what is being written. Students may also encounter additional difficulties as a result of the pressure to meet deadlines, manage difficult assignments, and reach high standards. These challenges highlight the need for institutions to provide adequate support and resources to help students improve their writing skills (Deng, 2021; Wang & Zhang, 2022; Kruse, 2024; Haake, 2025; Feltgen & Lefeuvre, 2025).

Academic writing demands a high level of critical thinking, which can be challenging for students who are more accustomed to surface-level summarization rather than in-depth analysis. Writing an academic paper requires students to not only summarize sources but also to critique and analyze the information, drawing connections between ideas and offering a reasoned argument (Enright, et all, 2023; Vasylets & Marín, 2025; Van, et all, 2023; Tian, Crossley & Van, 2025; Campos, 2025).

Developing the ability to think critically and analytically is often difficult, especially when students are still learning how to engage with complex academic texts. To address these challenges, standardized models such as the IELTS Writing Task 2 can offer a structured framework for practice.

The IELTS Academic writing test consists of two sections. Writing task 1 requires participants to write 150 words of descriptive writing based on a given diagram or tables. The purpose of task 1 is to evaluate participants' ability to compare and contrast the presented data. While on task 2, participants need to compose an essay in the form of advantages-disadvantages, opinion essays, causes-and-effects, causes-and-solutions, and both perspectives discussions essay in 250 words. The focus of task 2 writing is to evaluate participants' ability to respond to any given issues. The topics given in Task 2 writing vary from a wide range of different issues. IELTS Task 2 is scored based on criteria such as coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy. Qualified and certified examiners evaluate the writing scripts of candidates. Each task is scored separately, and the overall writing score is presented on a scale from 1 to 9 in 0.5 increments. While the final writing band score is based on the results of both tasks, Task 2 carries greater weight than Task 1.

Practicing similar essay writing activities as in the IELTS Task 2 writing is very beneficial for university students to support their scaffolding of language development and integrating critical thinking in a genre-based approach. The structure of IELTS Writing Task 2 requires students to construct clear arguments, ensure coherence, and develop lexical resources, which aligns well with recent research on Cognitive Load Theory, particularly studies examining cognitive load in EFL argumentative writing and integrated language tasks (Li, 2024; Ye, et al., 2024; Morgan & Speed, 2025). Moreover, by engaging in repeated and structured writing practice, students gradually reduce extraneous cognitive load and strengthen their ability to process and organize information more efficiently, ultimately promoting

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

deeper conceptual understanding and improved academic writing performance.

This practice allows learners to facilitate essential writing skills through practice, thus allowing cognitive resources for higher-order thinking. Model essays are commonly used in writing instruction as exemplary texts provided by instructors or found in textbooks, which students can read and emulate. These texts represent specific genres and serve as practical illustrations of writing conventions that students are expected to internalize and reproduce in similar contexts. Recent studies highlight that many writing instructors incorporate model essays as part of their teaching strategies to support students' development of genre awareness and writing proficiency (Hyland, 2022; Haake, 2025; Boillos & Idoiaga, 2025: Enright, Toledo & Landau, 2023; Almumen & Jouhar, 2025).

In first language (L1) writing instruction, model texts are frequently used to enhance students' understanding of structure, coherence, and style. This approach is similarly embraced in English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, where reading and imitating model essays is considered an effective method for improving writing skills (Tormala & Kulju, 2023: Morris, Crossley, Holmes & Choi, 2025; Falardeau, et al, 2024). Although some debate persists about the over-reliance on models potentially limiting creativity, their benefits in scaffolding learners' genre knowledge are widely acknowledged (Teng, 2021: Enright, Toledo, & Landau, 2023; Routarinne, Juvonen & Pentikäinen, 2023).

Exposure to model essays enables L2 learners to recognize the conventions of various genres such as descriptive, narrative, compare-and-contrast, expository, and argumentative writing. These texts offer topic-specific content that students can modify and use in their own writing, in addition to offering linguistic and structural models (Lee, 2023; Crossley, Tian & Wan, 2022; Tian, Kim & Crossley, 2024). Furthermore, Yang et al. (2024) and Tian, Crossley & Van, (2025) reported that students can improve their essay quality significantly by continuously practising with model essays and receiving feedback through AI platforms. This report showed the effectiveness of feedback through modelling an essay as a form of scaffolding. As mentioned in the Noticing hypothesis students get a lot of benefits from examining a model essay where they can notice correct language features, allowing input for acquisition to occur. Students can identify and notice syntactic and rhetorical patterns in high-scoring essay models to improve their writing coherence and cohesion by comparing model essays and their own writing.

Several researchers have reported the role of feedback in facilitating students' writing instruction (Hao, et all, 2000; Zhu & Xiong, 2025; Hyland, 2003; Tickoo, 2001; McKinley, 2022). Utilizing a model essay written by native or native-like proficient writers can also be used as a beneficial resource, which can function as a feedback tool. Furthermore, using a model essay can significantly improve students' writing in terms of task response and improved coherence and cohesion (Jafary, Amani, & Benoit, 2023; Meneses, et al, 2023; Enright, Toledo & Landau Wright, 2023; Törmälä & Kulju, 2023).

When students practiced writing using the IELTS model essay, their lexical resource score significantly increased (Nguyen & Le, 2022; Ulasik, Mahlow & Piotrowski, 2025; Kruse, 2024; Gebril, 2024; Sales, 2022; Rast, 2023).

The findings indicated that exposure to sample essays promotes the growth of academic language and expression. Another research mentioned the benefit of repeated writing practice as a task-based approach in writing (Mochizuki, 2025; Meneses, et al, 2023: Helm & Hesse, 2025; Enright, Toledo & Landau, 2023; Liu, Zao & Zhang, 2024; Shu, Wang & Xu, 2024). Students formally achieved formal writing drills through repeated writing practice, revising, editing, and receiving feedback.

Recent research underscores the importance of feedback in enhancing students' performance in the IELTS Academic Writing Task 2. (Kashiha, 2025; Haake, 2025; Salo, et all, 2023; Routarinne, Juvonen & Pentikäinen, 2023) examined the main issues that students faced and identified problems like poor argumentation, disorganized essays, and a lack of usage of academic terminology. They emphasized the importance of structured training and consistent practice and promptly provided corrective feedback to help overcome these obstacles. Familiarization with the expectations of the task through model essays and feedback was shown to contribute significantly to improved performance. Similarly, (Tabari, et all, 2025; Conijn, et al, 2025; Bouwer, et al, 2023; Van, et al, 2023; Almumen & Jouhar, 2025) investigated teachers' perspectives on written corrective feedback for Task 2. The study revealed that direct, prescriptive comments—such as highlighting specific grammar or structure errors and suggesting improvements—were perceived as the most helpful. Additionally, the way teachers

delivered feedback was influenced by their theoretical knowledge of writing pedagogy and their beliefs about learning, demonstrating that feedback is not a one-size-fits-all process.

More recent studies build on these findings and further highlight the effectiveness of feedback. Hosseini and Hashemi (2023); Campos (2025); Falardeau, et al, (2024) showed that when integrated with writing instruction, formative feedback can significantly enhance students' task response and coherence. When paired with model essay analysis, Liu and Chen (2023); Yin, Parpala & Toom (2023); Helm & Hesse (2025) found that individualized written feedback helped learners better internalize effective rhetorical structures and stylistic conventions. Furthermore, according to Nasiri and Amini (2024), using AI-assisted feedback tools combined with teacher input significantly increased students' lexical resources and grammatical accuracy. Students can get precise revision using these digital tools, which help them improve their writing. These findings collectively affirm the critical role of feedback—whether human-delivered, automated, or model-based—in the writing development process. When integrated with model essay analysis and task-based instruction, feedback becomes a powerful scaffolding mechanism for improving academic writing, especially in high-stakes assessments like IELTS Task 2. Therefore, IELTS Writing Task 2 can be used in the language classroom as a pedagogical instrument to facilitate both linguistic and metacognitive aspects of academic writing.

This study aims to examine the effectiveness of using IELTS Writing Task 2 model essays in improving the essay writing skills of university students. Specifically, it explores how structured writing practice, grounded in model-based instruction and supported by feedback and revision activities, can enhance students' coherence, lexical resource, and argument development in academic essays.

METHOD

This research employed a quantitative pre-experimental design, specifically a one-group pretest-posttest format. This design involves measuring the same group of participants before and after an intervention to determine whether the treatment produced any significant changes. Although lacking a control group, pre-experimental designs are widely used in classroom-based research to evaluate the initial impact of an instructional strategy (Creswell & Creswell, 2022).

The participants of this study were 20 undergraduate students enrolled in an English education program. All participants were taking an academic writing course and were considered to have intermediate proficiency in English. Data were collected through a pre-test and post-test, in which students were asked to write essays based on IELTS Writing Task 2 prompts. In the **pre-test**, students wrote an essay before any instructional intervention, allowing researchers to assess their initial writing abilities in areas such as task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy. Students finished a post-test using a new IELTS Task 2 prompt following a sequence of instructional sessions that included model essays, focused feedback, and revision exercises. Using the same IELTS evaluation criteria for consistency and comparability, this second essay was used to evaluate any progress they had made in their writing. The essays were evaluated using the official IELTS writing band descriptors, including task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy (British Council, 2025)

The treatment was implemented over six sessions. Each session focused on a specific aspect of IELTS Task 2 essay writing, such as opinion essays, advantages-disadvantages essays, cause-effect, and problem-solution structures. Students were exposed to Band 8–9 model essays, which served as examples of high-quality writing in terms of structure, coherence, and language use (Hyland, 2022; Le, 2023; Marlina, 2025; Kubota, 2025; Lu & Pan, 2024). Students read and analyzed these models during each session, focusing on discourse markers, topic sentences, lexical choices, and paragraph development.

The treatment is followed by an instructional process consisting of noticing, drafting, feedback, and revising. In the noticing stage, students were guided to identify and reflect on salient linguistic features of the model texts. After the noticing phase, students were assigned a writing task similar to the model. They drafted their essays individually, applying the structures and strategies observed in the model texts. Direct feedback was provided by the instructor. This feedback addressed key areas such as argument clarity, logical flow, grammatical accuracy, and lexical appropriateness (Beiler & Marti, 2025: Wang, 2025; Morale & Brice, 2025; Lee & Mak, 2025) . Students were then required to revise their drafts based on this feedback. The revision process aims to encourage students to reflect on their strengths

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

and weaknesses and to actively improve their writing. In later sessions, peer feedback was also incorporated, allowing students to evaluate one another's writing using simplified versions of the IELTS rubric. Throughout the six-session treatment, model essays functioned not only as linguistic input but also as indirect feedback tools. Students were encouraged to compare their writing to the models and identify structure, tone, and development discrepancies. This reflective comparison process facilitated students' internalization of genre conventions and improved their writing performance in terms of coherence and lexical sophistication (Jafary, Amani & Benoit, 2023; Liu & Chen, 2023; Wang, Zhang & Cooper, 2025).

To evaluate the impact of the treatment on students' essay writing performance, this study employed a quantitative analysis approach. The primary data consisted of students' pre-test and post-test scores, which were obtained through structured essay writing tasks based on IELTS Writing Task 2 prompts. These essays were assessed using the official IELTS Writing Band Descriptors, encompassing four key criteria: Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy style (British Council, 2025). Each criterion was scored on a scale from 1 to 9 in 0.5 increments.

The analysis was carried out using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize students' performance before and after the treatment. Statistical measurements, including the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum scores, are used to determine students' achievement before and after he test. To determine whether the observed differences between the pre-test and post-test scores were statistically significant, a paired sample t-test was conducted using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). This test is appropriate for pre-experimental designs involving one group measured at two different points in time (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). The paired t-test was applied to the overall writing scores as well as to each sub-component of the IELT rubric. A significance level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) was adopted to determine statistical significance.

In addition to numerical scores, qualitative aspects of students' written texts were also examined to complement the quantitative findings. Students' drafts were compared across pre-test and post-test stages to identify visible improvements in organization, vocabulary use, and argument development. These observations supported the interpretation of the statistical outcomes and provided deeper insight into the learning process triggered by the treatment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study aimed to investigate the effect of using IELTS Writing Task 2 as a model to enhance students' essay writin skills. A total of 20 students participated in both the pre-test and post-test writing ass ssments. Their essays were rated using the four IELTS Writing Task 2 band descriptors: Task Response (TR), Coherence and Cohesion (CC), Lexical Resource (LR), and Grammatical Range and Accura y (GRA). The results revealed an overall improvement in students' writing performance after the treatment.

Table 1. *Pre-test and post-test scores of respondents*

No.	Respondent	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score
1	MYI	4.0	4.5
2	MFR	4.5	5.0
3	NSH	5.5	6.0
4	RART	4.5	5.5
5	SAM	3.5	4.5
6	ZMA	4.0	4.5
7	SZ	3.5	4.0
8	NI	2.5	3.5
9	LS	3.5	4.0
10	ZV	2.5	3.5
11	PPT	2.5	3.5
12	NH	4.5	5.0
13	RHM	3.5	4.0
14	DWG	4.0	5.0
15	RH	4.5	5.5
16	MFM	4.5	5.5
17	SKR	4.5	5.5
18	MTQ	4.5	5.0
19	SDJ	4.0	5.0
20	ILK	4.0	4.5

In the pre-test, most students scored relatively low across all four aspects. The most significant weaknesses were found in Task Response and Lexical Resource. Many students struggled to fully understand the topic and struggled to develop the prompt, often presenting ideas that were underdeveloped, unsupported, or slightly off-topic. Additionally, their lexical usage was limited, marked by repetition and a lack of variety in word choice. Coherence, Cohesion, Grammatical Range, and Accuracy also showed moderate limitations. However, students appeared to have a slightly better grasp of paragraph structure and grammar rules compared to their ability to generate relevant content or express ideas with

varied vocabulary.

Students' performance on the post-test demonstrated significant gains after the writing sessions based on IELTS Task 2 prompts. In general, their works had a more specific focus and better-developed, presented, and coherent ideas. Additionally, there was evidence of better vocabulary use, with the students using more accurate and suitable word choices. Cohesion between paragraphs became smoother, and grammatical accuracy improved, though to a slightly lesser degree than vocabulary and content.

The average scores for each writing aspect before and after the intervention are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Average scores per IELTS writing criterion*

Writing Aspect	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean
Task Response (TR)	3.65	4.65
Coherence and Cohesion (CC)	4.50	5.35
Lexical Resource (LR)	3.60	4.60
Grammatical Range & Accuracy (GRA)	4.25	5.20

In the pre-test, most students scored relatively low across all four aspects. The most significant weaknesses were found in Task Response and Lexical Resource. Many students struggled to fully address the task, often presenting ideas that were underdeveloped, unsupported, or slightly off-topic. Additionally, their lexical usage was limited, marked by repetition and a lack of variety in word choice. Coherence, Cohesion, Grammatical Range, and Accuracy also showed moderate limitations. However, students appeared to have a slightly better grasp of paragraph structure and grammar rules compared to their ability to generate relevant content or express ideas with varied vocabulary.

The data show that Task Response improved from a mean of 3.65 to 4.65. This suggests that after practicing with IELTS-based prompts, students became more capable of addressing the task in a complete and relevant manner. Their arguments were clearer, and most students provided stronger supporting ideas than in the re-test. Similarly, Lexical Resource improved from 3.60 to 4.60, indicating better control over vocabulary use and a more effective expression of ideas. While the increase in Coherence and Cohesion from 4.50 to 5.35 may not be as dramatic, it reflects a substantial enhancement in students' ability to organize ideas logically and link them effectively across sentences and paragraphs. Grammatical Range and Accuracy also improved from 4.25 to 5.20, indicating that students were able to write more accurate sentences and use a broader range of structures.

Following the writing sessions based on IELTS Task 2 prompts, students' post-test performance showed noticeable improvement. Their essays were generally more focused, with ideas that were clearer, more developed, and better presented. There was also evidence of improved vocabulary use, with students applying more appropriate and precise word choices. Cohesion between paragraphs became smoother, and grammatical accuracy improved, though to a slightly lesser degree than vocabulary and content.

To determine whether these improvements were statistically significant, a paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the overall scores from the pre-test and post-test.

Overall score comparison

The results of the paired samples t-test showed a significant increase in students' writing scores after the treatment. The mean score for the pre-test was 3.95 (SD = 0.78), and the post-test mean rose to 4.70 (SD = 0.67). The difference was statistically significant with $p < 0.001$.

Table 3. *Paired samples statistics – overall score*

Test Phase	Mean Score	Std. Deviation	N
Pre-Test	3.95	0.78	20
Post-Test	4.70	0.67	20

Table 4. *Paired samples t-test – overall score*

	Mean Difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Post - Pre	0.75	-9.88	19	0.000

A follow-up paired samples t-test was also conducted on each writing aspect. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 5. *Paired samples t-test – per writing aspect*

Writing Aspect	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Task Response (TR)	-8.96	19	0.000
Coherence and Cohesion (CC)	-7.84	19	0.000
Lexical Resource (LR)	-8.67	19	0.000
Grammatical Range & Accuracy	-7.45	19	0.000

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://ieflj.uniku.ac.id/pub

Each aspect showed a statistically significant increase. The improvements in Task Response and Lexical Resource were especially prominent, reflecting the effectiveness of using IELTS writing prompts to help students develop both idea development and vocabulary control. The gains in Coherence, cohesion, and Grammar were also significant, though they built on a slightly higher baseline in the pre-test.

The results of this study indicate that using IELTS Writing Task 2 as a model for essay instruction leads to a statistically and pedagogically significant improvement in students' writing abilities. Students demonstrated measurable progress in all four writing aspects—Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy—following the intervention. The most marked improvements were in their ability to respond clearly and completely to writing prompts and in their use of vocabulary, which were initially the weakest areas.

The statistical tests confirmed that these gains were not due to chance, as all differences between pre-test and post-test scores were highly significant (*p* 0.001). Therefore, it can be concluded that integrating IELTS-based writing tasks into classroom instruction is an effective method for enhancing university students' academic essay writing performance.

The results of this study provide compelling evidence that the use of IELTS Writing Task 2 prompts as a writing model significantly enhances students' essay writing performance. After receiving the treatment, students demonstrated stronger text organization, more coherent arguments, better vocabulary choices, and more precise grammar. It reflects that the improvement was both statistically significant and pedagogically valuable. These results are consistent with earlier studies that highlight the importance of genre awareness and model-based education in the development of academic writing (Hyland, 2003).

The Task Response domain showed one of the most significant gains. The ability of a writer to meet the task requirements by providing relevant, well-developed ideas is referred to as task response. This is common with EFL learners who have not received genre-specific training; students frequently find it difficult to formulate strong points or effectively respond to the writing test prompt. After using IELTS Task 2 as a framework, students learned to understand better and meet the expectations of academic essay tasks. This outcome aligns with recent findings in genre-based writing research, which show that exposing learners to authentic, purpose-driven models significantly enhances their ability to internalize rhetorical structures and produce more coherent academic texts (Aljafen, 2025).

The results also showed another significant improvement in the area of lexical resources. Students' vocabulary choices in the pre-test were found to be generally repetitive, limited, and rather inadequate for academic writing, suggesting that students did not have a wide range of lexical repertoire. However, the post-test results revealed noticeable improvements in lexical variety, diction, and appropriateness. This progress resulted from frequent exposure to sample essays that provided students with continuous contact with high-quality academic language. Through this process, students were able to observe and assimilate a greater variety of language, including specialized terms, academic collocations, and transition markers. These findings align with recent research emphasizing that meaningful interaction with authentic texts and repeated exposure to academic vocabulary in context significantly enhances learners' lexical development (Zhang & Lu, 2025). Moreover, contemporary genre-based writing studies highlight that model texts serve as linguistic and cognitive scaffolding that help learners recognize and internalize appropriate lexical and rhetorical choices (Aljafen, 2025), reinforcing the value of genre-based approaches in academic writing instruction.

Improvements in Coherence and Cohesion reflect students' increasing awareness of how ideas are logically connected and signaled to the reader. In the post-test essays, students more consistently used discourse markers, appropriate paragraphing, and reference devices. This pattern of development aligns with recent research showing that effective use of cohesive devices and discourse features is a key indicator of writing quality in EFL academic contexts and contributes to readers' comprehension of the text (Agustini, Ramendra, & Adnyani, 2025; Tabari, 2023). It also demonstrates the benefits of explicit instruction in rhetorical organization and genre awareness, which help learners recognize and employ structural and lexical patterns that support coherent academic writing (Diep & Diep, 2024).

The improvements were statistically significant, even though Grammatical Range and Accuracy improved the least out of the four categories. This may be because, compared to areas such as content and vocabulary, grammatical

development typically progresses more slowly due to its complexity and the time required for internalization (Larsen-Freeman, 2022). Nonetheless, the observed improvement was likely facilitated by increased opportunities for output and consistent exposure to accurate grammatical input. Recent studies emphasize that comprehensible and well-structured input plays a crucial role in supporting grammatical development in L2 contexts, particularly when the input is slightly beyond learners' existing competence (Loewen & Sato, 2018). Additionally, output-oriented instruction encourages learners to notice gaps in their interlanguage and refine their grammatical forms through practice and feedback, a relationship supported by current empirical evidence in task-based and communicative language teaching research (Sun & Zhang, 2024).

The significant improvement across all four writing components reinforces the value of using model-based instruction, in this case, IELTS Writing Task 2, as an effective strategy in writing pedagogy for EFL learners. Unlike traditional methods that may focus on isolated grammar practice or general essay practice, model-based instruction provides learners with exposure to real-world tasks, guiding them through the proper structure of academic writing in English. The findings are consistent with recent research showing that genre-based and model-text-oriented instructional approaches significantly enhance EFL students' writing performance by fostering awareness of rhetorical structures, language features, and communicative purposes of academic genres (Abdel Latif, Alghizzi, & Alshahrani, 2024; Aljafen, 2025).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings suggest that integrating model essays in writing instruction using standardized tests like IELTS can bridge the gap between students' writing proficiency and the academic writing demands they are expected to meet. The model helps students become familiar with task formats and scaffolds their development in constructing logical arguments, using appropriate academic vocabulary, and writing with increased grammatical control.

Another possible factor in the students' progress is the authenticity and clarity of purpose provided by IELTS tasks. Recent research on task-based language teaching indicates that authentic, meaning-focused tasks that reflect real-world language use can significantly enhance learners' motivation, engagement, and willingness to communicate because learners perceive them as relevant and purposeful (Lee, 2025). When students understand the structure and communicative purpose of their writing, they are more likely to internalize the forms and functions required to perform effectively.

The limitations of research may include the following points: *Sample Size*: Limited number of participants may not accurately represent the broader student population, affecting the generalizability of the findings. *Duration of Study*: A short intervention period might not be sufficient to observe significant improvements in writing skills. *Participants' Background*: Variations in students' prior knowledge, language proficiency, and learning styles may affect their ability to adapt to the model essay approach. *Focus on IELTS Format*: The emphasis on IELTS Task 2 may lead students to develop skills that are too specific to this format, potentially limiting their overall writing abilities in other contexts. *Assessment Bias*: The criteria for evaluating essays may introduce subjectivity, influencing the perceived effectiveness of the model essay approach.

The continuation of research can take several directions: *Longitudinal Studies:* Conducting long-term studies to track the development of writing skills over time and assess the retention of skills learned through the model essay approach. *Comparative Studies*: Comparing the effectiveness of the IELTS model essay approach with other writing instruction methods to identify best practices and optimal strategies for improving essay writing. *Integration of Technology*: Exploring the use of digital tools and platforms that support collaborative learning, feedback, and self-assessment to enhance the writing process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this research. My deepest appreciation goes to Prof. Dr. Abdu Mas'ud, M.Pd and MS. Wang Xiaoqian for their guidance, valuable insights, and continuous support throughout the research process. I am also thankful to my colleagues and peers for their encouragement and constructive feedback.

Special thanks to FKIP Universitas Khairun for providing the necessary resources and funding. I am grateful to my family and friends for their unwavering support and motivation.

This research would not have been possible without the collective efforts of everyone

involved. Thank you all for your encouragement and assistance.

.

REFERENCES

Agustini, M. A. D., Ramendra, D. P., & Adnyani, L. P. S. (2025). Analysis of coherence and cohesion in paragraphs writing of EFL students. *Journal of Educational Study*, *5*(1), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.36663/joes.v5i1.966

Aitken, A., & Graham, S. (2023). Perceptions of choice in writing of university students. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(2), 225–332. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.02.03

Aljafen, B. S. (2025). The impact of genre-based instruction on the academic writing of EFL students. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i10.10943

Almumen, H. A., & Jouhar, M. R. (2025). The impact of ChatGPT as a brainstorming tool on gifted students' persuasive writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(2), 181–207. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.02.01

Alston, C. L., Marshall, S. A., & Sassi, K. (2021). Teaching models of disciplinary argumentation in middle school social studies: A framework for supporting writing development. *Journal of Writing Research*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2021.13.02.01

Beiler, I. R., & Marti, K. T. (2025). 'A quest gone too far': Rhetorical citizenship in secondary students' L2 English writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101262

Boillos, M. M., & Idoiaga, N. (2025). Student perspectives on the use of AI-based language tools in academic writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(1), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.01.06

Bouwer, R., Lesterhuis, M., De Smedt, F., Van Keer, H., & De Maeyer, S. (2023). Comparative approaches to the assessment of writing: Reliability and validity of benchmark rating and comparative judgement. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(3), 497–518. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.15.03.03

Campos Oaxaca, G. (2025). Examining reading and writing processes in a graduate level multiple text task: A think-aloud study. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(2), 247–285. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.02.03

Cao, S., Zhong, L., & Wang, C. (2025). *The impact of student writing assessment literacy on psychological factors: An ordinal logistic regression analysis*. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.00004

Carter, H., & Townsend, D. R. (2022). A rationale for integrating writing into secondary content area classrooms: Perspectives from teachers who experience the benefits of integrating writing frequently. *Journal of Writing Research*, *13*(3). https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2022.13.03.01

Conijn, R., Rossetti, A., Vandermeulen, N., & Van Waes, L. (2025). Phase to phase: Developing an automated procedure to identify and visualize phases in writing sessions using keystroke data. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(2), 339–369. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.02.06

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Crossley, S., Tian, Y., & Wan, Q. (2022). Argumentation features and essay quality: Exploring relationships and incidence counts. *Journal of Writing Research*, *14*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2022.14.01.01

Deng, L. (2021). Challenges and strategies for improving academic writing among university students. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *10*(3), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.2307/4575012

Diep, G. L., & Diep, L. T. N. (2024). Analysis of coherence and cohesion errors in academic writing of English majors. *International Journal of Linguistics and Literature Insights*, *2*(4), 15–29.

Enright, E. A., Toledo, W., & Wright, K. L. (2023). Advancing civics-specific disciplinary writing in the elementary grades. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(1), 41–71.
https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.01.03

Falardeau, E., Guay, F., Dubois, P., & Pelletier, D. (2024). Effects of teacher-implemented explicit writing instruction on the writing self-efficacy and writing performance of 5th grade students. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(1), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.16.01.01

Feltgen, Q., & Lefeuvre, F. (2025). Clitic subjects as landmarks in the writing production process: A study based on a keylog-derived corpus of writing bursts. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(3), 435–462. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.16.03.04

Gebril, A. (2024). Towards a reconciliatory approach to ungrading in writing classes: A response to Crusan. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *66*, Article 101151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101151

Haake, L. (2025). Does the relationship between executive functions and L2 writing depend on language proficiency? *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(1), 115–153. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.01.05

Hao, X., & colleagues (2025). A cross-linguistic perspective on the relationship between syntactic complexity and Chinese L2 writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101241.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101241

Helm, G., & Hesse, F. (2025). Training programmes on writing with AI – but for whom? Identifying students' writer profiles through two-step cluster analysis. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.01.01

Hosseini, S. B., & Hashemi, M. R. (2023). The impact of formative feedback on EFL learners' IELTS writing task performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *14*(1), 120–128. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1401.14

Hyland, K. (2022). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Ismail, A., Anwar, I. W., & Daud, A. (2025). Writing together, learning together: Boosting student skills through collaboration. *EFL Journal*, *11*(3), 753–764. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v11i3.70

Jafary, M., Amani, S. F., & Benoit, B. (2023). Enhancing writing proficiency: The role of model essays as corrective feedback tools in IELTS writing task achievement and coherence/cohesion. *English Language Teaching*, *16*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n11p1

Kashiha, H. (2025). From algorithms to annotations: Rethinking feedback practices in academic writing through AI-human comparison. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101254

Kruse, M. (2024). Problem-solving activity during the foreign language writing process: A proposal for categorisation and visualisation of source use and a new take on fluency in multilingual writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(1), 129–161. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.16.01.05

Kubota, R. (2025). Timely and timeless topic: Global Englishes in L2 writing pedagogy and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101252

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2022). Second language development: A complex, dynamic process. *The Modern Language Journal*, *106*(S1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12825

Latif, M. M. M. A., Abdel, T. M., & Alshahrani, T. M. (2024). The impact of genre-based instruction on Saudi university students' English writing performance and motivation: A mixed-method study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, Article 1387009. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1387009

Lee, I., & Mak, P. (2025). Global Englishes language teaching and second language writing: A disciplinary dialogue. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101257

Lee, J. (2023). Genre-based instruction in EFL writing classrooms: Insights and applications. *TESOL Quarterly*, *57*(1), 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3301

Lee, S. (2025). Motivation and engagement through task-based language teaching (TBLT): Pedagogical insights from Japanese education. *Global Journal of Educational Studies*, *11*(2), 33–50. https://doi.org/10.5296/gjes.v11i2.23130

Li, J. (2024). A measure of EFL argumentative writing cognitive load: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *63*, Article 101095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101095

Liu, C., Zhao, Y., & Zhang, J. (2024). Steering toward situational propensity/shi 势: A multicase study of planning and developing EFL writing centres in China. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *66*, Article 101158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101158

Liu, Y., & Chen, H. (2023). The effect of individualized feedback and model essay analysis on EFL learners' academic writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *8*, Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00151-5

Lu, Y., & Pan, X. (2024). Writing performance and discourse organization in L2 Chinese: A longitudinal case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *66*, Article 101150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101150

Marlina, R. (2025). Embracing Global Englishes approach to teaching multilingual writing via EIL-aware teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101244

McKinley, J. (2022). An argument for globalized L2 writing methodological innovation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *58*, Article 100945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100945

Meneses, A., Montenegro, M., Acevedo, D., Figueroa, J., & Hugo, E. (2023). Cross-disciplinary language changes in 4th graders as a predictor of the quality of written scientific explanation. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(1), 105–132. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.01.05

Mochizuki, Z. (2025). EFL undergraduate students' thinking and awareness in genre-based writing: Conceptualizing rhetorical moves and experimenting with linguistic knowledge. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101243

Mombaers, T., Van Gasse, R., & De Maeyer, S. (2024). Learning from comPA(I)Ring exemplars: Enhancing genre knowledge of argumentative texts. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(1), 163–193. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.16.01.06

Morales, C. P., & Brice, C. (2025). Selected bibliography of recent scholarship in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101266

Morgan, S., & Speed, T. (2025). *A guide to IELTS writing task 2*. https://www.ieltstutors.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/IELTS-Writing-Task-2-eBook.pdf

Morris, W., Crossley, S., Holmes, L., & Choi, J. (2025). Distinguishing effective writing styles in the PERSUADE corpus. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(2), 209–245. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.02.02

Nasiri, M., & Amini, D. (2024). Enhancing academic writing through AI-powered feedback: Evidence from IELTS preparation classrooms. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.XXXXX

Nguyen, L. Q., & Le, H. V. (2022). Enhancing learners' lexical resources in IELTS Task 2 writing: The role of noticing hypothesis, model essays, and productive vocabulary knowledge. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, *6*(5), 13320–13330. https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/13320

Noviantoro, N., Muslim, A. B., & Wirza, Y. (2025). How do Indonesian in-service EFL teachers define writing practice and writing instruction: A micro-ecological perspective. *EFL Journal*, *11*(3), 741–752. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v11i3.56

Pander Maat, H., De Glopper, K., Raaijmakers, K., Veerbeek, J., & Vermeulen, D. (2023). Fleshing out your text: How elaboration and contextualization moves differentially predict writing quality. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(2), 363–393. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.02.05

Rast, M. (2023). *Writing for the biggest customer in the world: Efficiencies and inefficiencies in proposal writing* [Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University]. ASU Keep. https://keep.lib.asu.edu/items/187428

Routarinne, S., Juvonen, R., & Pentikäinen, J. (2023). Developing writing across and in school subjects: Introduction to special issue. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.01.01

Sales, H. E. (2002). *Engineering texts: A study of a community of aerospace engineers, their writing practices, and technical proposals* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham]. University of Birmingham E-theses Repository. https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/241/

Salo, A. E., Routarinne, S., Juvonen, R., & Kaasinen, A. (2023). Participatory roles adopted by elementary students when writing collaboratively in environmental and social studies classrooms. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(1), 73–103. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.01.04

Seloni, L. (2025). Towards a raciolinguistically informed GELT paradigm in teaching multilingual writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101258

Shu, J., Wang, G., & Xu, C. (2024). An exploration of CFL learners' metaphor use in second language writing: Effects of genre and topic. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *66*, Article 101162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101162

Sun, P., & Zhang, R. (2024). The role of pushed output and feedback in improving EFL learners' grammatical accuracy. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *14*(2), 311–334. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2024.14.2.6

Tabari, M. A. (2023). Exploring new insights into the role of cohesive devices in written academic genres. *Assessing Writing*, *57*, Article 100749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100749

Tabari, M. A., Zhuang, J., & Farahanynia, M. (2025). Task repetition and L2 written performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101255

Tarchi, C., & Casado-Ledesma, L. (2024). Readers' awareness in the use of intertextual strategies when reading multiple texts. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(2), 300–320. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.16.02.04

Tian, Y., Crossley, S., & Van Waes, L. (2025). The KLiCKe corpus: Keystroke logging in compositions for knowledge evaluation. *Journal of Writing Research*, *17*(1), 23–60. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.17.01.02

Tian, Y., Kim, M., & Crossley, S. (2024). Making sense of L2 written argumentation with keystroke logging. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(3), 435–461. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.15.03.01

Tikupasang, O., Hardiyanti, S., & Arman, A. (2022). EFL students' difficulties with the IELTS writing task 2. *AMCA Journal of Education and Behavioral Change*, *2*(1), 28–31. https://doi.org/10.51773/ajeb.v2i1.141

Törmälä, V., & Kulju, P. (2023). Work descriptions written by third-graders: An aspect of disciplinary literacy in primary craft education. *Journal of Writing Research*, *15*(1), 15–40. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.01.02

Ulasik, M. A., Mahlow, C., & Piotrowski, M. (2025). Sentence-centric modeling of the writing
process. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(3), 463–498. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.16.03.05

Van den Bergh, D., Vandermeulen, N., Lesterhuis, M., De Maeyer, S., Van Steendam, E., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Van den Bergh, H. (2023). How prior information from national assessments can be used when designing experimental studies without a control group. *Journal of Writing*

Research, *14*(3), 447–469. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.14.03.05

Vasylets, O., & Marín, J. (2025). Linguistic and behavioral alignment in writing: A scoping review. *Journal of Writing Research*, *16*(3), 377–406. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2025.16.03.02

Wang, K., Zhang, L. J., & Cooper, M. (2025). Taking stock of metacognitive strategies and collaborative writing for EFL learners' writing development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *68*, Article 101211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101211

Wang, Y., & Zhang, L. (2022). Challenges and strategies in academic writing: A case study. *Language and Learning Journal*, *28*(2), 112–130.

Yahia, I., & Egbert, J. L. (2023). Supporting non-native-English speaking graduate students with academic writing skills: A case study of the explicit instructional use of paraphrasing guidelines. *Journal of Writing Research*, *14*(3), 305–341. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.14.03.01

Yang, K., Raković, M., Liang, Z., Yan, L., Zeng, Z., Fan, Y., Gašević, D., & Chen, G. (2024). *Modifying AI, enhancing essays: How active engagement with generative AI boosts writing quality*. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.07200

Ye, L., Chang, Y., Zhang, R., & Zhou, S. (2024). Exploring the relationship between reading-writing connections and L2 writing quality in integrated tasks. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*, Article 545. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03046-y

Yin, Y., Parpala, A., & Toom, A. (2023). The relationship between international higher education students' writing conceptions and approaches to learning. *Journal of Writing Research*, *14*(3), 421–446. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.14.03.04

Zhang, L., & Lu, X. (2025). Vocabulary development through extensive reading and writing feedback in EFL contexts. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *71*, Article 101256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101256

Zhu, Z., & Xiong, W. (2025). Syntactic complexity and L2 Chinese proficiency: An analysis of Malaysian CSL learners' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *70*, Article 101242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101242