MODEL TEXTS AS A FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT IN EXPOSITORY WRITING: EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VIETNAMESE EFL LEARNERS' AFFECTIVE ENGAGEMENT AND THEIR WRITING PERFORMANCE

Nguyen Long Quoc[1,2]

[1]University of Foreign Languages and International Studies, Hue University,

57 Nguyen Khoa Chiem Str, Hue, Vietnam

[2] FPT University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

* Correspondence to **Nguyen Long Quoc** < nlquoc.dhnn23@hueuni.edu.vn>

Abstract. As an alternative to written corrective feedback, model texts as a feedback instrument (MTFI) have been deployed to facilitate English as a foreign language (EFL) writing for almost two decades. However, past MTFI research mainly focused on narratives over a three-stage task including composing (stage one), comparing (stage two), and rewriting (stage three); expository writing still receives insufficient attention, especially in the Vietnamese context. Moreover, EFL learners' affective engagement with MTFI and its relationship with writing performance are largely underexplored. This study aimed to address these gaps by employing a quasi-experimental design with the participation of 68 Vietnamese EFL undergraduates who were assigned into a control group ($N = 33$) and a modeling group ($N = 35$). While the modeling group compared their original draft with a given model in stage two and completed a questionnaire in stage three, the control group did not. The results showed that the modeling group significantly outperformed the control group in the overall writing score. Additionally, Exploratory Factor Analysis and repeated measure correlations revealed that the learners' affective engagement with MTFI was generally positive, which was substantially associated with their overall writing performance. This study also entailed discussions on theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical implications that might be of great value to researchers and education stakeholders.

Keywords. model texts, expository writing, Vietnamese EFL learners, affective engagement, writing performance, relationship

1. Introduction

Defined as well-crafted compositions that correspond to learners' ages, proficiency levels of the target language, and educational backgrounds (Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015), model texts have been deployed as a feedback instrument in English as a foreign language (EFL) writing classrooms (Hanaoka, 2007; Kang, 2020, 2023) for the past two decades. This instructional approach encompasses three main stages: i) students compose a text based on a given topic and write down the issues they face, ii) students compare their draft with a provided model, and iii) students rewrite their text on the same topic. It is beneficial to EFL learners in many ways: enhancing metalinguistic awareness, promoting autonomous learning (Hanaoka, 2007), directing attention to both micro-level (e.g., lexis, grammar) and macro-level (i.e., content, organization) writing features (Kang, 2020, 2023), and improving writing performance (Tieu & Baker, 2022; Wu et al., 2023). Practically, model texts as a feedback instrument (MTFI) could lessen teachers' workload by reducing the need to provide written corrective feedback (WCF) (i.e., error corrections) (Hamano-Bunce, 2022).

Despite such affordances, studies on MTFI mainly focused on learners' noticing and incorporations of features in models (Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015; Hanaoka, 2007)or text quality (Kang, 2020; Wu et al., 2023). It seems that none, to date, has comprehensively delved into their affective engagement with this writing approach. It is essential to zero in on affective engagement because this aspect has been demonstrated to affect language learning (Fredricks et al., 2004). Previous research attempted to explore either learners' perceived usefulness of MTFI (Kang, 2020, 2023) or task motivation (Lázaro-Ibarrola & Villarreal, 2021; Roothooft et al., 2022). However, these dimensions, when examined separately, only partially reflect affective engagement with feedback which is conceptualized as learners' willingness, emotions, and perceived usefulness towards the writing task (Fan & Xu, 2020). Moreover, most MTFI studies on motivation employed narratives; scholarship on expository writing, an important genre in higher education (Yang et al., 2023), is still scarce, especially in the Vietnamese context. Additionally, the correlation between EFL learners' affective engagement with MTFI and their writing performance is still under-researched. Thus, further explorations are highly warranted to address these gaps.

2. Literature review

2.1. Expository writing

Exposition, a form of writing, necessitates the writer to present ideas, arguments and evidence regarding different facets of a problem (Yang et al., 2023). This type of writing

encompasses various sub-genres such as causes, solutions, (Ludine & McCauley, 2016), and argumentation (Beers & Nagy, 2011). In EFL contexts, particularly in tertiary education as students advance academically, expository writing holds significant importance (Yang et al., 2023). It demands language learners to produce linguistic elements of greater complexity than narratives (Ludine & McCauley, 2016), serving as a crucial means for them to put their knowledge into practice (Nippold, 2016). Nonetheless, there has been insufficient focus on this genre of writing (Yang et al., 2023), especially in MTFI tasks.

2.2.   *Theoretical support for MTFI*

The employment of MTFI is mainly framed within the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985), which entails three functions: noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic processing. These functions align accordingly with the three stages of MTFI and are reinforced by the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 2001)and the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985). In stage one, learners compose a text (output) and think about the problems they encounter (noticing). In stage two, they read and compare given models with their draft, from which they look for possible solutions to the previous issues or for new features (noticing). They use models as feedback or comprehensible input, which is necessary for learning to occur (Krashen, 1985), and evaluate whether the input is appropriate (hypothesis testing). In stage three, learners try to recall their noticing (metalinguistic processing) and incorporate the noticed features or solutions in models into their rewritten text, which may lead to learning uptake or gains. Indeed, the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 2001) argued that more noticing would promote more learning.

2.3.   *Learners' affective engagement with MTFI*

Affective engagement is referred to as learners' attitude to feedback (Ellis, 2010), which can be captured via three sub-constructs: *affect, value, and interest*. Fan and Xu (2020) considered students' emotions when receiving and reading feedback as *affect*, the usefulness of feedback as *value*, and willingness in the participation with feedback as *interest.*

2.3.1.   *The affect dimension*

In 2007, Hanaoka attempted to explore the *affect* dimension of affective engagement in an MTFI study. The author asked 37 Japanese EFL learners at a university to rate on a scale of 1.0 (not at all) to 5.0 (very much) to indicate how eager they were when reading two models. 'It was found that the students perceived the model texts positively. However, García Mayo and Loibi Labandibar (2017) reported an opposite finding in a study with Spanish EFL young learners. After exposure to two model texts, the motivation of 40 participants was found to be negative, largely due to the fact that they found the models to be difficult to understand.

The two studies above only measured EFL learners' emotions via a one-shot scale. Lázaro-Ibarrola and Villarreal (2021) attempted to gauge learners' motivation multiple times across the three stages of MTFI. Dividing 24 Spanish EFL learners (aged 10-11) into two groups: modeling group (six pairs) and task-repetition group (six pairs) and adopting a three-stage task, the authors aimed to explore the learners' motivation in both task conditions. While the modeling group received two models for comparison in stage two, the task-repetition group only rewrote their narrative draft. Motivation thermometers (i.e., a single 10-scale item representing learners' level of motivation with 1.0 being the lowest and 10.0 being the highest, accompanied by a list of reasons for students to choose from) were administered before and after the main task in the first two stages. The results showed that motivation was generally high in both groups; moreover, while motivation remained quite the same in the task-repetition group, it dropped in the modeling group. These findings were supported by Roothooft et al. (2022) who also reported that EFL learners' motivation after model-text exposure declined slightly (7.60 to 6.50, out of 10.0). The reason could be attributed to the learners' belief that they were expected to write something as good as the models (Lázaro-Ibarrola & Villarreal, 2021).

In general, previous MTFI research reported mixed findings about EFL learners' feelings and emotions. Furthermore, these studies focused solely on narrative writing; the *affect* dimension in expository writing is not discovered yet. Therefore, more scholarship should be performed to shed light on these issues.

2.3.2. *The value dimension*

A small number of expository MTFI studies have attempted to explore this dimension of the affective engagement. For example, Kang (2020) probed into how 20 Korean EFL learners (Grade 11) perceived the usefulness of two argumentative essays. The author asked the participants to rate the models on a scale from 1.0 (not useful at all) to 5.0 (very useful). The results indicated that the learners found MTFI quite useful for enhancing their writing (M = 3.70, SD = .97). Three years later, Kang (2023) conducted a similar study, yet with the participation of 33 Korean EFL undergraduates. He reported that over 78% of the learners agreed that the models helped them improve their draft. These findings were supported by Nguyen and Le's (2022) research. The authors interviewed about 18% of 27 Vietnamese participants who were exposed to two argumentative essays. It was found that all interviewees held a positive view towards the usefulness of these models.

Consequently, it can be inferred that expository MTFI was perceived as useful by EFL learners. However, since scholarship on this aspect is still very limited, further research needs to be conducted to provide insights into how EFL learners value MTFI.

2.3.4.   The interest dimension

Prior research on MTFI primarily concentrated on the *value* and *affect* aspects of affective engagement. The *interest* dimension, which is regarded as learners' willingness in participating in the feedback activity (Fan & Xu, 2020), has not been sufficiently addressed yet. In other words, whether students are willing in the MTFI task or not still remains largely unanswered, which warrants further investigations.

2.4.   The effect of MTFI on learners' expository writing performance

Research on MTFI and learners' overall score performance regarding expository writing is relatively limited. Kang (2020) attempted to explore this dimension in a study with 40 Korean EFL learners (Grade 11) divided into a control group ($N = 20$, self-editing texts) and a modeling group ($N = 20$, comparing own texts with two argumentative models). The results showed that the modeling group significantly outperformed the control group in the overall writing. In a similar study, Kang (2023) also reported a substantial improvement in 33 Korean EFL undergraduates' argumentative essays, though with a small effect size. One common limitation in these two studies is that the participants had already discussed ideas related to the given topic prior to the composing stage, which might have influenced the obtained outcomes.

In Vietnam, Tieu and Baker (2022) also found considerable improvements in argumentative essays written by 19 Vietnamese undergraduates after a three-stage MTFI task. However, the posttest was organized three months after the pretest due to the Covid-19 pandemic. During that time, the learners might have been exposed to other kinds of input or techniques, which cast doubt on the reliability of the outcomes. Also conducting a quasi-experimental study in Vietnam, Nguyen and Le (2022) reported that MTFI considerably improved 25 Vietnamese EFL learners' overall writing scores. In a more recent study in China, Wu et al. (2023) examined the impact of MTFI on 40 EFL undergraduates. After being exposed to two argumentative models, the students considerably improved their writing performance. However, the magnitude of these significant outcomes was not clear as effect sizes were not reported.

2.5.   The relationship between learners' affective engagement and their writing performance

In second language (EFL) research, affective engagement can be a good predictor of academic performance (Fredricks et al., 2004). This relationship in the MTFI scholarship, nevertheless, is still scarce. To date, only one study attempted to explore the correlation between learners' perceived usefulness of MTFI and their writing scores. Kang (2023) employed a five-point Likert scale questionnaire to capture 33 Korean EFL undergraduates' attitudes towards MTFI. The relationship between the learners' attitudes and their overall writing

performance was measured using Pearson coefficient values, which showed a significant correlation (r = .54). However, perceived usefulness is only a part of affective engagement; the whole concept of this engagement type is not discovered yet. Additionally, the questionnaire used in Kang (2023) was not validated via statistical analyses yet, which might cast doubt on the obtained outcomes.

Taken together, it can be indicated that MTFI had the potential to enhance EFL learners' writing performance. However, their affective engagement with MTFI and its relationship with the overall writing, especially regarding expository compositions in the Vietnamese context, are still underexplored, which warrants further research.

3.   The present study

The literature has underscored several important gaps in previous MTFI research. The present study aimed to offset these limitations by examining the extent to which Vietnamese EFL learners engage emotionally with MTFI and measuring the correlation between their affective engagement and writing performance. Thus, three research questions were addressed:

1. To what extent do Vietnamese EFL learners engage emotionally with MTFI?

2. To what extent does MTFI impact the learners' overall writing performance?

3. What is the relationship between the learners' affective engagement and their overall writing performance?

4.   Methodology

4.1.   *Context and participants*

The participants in this study were 68 EFL learners at a private college in Vietnam. They were 54 males and 14 females, from 18 to 23 years old, from two intact EFL classes instructed by the same teacher. The aim of the course was to help the students achieve the target English level required for their chosen disciplinary specializations, which was B2 (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). In this course, the students also learned how to write an expository paragraph.

The general proficiency level of the students in two classes was similar (generally B1), as indicated by the Quick Oxford Placement Test (UCLES, 2001), which contained 60 questions related to vocabulary and grammar. This test was chosen as it was a standardized test, the outcomes of which could be good indicators of EFL learners' proficiency levels (Vasylets & Marín, 2021). Thus, the classes were randomly divided into a control group (N = 33) and a

10

modeling group (N = 35). All participants joined the research on a voluntary basis and agreed to sign a consent form.

4.2.   Research design and materials

This study was conducted following a quasi-experimental design with a pretest and a posttest over a three-stage task. Both groups attended the first (pretest) and third (posttest) stages. The disparity between the two groups lied in the second stage; that is, while the modeling group were given a model as comprehensible input with which they compared their writing, the control group did not join this stage.

The research materials included a writing prompt, a model text and a questionnaire. The prompt, adopted from Nguyen et al. (2024), required the participants to compose a paragraph (around 120 words in 25 minutes) to suggest solutions to the problem of littering in urban areas, which followed the course' syllabus. As for the model text (see Appendix), it was also adopted from Nguyen et al. (2024) and reviewed by two other experienced Vietnamese EFL teachers, owning a master's degree in English Language Teaching, to confirm its appropriateness for the target learners. One model was administered instead of two because it could lessen the students' cognitive burden, address classroom time constraints, and help them stay more focused on the given task (Nguyen et al., 2024). Regarding the questionnaire, it consisted of 12 items using five-point Likert scale (from 1, *strongly disagree*, to 5, *strongly agree*), about three sub-constructs of affective engagement with feedback: *interest, affect* and *value*. The first two were adjusted from Fan and Xu (2020), and the third one was based on Kang (2023); the wording was adopted from Nguyen and Vu (2024). The questionnaire was reviewed by the second researcher and piloted on 10 students with a similar profile to the target learners; the language used in the questionnaire was modified following their feedback to assure its appropriateness and accuracy. The data, however, revealed that there were only two main sub-constructs, with the *interest (willingness)* and *affect* loading on one factor (items 1-7) and *value* on the other (items 8-12) (see section 4.4).

4.3.   Procedure

The study was conducted over a four-week period, with the first one spent on research announcement, the Quick Oxford Placement Test, paragraph consolidation, and biographical data collection. In week two, the students were asked to write a paragraph on the given topic, serving as a pretest. In week three, only the modeling group were provided a model with which they compared their original draft (noting down any similarities, differences and anything they considered useful in a sheet, either in English or Vietnamese). In the last week, both groups rewrote their paragraph on the same topic (posttest) without any prior notice. During the

paper-based tests, all participants were not allowed to have access to any other support. Following this, the modeling group completed the questionnaire in a Google Form format, which took them about 10 minutes. At the end of each session, the materials were collected by the class teacher.

4.4.   Data coding and analysis

The data consisted of 136 written paragraphs and 35 questionnaires. The texts were graded based on a scoring rubric which was adopted from Nguyen et al. (2024). The rubric encompassed four criteria: content, vocabulary, grammar, and organization, each ranging from 0 to 5.0 points. The researcher, along with a trained research assistant holding a master's degree in Applied Linguistics, collaboratively scored three paragraphs r before coding 24 (18%) additional texts independently. The agreement proportion between the two coders was 83.3%, which was considered highly acceptable (McHugh, 2012). The coders discussed and resolved all rating differences before the researcher continued to grade the rest of the texts. Concerning the questionnaire, the researcher downloaded the response spreadsheets from Google Form and changed the scale labels (e.g., strongly disagree) to numbers (e.g., 1) accordingly.

The coded data were saved in an Excel spreadsheet before converted into SPSS version 27.0 for analysis. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed to investigate the underlying structure of the questionnaire. Pearson coefficients showed that the items were correlated and there was no serious multicollinearity (all r values < .80). Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of .805 and Bartlett's test of sphericity (p < .001) indicated that the EFA was appropriate (Hair et al., 2019). Two factors were extracted (Eigenvalues > 1.0, factor loadings > .50), explaining 63.30% of the total variance (Hair et al., 2019): factor one (*affect* and *interest*, items 1-7) and factor two (*value*, items 8-12). Therefore, factor one was renamed as *willingness* and *affect* and factor two as *value* (see Tables 1 and 2). Cronbach's value for factor one (α = .924, N = 7) and two (α = .77, N = 5) with total correlations > .30, demonstrated that the questionnaire was reliable with good internal consistency (Pallant, 2020). To answer the first question about affective engagement, descriptive analysis such as Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) were used. As for the second question about the writing performance, the overall score (the average of all four criteria) was used, which was further examined by both descriptive and inferential analyses. Particularly, as the writing scores were not normally distributed (Shapiro Wilk tests, p values < .05), Median (Mdn) and Range were reported. Furthermore, Mann-Whitney U tests were employed to compare the scores between the two groups over the two testing times. The affective engagement score for each participant was calculated by adding the points from all 12 items, with each item worth 5.0 points, yielding a total score range of 12 to 60. The correlations

were captured in R environment version 4.2.3 using the *rmcorr* package (Bakdash & Marusich, 2017) for repeated measure correlations (*r*).

5.   Results

This section presents the results of the data analysis in response to the three research questions. It begins by outlining how Vietnamese EFL learners emotionally engaged with MTFI, followed by findings on the effectiveness of this instructional approach in enhancing learners' writing performance. Finally, it showcases the interplay between affective engagement and text quality.

5.1 Vietnamese EFL learners' affective engagement with MTFI

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the *affect* and *willingness* construct

(Fan & Xu, 2020; Nguyen & Vu, 2024)

Statement	M	SD	Loading
1. I was willing to participate in the writing task using the model text.	3.94	1.11	.69
2. I was willing to read the model text.	4.29	1.02	.74
3. I was willing to compare my draft with the model text.	4.23	.97	.76
4. I was willing to rewrite my draft after comparing it with the model text.	4.17	.92	.83
5. I felt excited when reading the model text.	3.83	.95	.85
6. I felt excited when comparing my draft with the model text.	3.80	.93	.83
7. I felt excited in rewriting my draft after comparing it with the model text.	3.71	1.05	.77
General	4.00	.83	

Table 1 shows that the modeling group were willing to participate in the MTFI task (*M* = 3.94, *SD* = .11). They were also willing and excited to read the model text (*M = 4.29* and *M = 3.83*, respectively), compare their draft with the model (*M* = 4.23 and *M* = 3.80, respectively), and

rewrite their draft (*M* = 4.17 and *M* = 3.71, respectively). Therefore, it could be inferred that their emotions and willingness were positive during this writing task (General *M* = 4.0, *SD* = .83).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the *value* construct (Kang, 2023; Nguyen & Vu, 2024)

Statement	M	SD	Loading
8. Model texts were useful to improve my draft in general.	4.31	.76	.75
9. Model texts were useful to improve my draft's vocabulary.	4.14	.81	.81
10. Model texts were useful to improve my draft's organization.	4.06	.84	.65
11. Model texts were useful to improve my draft's grammatical accuracy.	3.51	.92	.70
12. Model texts were useful to improve my draft's content/ideas.	3.89	.99	.52
General	3.98	.63	

Turning to Table 2, the modeling group believed that MTFI helped them enhance their overall paragraph writing (*M* = 4.31, *SD* = .76). Particularly, vocabulary was reported to be the highest contributor to the score improvement (*M* = 4.14, *SD* = .81), followed by organization (*M* = 4.06, *SD* = .84), content/ideas (*M* = 3.89, *SD* = .99), and grammar (*M* = 3.51, *SD* = .92). These results indicated that the participants perceived the expository model as a useful feedback tool.

Overall, it could be concluded that the learners' affective engagement with MTFI was generally positive.

5.2. The impact of MTFI on Vietnamese EFL learners' overall writing performance

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for the overall writing performance by two groups

Test	Control Group (*N* = 33)		Modeling Group (*N* = 35)	
	Mdn	**Range**	**Mdn**	**Range**
Pretest	2.13	2.00	2.38	1.75
Posttest	2.25	1.88	2.75	2.25

Note: The minimum and maximum scores were 0 and 5.0, respectively.

14

Table 3 demonstrates that both groups' scores were quite low in the pretest (*Mdn* < 2.50, the average point). However, they achieved better writing performance in the posttest. Further analysis using Mann-Whitney U tests revealed that although their pretest scores were similar (Control Group *Mdn* = 2.13 and Modeling Group *Mdn* = 2.38; U = 566.5, p = .892), the modeling group significantly outperformed the control group in the posttest' overall scores (Control Group *Mdn* = 2.25 and Modeling Group *Mdn* = 2.75; U = 320, p = .002). The effect size, calculated based on Field (2018), was medium (r = .38) following the guideline by Plonsky and Oswald (2014). Thus, it can be indicated that MTFI could significantly improve learners' overall writing performance.

5.3.   The relationship between learners' affective engagement and writing performance

Table 4. The correlation between affective engagement and writing performance

	r	Degree of freedom	p	95% Confidence Interval
Affective engagement x writing performance	.62	16	.006	[.22, .84]

As depicted in Table 4, there was a significant correlation between the learners' affective engagement and their overall writing performance (*r* = .62, *p* = .006). Therefore, it can be indicated that how MTFI was perceived was considerably related to their overall writing performance.

6.   Discussion

The present study's goal was to examine Vietnamese EFL learners' affective engagement with MTFI and their overall writing performance. It added insights into previous studies by tapping into expository writing, an important yet under-explored genre. Furthermore, it shed greater light on the extent to which the learners' affective engagement with MTFI could predict their writing scores.

6.1.   Vietnamese EFL learners' affective engagement with MTFI

One notable finding in the current study was that the participants perceived MTFI quite positively, either in terms of *willingness and interest* or *value*. This outcome was in contrast with García Mayo and Loidi Labandibar (2017) who found that their learners' task motivation was generally negative. One feasible explanation was that in the present study the model was comprehensible to the participants while the models in their study were deemed difficult for the learners to understand. Therefore, it could be indicated that model piloting before the intervention was pivotal, lending support to the need to consider "the content and the genre of the composition, as well as learners' age, proficiency level" (Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015, p. 65). However, the current research's findings aligned with other MTFI studies (Kang, 2020, 2023; Roothooft et al., 2022) which reported positive task motivation. Such positivity could be attributed to the argument that models were regarded as a reliable source of positive evidence or solutions that helped mitigate learners' writing problems (Kang, 2023). Moreover, models were also found to correspond to learners' internal syllabus (Qi & Lapkin, 2001), which might contribute to their acceptance of MTFI.

6.2.   Vietnamese EFL learners' overall writing performance via the MTFI task

Another important finding lay in the modeling group's writing performance over the three-stage writing task, which demonstrated a significant improvement. This result was in line with previous studies on expository MTFI (Kang, 2020, 2023; Tieu & Baker, 2022; Wu e al., 2023). However, only Kang (2023) reported an effect size, which was small for the significant outcome. In the current study, the magnitude of the effect was medium (*r* = .38), indicating a stronger significance when compared to Kang (2023). The considerable gain in the learners' writing scores can be explained in light of the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985), the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 2001), and the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985). Indeed, when reading the model as a source of comprehensible input, which was a premise for learning (Krashen, 1985), the students noticed features that could solve their previously encountered problems (first output) in stage one or those that helped them advance their writing. Such noticing was believed to lead to learning gains (Swain, 1985; Schmidt, 1990, 2001), which were the incorporated features in the model into the rewritten text (second output) in stage three. For example, a closer look into the paragraphs in the current study showed that the participants chose to include the idea about littering fines in Singapore in the model into their rewritten text because they did not provide any examples in their first version, which led to the enhancement of their writing.

6.3.   The correlation between the learners' affective engagement and writing performance

A noteworthy point was that how learners perceived MTFI was closely linked to their writing scores. The results from repeated measure correlations (*r* =.62, *p* =.006) revealed that the positive affective engagement was significantly correlated with better writing. This finding corroborated Kang's (2023) study which also reported a close relationship between the participants' perceived usefulness of MTFI and their overall writing (*r* = .54). Such an outcome could be expected because in EFL research, affective engagement was shown to be a good predictor of academic improvements (Fredricks et al., 2004). In the MTFI task, learners chose to incorporate the features in model texts into their rewritten drafts because they found them helpful for their writing (Kang, 2023). Similarly, the study by García Mayo and Loidi Labandibar (2017) reported that more motivated students noticed and incorporated more features from models. Nonetheless, given the scarcity of research on this aspect, further explorations are needed.

7.   Conclusion, limitations, and implications

This study explored how Vietnamese EFL learners emotionally engaged with MTFI and examined the relationship between this engagement and their overall writing performance. Analysis of questionnaires and written texts revealed that learners held a positive perception of MTFI, particularly in terms of their willingness, emotional responses, and perceived usefulness of the model. Moreover, a strong correlation was found between their affective engagement and writing scores, indicating that learners with higher affective engagement tended to produce higher-quality expository paragraphs. These findings could be promising, providing us with empirical evidence for the adoption of expository MTFI in EFL writing classrooms. If model texts are appropriately composed for the target learners, they could lessen the need to provide WCF, particularly error corrections, which gives teachers more time to facilitate their students' learning.

There are three limitations that should be noted when interpreting the obtained results. First, the current research only addressed short expository paragraphs with the use of one model; whether the adoption of longer ones such as argumentative essays and two models would generate similar outcomes warrants further research. Second, it mainly investigated affective engagement and its relationship with overall writing performance. The other dimensions of engagement (cognitive and behavioral engagement) are still undiscovered. Finally, writing performance was gauged via a scoring rubric; whether the adoption of other measures such as complexity, accuracy, and fluency would yield similar or different findings remains underexplored. These can be avenues for future research to examine MTFI even further.

The present study encompasses salient implications. Theoretically, it contributes to the better understanding of MTFI, especially learners' affective engagement and their writing performance. Methodologically, it appeared to be the first to validate a questionnaire on the affective engagement with MTFI, which resulted in two key factors (*willingness and affect*, *value*), not three different sub-constructs as in (Fan & Xu, 2020). Future research on MTFI can utilize this instrument for the measurement of learners' affective engagement. Pedagogically, teachers are recommended to implement this instructional approach in their writing classrooms as an alternative to WCF because it could lead to learning gains. Moreover, learners' affective engagement should be carefully observed and enhanced as it is closely linked to their writing scores.

References

1. Bakdash, J. Z., & Marusich, L. R. (2017). Repeated measures correlation. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 456.

2. Beers, S. F., & Nagy, W. E. (2011). Writing development in four genres from grades three to seven: Syntactic complexity and genre differentiation. *Reading and Writing, 24*(2), 183–202.

3. Cánovas Guirao, J., Roca de Larios, J., & Coyle, Y. (2015). The use of models as a written feedback technique with young EFL learners. *System*, *52*, 63-77.

4. Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *32*(2), 335-349.

5. Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *50*, 100775.

6. Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.

7. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59–109.

8. García Mayo, M. P., & Loidi Labandibar, U. (2017). The use of models as written corrective feedback in English as a foreign language (EFL) writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *37*, 110-127.

9. Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European business review*, *31*(1), 2-24.

10. Hamano-Bunce, D. (2022). The effects of direct written corrective feedback and comparator texts on the complexity and accuracy of revisions and new pieces of writing. *Language Teaching Research.* Advance online publication.

11. Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Language Teaching Research*, *11*(4), 459–479.

12. Kang, E. Y. (2020). Using model texts as a form of feedback in L2 writing. *System*, *89*, 102196.

13. Kang, E. Y. (2023). EFL learners' perceptions and their association with the effectiveness of model texts as a feedback tool. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1-12.

14. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.

15. Lázaro-Ibarrola, A., & Villarreal, I. (2021). Are EFL writers motivated or demotivated by model texts and task repetition? Evidence from young collaborative writers. *International Journal of English Studies*, *21*(2), 29-55.

16. Lundine, J. P., & McCauley, R. J. (2016). A Tutorial on Expository Discourse: Structure, Development, and Disorders in Children and Adolescents. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 25*(3), 306.

17. McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, *22*(3), 276-282.

18. Nguyen, L. Q., & Le, H. V. (2022). Improving L2 learners' IELTS task 2 writing: the role of model essays and noticing hypothesis. *Language Testing in Asia, 12*(58), 1-20.

19. Nguyen, L. Q., & Van Vu, D. (2024). Exploring EFL learners' engagement and draft quality in a multi-stage expository writing task using model texts as a feedback facilitator: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *66*, 101161.

20. Nguyen, L. Q., Nguyen, B. T. T., & Phuong, H. Y. (2024b). Exploring the use of model texts as a feedback instrument in expository writing: EFL learners' noticing, incorporations, and text quality. *Assessing Writing*, *62*, 100890.

21. Nippold, M. A. (2016). *Later language development: School-age children, adolescents, and young adults*. PRO-ED, Inc.

22. Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. McGraw-hill education.

23. Plonsky, L., & Oswald, F. L. (2014). How big is "big"? Interpreting effect sizes in L2 research. *Language Learning, 64*, 878–912.

24. Qi, D. S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(4), 277–303.

25. Roothooft, H., Lázaro-Ibarrola, A., & Bulté, B. (2022). Task repetition and corrective feedback via models and direct corrections among young EFL writers: Draft quality and task motivation. *Language Teaching Research.* Advance online publication.

26. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

27. Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press.

28. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*, 165–179.

29. Tieu, L., & Baker, J. R. (2022). Using model essays in conjunction with noticing as a feedback instrument in IELTS writing preparation. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–13.

30. UCLES. (2001). *Oxford quick placement test*. Oxford University Press.

31. Vasylets, O., & Marín, J. (2021). The effects of working memory and L2 proficiency on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *52*, 100786.

32. Wu, Z., Qie, J., & Wang, X. (2023). Using model texts as a type of feedback in EFL writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14:1156553.

33. Yang, Y., Yap, N. T., & Ali, A. M. (2023). Predicting EFL expository writing quality with measures of lexical richness. *Assessing Writing*, *57*, 100762.

Appendix

(The model text, adopted from Nguyen et al., 2024)

To address the problem of littering in urban areas, a number of measures can be taken. First, it is important to raise public awareness of this issue through social media and educational campaigns. By informing people of the negative effects of littering, the government can

encourage the public to avoid such behavior. Second, more severe punishments should be imposed on those who litter. This can be an effective way to make individuals think twice about the results of their actions. In fact, in Singapore, the streets are impeccably clean because the fines for littering here are extremely high. Finally, more trash bins and recycling facilities need to be placed throughout the cities. As a result, it would be more convenient for everyone to dispose of waste in the right places. In conclusion, we can solve the issue of littering in cities through education, strict punishments, and provision of trash cans.