گۆڤاری ئەکادیمیای کوردی

Kurdish Academic Journals

| No. 61 | 2024 |

هەولێر - شەقامی هەڵەبجە

http://gov.krd/ka

گۆڤاری ئەکادیمیای کوردی

Kurdish Academic Journals

• No. (61) • 2024 •

http;//gov.krd/ka ISSN: 2520-4106 Erbil - Halabja Street

Investigating the Impact of Scaffolding Strategy on EFL Learners' Writing Skill at Soran University

Assist. L. Naznaz Shawqi Malla

UEnglish Department, Faculty of Arts,
Soran University, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.
naznaz.mal@soran.edu.iq

Prof. Dr. Hoshang Farooq Jawad

English Department, College of Basic Education,
University of Sulaimani, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.
hoshang.jawad@univsul.edu.iq

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the effect of scaffolding on learners' English writing skill. In order to carry out this study, sixty-one English major sophomore students were selected from faculty of Arts at Soran University in the academic year 2022-2023. For the purpose of data collection, a quantitative quasi-experimental method was used. Both pre-test and post-test were undertaken with two groups; the control group which received the traditional method, and an experimental group who implemented the scaffolding instruction. Following the administration of tests, the students' scores were collected, and the results were statistically analyzed. The findings of the study reveal that the students who received instructions through the scaffolding strategy performed better than those who have been taught with the traditional method. The study highlights the importance of using scaffolding strategies in language instruction and suggests that educators should incorporate these strategies into their teaching practices to enhance the language learning experience for their students.

Keywords: Scaffolding, Writing skill, EFL Learners

1. Introduction

Writing in English is an essential skill in learning the language and is crucial for college students as a means of communication and academic success. However, many English major students still struggle with English writing and their proficiency cannot yet reach the expected level. As a result, it is a crucial and difficult responsibility for writing instructors to support these students in the development of their English-writing skills and stimulate their interest in the subject.

Scaffolding is one of the various teaching/ learning approaches that has attracted significant attention in educational studies over the last few decades. This teaching approach, which is developed from socio-cultural and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theories, offers a new perspective on how to improve the current state of education. According to Richards and Schmidt (2002), scaffolding, as a teaching and/ or learning approach, involves teachers and students working together to solve problems. Through teachers' assistance and direction, the students grow more independent during this process. It entails any temporary assistance from teachers allowing students to participate in challenging activities that may eventually help them succeed at completing those activities on their own (Ediger, 2001). Moreover, Walqui (2006), states that scaffolding is the process of establishing circumstances to make a novice's entry into the activity simple and successful, then progressively removing those circumstances and handling their roles as the learners get the necessary competence to manage carrying out the work. As a result, many academics have found the impact of scaffolding on language learning to be an interesting subject.

2. Scaffolding: Theoretical background

The term scaffolding has been used since 1300s and originally taken from the field of construction. It was defined as a "temporary framework of platforms and poles constructed to provide accommodation for workmen and their materials during the erection, repairing or decoration of a building" (Benson,1997:127). This means that scaffolding is used around the exterior of newly built structures in order to allow construction workers access to the structure as it rises above the ground. Then, the scaffolding is removed after the building is able to support itself (Hammond & Gibbons,2001).

In the learning context, the term 'scaffolding' was metaphorically used. It was initially used and defined in the study examining the interactions between adults and children during problem-solving sessions by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976:90) in their article, "The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving". In their study, children who aged three, four, and five-year old were paired with an adult to form dyads. Each child was given a problem-solving task. During this activity, the adult directed the kid in the use of suitably calibrated support, ensuring that the child completed the task successfully (Boblett, 2012:2).

Later, Vygotsky expanded scaffolding, assuming that children' cognitive abilities will develop to a higher level through guided interactions with an adult or a peer. Although he had never used the term, Vygotsky thought that this support would enable students to enhance their understanding through the Zone of Proximal Development (henceforth ZPD). According to Raymond (2000:176), ZPD is the gap between the student's current knowledge and the subsequent learning that will help them acquire proficiency. In other words, it refers to the period of time it takes a

student to advance from a subject they can learn independently to one in which they can receive help in order to become competent.

3. Definitions of Scaffolding

Scaffolding is a broad concept that has been examined in numerous studies. Thus, throughout the literature, various definitions of scaffolding have been proposed. In its teaching sense, the first use of the word 'scaffolding' was in 1976 by Wood, Bruner, and Ross. They defined it as a "process that enables a child or a novice to solve a problem, carry out a task or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts." (Ross, Wood and Bruner, 1976:90). This means that adult monitoring and direct teaching are required for the process of scaffolding in the education of children. Scaffolding, according to Bruner (1983), is the process of "setting up" the environment to make the child's entry easy and successful before gradually stepping back and handing the job over to the child as he learns the essential abilities. Since then, more and more educational professionals and specialists have utilized the idea to describe and clarify the function of adults or more experienced peers in directing children's learning and development. Vygotsky describes scaffolding as the "role of teachers and others in supporting the learner's development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level" (Raymond, 2000:176). In addition, the process of scaffolding in education involves the teacher giving students a temporary framework for learning. If done properly, it will help a pupil to develop independent thought, motivation, and creativity (Lawson, 2002). In fact, scaffolding acts as a link between students' existing knowledge and new information. Thus, scaffolding will work as an enabler, not a disabler, if it is used properly (Benson, 1997).

4. Types of scaffolding strategies

Although there are many strategies of scaffolding, this paper presents Walqui's (2006) strategies.

According to Walqui (2006), teachers should employ some strategies to assist students attain their learning objectives. He proposed six scaffolding strategies as explained below:

1) Modeling. It means "a learning process in which a person observes someone's behavior and then consciously or unconsciously attempts to imitate that behavior" (Richards et al., 1992:233). Here, instructors provide students specific examples of what is required of them. Modeling helps students gain a better knowledge of the subject matter, and afterwards they can adapt the exercises for their own use (Walqui, 2006).

2) Bridging. This necessitates activating and expanding on prior knowledge, or progressing from what is known to the unknown. Alternatively put, students can create links between new concepts or behaviors and what they've learned previously. They can then demonstrate how the new material is relevant to their lives.

3) Contextualizing. It means that teachers need to provide context that is more relevant to students' real-life experiences. This aims to make language learning more understandable for learners while also lowering their cognitive demands. In this stage, the teacher may use manipulatives, photos, films, and/or actual materials to embed the language in a sensory context, making it more accessible and interesting for students (Arlinda, 2019:86).

4) Schema building. According to Walqui (2006), schema building corresponds to the "process of organizing learners' knowledge and understanding". This strategy refers to interconnected clusters of meaning, or how

knowledge and thinking are arranged. Teachers must assist students see the connection between new material and their pre-existing meaning structures through a range of activities in order to enhance their comprehension (Abdulmajid & Muhammad, 2015:97).

5) Re-presenting text. The knowledge that the students gained is transformed into various types of text in this situation.

6) Developing metacognition. Metacognition has been defined as "the ability to monitor one's current level of understanding and decide when it is not adequate. It refers to the ways in which students manage their thinking" (Walqui, 2009:173). This strategy is employed by the teacher to help students improve their ability to solve problems and think critically.

5. **Stages of scaffolding**

Throughout the literature, many scholars have proposed various stages and frameworks for the provision of an effective scaffolding in class. According to Xiaona (2022:5-6), many scholars and researchers have suggested that there should be five steps in scaffolding instruction, which are as follows:

Step one: Setting scaffolding: Before class, in order to find students' Zone of Proximal Development, teachers need do some preparation for teaching materials and students. When class begins, teachers can provide reasonable scaffolding for students, which includes some related instruments, knowledge and experience and which should be a little higher than students' present level.

Step two: Get into settings: In this step, teachers should arouse students' enthusiasm and motivation and guide students into settings, which can be achieved by provoking questions, designing tasks, showing pictures, and assigning tasks etc. In designed settings, students can quickly get access into topics and finish the construction of the language knowledge and culture knowledge.

Step three: Independent exploration: After the preparation in the first two stages, it comes to the third stage where students need to choose their own methods to explore the topic and solve problems by themselves. During the process of independent exploration, teachers still need to properly give some prompts, suggestions and explanations to students in order to promote them to make a progress. Such help should be offered more at first and then reduced gradually.

Step four: Cooperative learning. Students' cooperative learning can be carried out in different forms, such as in pairs' or in groups' discussions and negotiations or in whole class debate. Through cooperative learning, the achievements of collective thinking can be shared by every member and they can have a more comprehensive understanding about what they are learning.

Step five: Evaluation. The final evaluation for learning effect includes students' self-evaluation and evaluation from study groups and teachers. The content of evaluation includes the self-study ability, the contribution to cooperative study and the construction of the knowledge. Through the evaluation, teachers can get to know the teaching effect and problems existing in their teaching designs, thus they can adjust the scaffolding in time. For students, the feedback and assessment from teachers and peers can make them get a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of themselves and promote them to make up their deficiencies and motivate more enthusiasm for study.

6. **Previous Studies**

Scaffolding, in Iraqi Kurdistan, is a relatively new teaching strategy and rarely utilized in class,

therefore, a few studies have been conducted. The researcher has found only one study that has been carried out on the use of scaffolding in writing classes.

Faraj (2015) carried out a research entitled, "Scaffolding EFL Students' Writing through the Writing Process Approach" at Koya University/ English Department, to determine whether teachers' scaffolding of the writing process instruction improves students' writing skills. The participants of the study were 30 second year English majors whose ages ranged 20 to 23. There was only one experimental group. To assess how much the students had learned from the lessons, the researcher administered pretest and posttest. The study's main finding was that learners' performance significantly improved between the pretest and posttest. Additionally, the scaffolding of students' writings through the writing process approach matched the demands of the students in EFL writing and ultimately enhanced their writing ability, even though the majority of them had trouble with the fundamental components of writing, such as grammar. This research was limited due to having a small number of participants and taking only one experimental group. In addition, the pre-test and post-test were not set as a writing task to test students' writing abilities but only through questionnaire administered among students. The above points, therefore, affect this study's validity and reliability.

In Iran, Ahangaria, Hejazib, Razmjou (2014) conducted a research entitled; "The Impact of Scaffolding on Content Retention of Iranian Post-elementary EFL Learners' Summary Writing". The aim was to examine how scaffolding affects the capacity of EFL learners to write summaries. The study's main focus was how well the students remembered the content of their written work. For this purpose, 40 female students from a language institute between the ages of 12 and 15 were chosen randomly and then divided into control and experimental groups. The experimental group used a scaffolding strategy in which the teacher initially gave the students constant assistance but as they advanced in the course, this assistance faded. The control group, on the other hand, just followed the book's instructions without any assistance in their writings. Comparing the grades of the written posttest, it was revealed that the experimental group students had more improvements on their writing assignments and retained more story elements as opposed to the students in the control group.

The impact of scaffolding has also been emphasized in Vonna, Mukminatien and Laksmi's research at English Education Department in Abulyatama University in academic year 2014-2015. This study examined how scaffolding methods affected students' writing proficiency. With a nonrandomized control group design, this study represents a quasi-experimental investigation. There were 36 first year pupils who split into the control and the experimental groups. The experimental group had twenty students, while the control group had sixteen. The findings showed that the students receiving scaffolding approaches outperformed those who were taught without them in terms of writing achievement.

In Algeria, Dib (2021) undertook a study about the effect of scaffolding instruction on students' writing skills through creating a test for students to see how they used their writing abilities. A total of two groups, each with 30 students, were randomly selected. As the academic year started, both groups were given a pre-test simultaneously. The experimental group, in comparison to the control group, had an eight-week treatment

phase that involved teaching writing skills via scaffolding instruction. The researcher then conducted a posttest that, in terms of question structure and partition, was identical to the pre exam but had a different content. The results obtained have revealed that the performance of the experimental group has greatly improved. As a result, it has been demonstrated how important scaffolding instruction is for helping students grasp writing abilities.

Gashaye and Muchie (2021), conducted a study to determine how well grade nine students wrote paragraphs. The quasi-experimental research design was used and data were gathered via test, questionnaire, and interview. While thematic analysis was used for the qualitative data, an independent sample t-test was used for the quantitative data. There were two groups of students: an experimental group and a control group, each with 40 students. Based on the results of the pre-test, a significant value of 0.659, higher than 0.05, was obtained. This demonstrated that the writing abilities of the control and experimental groups of students were comparable and consistent prior to the intervention. The analysis of the writing test in the post-test, however, produced sig.=0.025, which was less than 0.05, indicating a substantial difference between the writing abilities of the two groups of students after the intervention. This suggests that the participant's capacity in the experimental group to write better was enhanced by the treatment. To further support test results, the findings of the questionnaire and interview demonstrated that students in the experimental group were inspired and prompted by the instructor scaffolding to advance their writing abilities.

Last but not least, recently, Hassen, Adugna and Bogale (2023) carried out a quasi-experimental study in an Ethiopian EFL setting. The study aimed at investigating the impacts of scaffolding instruction on developing students' writing skill and their perspectives. From a total of nine sections in Grade 10, two were randomly chosen to serve as comparison and experimental groups. Each group had 48 students, and pre-post writing assessments as well as follow-up questionnaire were used to gather data. The results of the paired t-test displayed that the treatment significantly improved students' writing achievement. As shown by p=.001, p, at 0.05 for every component of writing apart from mechanics, which had p=-307. The findings suggested that, with the exception of mechanic's use, the treatment allowed participants in the experimental group to advance in all areas of writing ability. In addition, the questionnaire results showed that the members of the experimental group had favorable opinions of the scaffolding strategy instruction's contribution to the development of their writing abilities.

This study's main goal is to investigate the impact of implementing scaffolding strategy on Kurdish EFL second year university students' written performance. It ultimately attempts to explore whether there is statistically significant difference between the scaffolding instruction and the traditional product instruction in developing the writing skills of EFL university students. Additionally, to probe which writing skills or aspects can best be developed through scaffolding instruction. The study primarily aimed to respond the research questions below:

1. Is there a statistical significant difference between the scaffolding instruction and the traditional method in developing EFL university students' writing skill?

2. Which writing skills can best be developed by scaffolding instruction?

7. Methodology

In order to achieve the aim and answer the research question, this paper used the quantitative method through quasi-experimental design which two groups of students involved; the experimental group and the control group. The first group experienced scaffolding strategy while the latter was exposed to the traditional teaching. This experiment started from September to late December in 2022, which lasted for one term. Due to the flexibility and feasibility of both syllabus and research aims, the module selected was "College Writing", which was studied in the second stage as a part of the curriculum taught in the English department. The experimental group were 31 students consisting of (12) males and (19) females, while the control group included (11) males and (19) females, which means 30 students in total.

For collecting data, the current study employed pre-test and post-test to measure Kurdish EFL students' writing skills. The questions in the pre-test and post-test were not identical but had an equivalent form. Prior to the treatment, both the control and experimental groups underwent a pre-test to make sure the two groups were equivalent. At the end of the experiment, a post-test was administered to them to determine whether the experimental group had made any progress since the experiment had been applied to them. To find out how teaching strategies affected the groups, the test results from the two tests were compared.

To attain the validity and reliability in this study, a committee of five specialists were engaged to ensure the tests' validity and make any necessary adjustments. Based on their comments and suggestions, some modifications were made to the test questions and some linguistic changes were undertaken for better and easier understanding.

Considering the tests' reliability, Cronbach Alpha was employed. The score of Cronbach's Alpha for the control group was 0.809, and it was 0.790 for the experimental group. So, these indicate that the test results are reliable.

8. Data analysis

This section presents the analysis of the test data. For statistical purposes, the data were analyzed using SPSS version 25. Before and after the intervention, the performance of students in the control group and experimental group was compared using means, standard deviations, and two independent samples t-tests.

Before the experiment, there must have been no visible difference between the two classes in order to determine whether the two chosen classes can be used as the control class and the experimental class. So, a pre-test was given, and the results of the writing sections for the two classes were examined using an independent sample t-test. Results were analyzed as follows:

Table 1: Independent Sample T-Test for total score in the pre-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means				
Pre-test		N	F	.Sig	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed) P- value	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Control	Equal variances assumed	30	3.573	0.064	-0.475	59	0.637	-0.46742	0.98404
Experimental		31							

The above table shows the mean score between the control and experimental groups in the pretest which was -0.46. The results of the independent t-tests demonstrated that there was not statistically significant difference, as shown by the t-value of t= -0.475., a p-value of 0.637 at = 0.05 of the pre-test. It means that if the p-value is higher than 0.05, there is no significant difference between the groups. This reveals that the two groups were homogeneous or had similar writing abilities prior to the intervention.

The following tables compare the experimental and control group data based on the four writing questions in both pre-test and post-test.

Table 2: descriptive statistics for question one

	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pretest	Control	30	8.30	4.018	0.734
	Experimental	31	6.23	1.707	0.307
Post-test	Control	30	10.42	1.830	0.329
	Experimental	31	10.60	3.423	0.625

Table 2 displays the results obtained from the first question which focused on expressing opinions, providing arguments and writing accurate sentences. The findings have revealed that the students' performance mean in the control group was 8.30 and was 6.23 for the experimental group before receiving the instruction. This indicates that the control group students performed better compared to the experimental group in answering the first question and providing appropriate arguments for their response. In the post-test, the students' performance has improved in both groups to the similar level. However, a significant improvement can be noticed in experimental group who received scaffolding instruction as before receiving the instruction, the mean score was 6.23, but after receiving the instruction, it has reached 10.60.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for question two

	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pretest	Control	30	8.97	2.470	0.451
	Experimental	31	8.45	2.434	0.437
Post-test	Control	30	11.60	1.812	0.331
	Experimental	31	12.13	2.012	0.361

This table shows the second question of the written test about punctuation and capitalization. As it can be seen, in the pre-test both groups had similar scores (8.97 for control, and 8.45 for the experimental). In the post-test, the result from both groups show improvement in the students' writing ability. Yet, the experimental group advanced more than the control group after receiving the scaffolding. For example, the mean score of experimental group is 12.13, while, the mean in the control group is 11.60.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for question three

	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pretest	Control	30	6.43	3.411	0.623
	Experimental	31	6.13	2.918	0.524
Post-test	Control	30	8.98	2.715	0.496
	Experimental	31	11.17	2.160	0.388

Table 4 shows the findings of the third question on evaluating students' proficiency in writing parts of paragraph such as topic sentence, supporting sentence, example sentence and

concluding sentence. Although both groups' results demonstrate that students have made improvement in writing paragraph components, the experimental group's level of development is noticeably higher than that of the control group. After getting instruction, the students' mean in the control group increased from 6.43 to 8.98. In the meantime, the experimental group scored 6.13 on the pretest, but 11.17 on the posttest, indicating a considerable improvement in their performance.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for question four

	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pretest	Control	30	16.09	6.955	1.270
	Experimental	31	18.32	5.810	1.044
Post-test	Control	30	24.16	9.413	1.719
	Experimental	31	28.82	6.289	1.130

As for the last question in the test which targeted students' production skill through writing a 200 words essay, the results in the above table reveal that both groups improved. However, the experimental group students outperformed in the post-test writing achievement over the control group students. For example, the control group's performance on the pre-test was 16.09 and became 24.16 in the post-test. In contrast, the performance of the experimental group's students on the pretest was 18.32, but they significantly improved on the post-test, when their mean score rose to 28.82. This demonstrated the intervention's feasibility for raising students writing performance.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics for overall performance

	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pretest	Control	30	11.2100	4.36154	0.79630
	Experimental	31	11.6774	3.26269	0.58600
Post-test	Control	30	16.0767	5.15971	0.94203
	Experimental	31	18.5468	3.45591	0.62070

Concerning table 6, the control and experimental class mean scores are respectively: 11.210 and 11.677. So the overall descriptive analysis of the pretest shows that was no obvious difference in the total scores between the two classes before teaching experiment. It means both the experimental group and the control group were nearly at the same linguistic level. Nevertheless, following the application of the treatment, there was a substantial mean score difference between the two groups in favor of the experimental, as the mean score for the control class group is 16.076 and for the experimental group is 18.546. This indicates that both groups show improvement in their writing abilities, but the experimental group who experienced scaffolding performed better than the control group who did not receive scaffolding.

In order to further check students' development in writing ability of both groups, the independent sample t-test was used in the post-test, which is shown in the following table:

Table 7: Independent Sample T-Test for total score in the post-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means				
Pre-test			N	F	.Sig	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed) P- value	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Control	Experimental	Equal variances assumed	30	7.712	0.007	-2.203	59	0.031	-2.47011	1.12100
			31							

From the above table, it can be seen that the value of t-test is -2.203 (>2.045) and the value of p is 0.031, which is less than 0.05. This means there is a significant difference between the total scores of the control and experimental groups on the posttest favoring the experimental group.

9. **Discussion:**

The pre-test was conducted to address whether there is any significant difference between the control and experimental groups of students' overall writing achievement. The results from analyzing the pretest's average scores revealed that there was no statistically significant mean score difference between the control and experimental groups (t=-0.475, p= 0.637). The estimated p-value, which is significantly higher than 0.05, revealed that the two groups were homogeneous prior to the intervention (Table 1). This demonstrates that participants in the two groups had comparable abilities in writing; otherwise, this would have an impact on the study's findings. However, the results of the post-test showed a statistically difference between the mean scores of the two groups, favoring the experimental group, as shown by t=-2.203, p=0.031. In comparison to students who learned how to write in English using the traditional method of instruction, students who learnt utilizing the scaffolding strategy achieved significantly better outcomes on the post-test (Table 6). This finding indicates the usefulness of the intervention, i.e., the scaffolding instruction, as the posttest writing achievement scores of the experimental group students significantly improved. This study's findings matched those of Vonna et al. (2015), who came to the conclusion that scaffolding strategies considerably raise students' writing achievement.

With regard to writing skills, the study examined which aspect of writing showed great improvements through analyzing each of the four writing questions in the tests. For instance, the first question which was about the students' ability to think, express their opinions, and then produce appropriate and accurate sentence(s), the mean score of control group and experimental group were 10.42 and 10.60 respectively in the post-test. While in the pretest, the average scores of both groups were 6.23 and 8.30. Although both groups improved, the experimental group improved a little higher with a difference of 0.18. This could be linked to the fact that students in the experimental group already had difficulty in the aspect of argumentation since a significant difference can be seen in the mean scores between both groups in the pre-test (Table 2). In other words, although students might have offered arguments in their responses, they were not effectively tied to the writers' experience or viewpoints and not presented in an engaging manner with the main

ideas clearly expressed and fully supported by the supporting evidence. Another reason why in this question in particular the difference is not high could be students' insufficient knowledge about the given topic. Most importantly, the students were rarely given such activity to practice their writing. Concerning the punctuation marks and capitalization (question two), the experimental group performed better than control group as the mean scores for control group was 11.60 and for the experimental group was 12.13 (Table 3). The third question which was about the recognition of the structure of a paragraph and writing parts of the paragraph, the students' progress in the experimental increased remarkably compared to the control group. Namely, the mean scores of both groups were 11.17 and 8.98 respectively. The main reason could be related to the effectiveness of scaffolding in teaching those skills (writing parts of paragraphs) (Table 4). Similar to the third question, there was a significant difference in the mean score between both groups in the fourth question (writing essay). The experimental group scored (M=28.82) and the control group (M=24.16) (Table 5). The following can be inferred as the reasons behind experimental group's significant achievements in the three questions compared to the control group:

Scaffolding instruction calls for the teacher and other more capable students in the group to provide timely assistance for those students who are in need. During the scaffolding intervention, when students in the experimental group experienced challenges with structuring their compositions and establishing their arguments in class, the teacher could create an environment that would inspire them by offering relevant instructional resources and some helpful writing practices. In addition, through group collaboration or class collaboration, students with greater proficiency and less proficiency could work together to find solutions to problems. This might have benefited students' writing skills develop as a result. Moreover, the strategies such as modelling, bridging, schema building and task representation were effective in assisting students to develop those writing skills. Furthermore, scaffolding instruction uses multiple evaluation methods, such as peer review, self-review, and teacher assessment. Therefore, the amount of incorrect language in student assignments or tasks were significantly reduced by cooperative revision. These could have helped students improve in communicative quality, linguistic accuracy (including, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, capitalization), writing parts of paragraph, using linking words, writing and organizing essay. These support the claims mentioned by Mckenzie (2000), Walqui (2006), that scaffolding is a means for supporting students as they go toward a deeper knowledge and, ultimately, more independence.

Overall, the experimental group's improvement in writing ability was greater than that of the control group'. It demonstrates that scaffolding outperforms the conventional product strategy in terms of raising students' overall writing scores as well as each writing-related skill. Thus, the research questions can be answered depending on the results. The present study's findings are consistent with Ahangaria, Hejazib, Razmjou (2014), Vonna, Mukminatien and Laksmi's (2015), Dib (2021) and Hassen, Adugna and Bogale (2023) research which stated that the experimental group's students had improved more and outperformed the control group in their written performance. This means that scaffolding strategies were implemented successfully in teaching English writing.

10. Conclusion:

This study aimed to investigate the impact of scaffolding strategy on Kurdish EFL university learners' writing skill. The findings revealed that the experimental students' writing achievement demonstrated a statistically significant improvement after receiving scaffolding instruction compared to the control group, which was taught writing using the traditional method. Additionally, the larger mean score difference between the results of the pretest and posttest may contribute to demonstrating how effective scaffolding is to improve the overall writing performance of EFL students. As a result, the current research strongly recommends teachers to employ scaffolding instruction as a crucial teaching strategy of the writing classes in order to address the challenges that the students have when writing in English and then assist them to improve. The author also encourages other researchers to conduct additional studies to ascertain the impact scaffolding on other skills of language apart from writing.

11. References:

Abdul-Majeed, M. A. & Muhammad, N. M. (2015). The effect of using scaffolding strategies on 2. EFL students' reading comprehension achievement. *Arts Journal*, 3(1), pp. 91-118.

Ahangari, S., Hejazi, M., & Razmjou, L. (2014). The impact of scaffolding on content retention of Iranian post-elementary EFL learners' summary writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 98, pp. 83–89. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.392

Basit, T. N. (2010). *Conducting research in educational contexts*. London: Continuum.

Benson, B. (1997). Scaffolding. *English Journal*, 86 (7), pp. 126–127.

Boblett, N. (2012). Scaffolding: defining the metaphor. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics,* 12 (2), pp. 1-16.

Brown, J. & Rodgers, T. (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's Talk*. New York: Norton.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London: Routledge.

Davis, D. (2004). 'Reliability and validity: Part 1'. *Neonatal Network: The Journal of Neonatal Nursing,*.23(1), 54-56.

Dib, N. (2021) The Effect of Scaffolding Instruction on Students' Writing Skills. *Revue EL-Bahith en Sciences Humaines et Sociales*, 13 (2), pp. 543-549.

Faraj, A.K.A. (2015). Scaffolding EFL Students' Writing through the Writing Process Approach. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (13), pp. 131-141

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (3rd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gashaye, S. & Muchie, B. (2021). The Effect of Teacher Scaffolding on Students' Paragraph Writing Skills in EFL Classroom: The Case of Grade Nine Students in Meneguzer Secondary School, Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12 (6), pp. 892-898.

Gibbons, P. (2002) Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hammond, J & Gibbons, P. (2001). What is scaffolding? In J. Hammond (ed.) *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in language and literacy education*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.

Hassen, S. K., Adugna, E. T. & Bogale, Y. B. (2023). Effects of Scaffolding Strategies Instruction on EFL Students' Writing Achievement and Perceptions. *A Journal on Language and Language Learning,* 26 (1), pp. 272-292.

Larkin, M. (2002). Using scaffolded instruction to optimize learning. Retrieved November 12, 2022 from: http://www.vtaide.com/png/ERIC/Scaffolding.htm

Lawson, L. (2002). Scaffolding as a teaching strategy. Paper presented in course EDUC 0500, City College of New York.

Mackey, A. & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: methodology and design*. Mahwah, New Jersy: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McKenzie, J. (2000). Scaffolding for Success. *The Educational Technology Journal,* 7, pp. 34-37. Retrieved Nov. 20, 2022, from http://fno.org/dec99/scaffold.html

Mousavi, S. A. (1997). *A dictionary of Language Testing*. lran: Rahnama Publication.

Philpott, M. and Lawson, C. (2008:80). *Reliability and validity: doing classroom research: a step-by-step guide for student teachers.*UK: McGraw Hill Education.

Raymond, E., (2000). *Cognitive Characteristics: Learners with Mild Disabilities*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn, &Bacon, Pearson Education Company.

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Stufy. R.V.D. (2002). Scaffolding as a Teaching Strategy. (Online) http://www.sandi.net/cms/lib/.../scaffolding_as_a_teaching_strategy.pdf

Vonna, Y., Mukminatien, N., & Laksmi, E. D. (2015). The effect of scaffolding techniques on students' writing achievement. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 3(1), pp. 227-233.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding Instruction for English Language Learners: A Conceptual Framework. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 9(2), pp. 159-180. DOI:10.1080/13670050608668639

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, pp. 89-100.

Xiaona, G. (2022). A Study on the Application of Scaffolding Instruction to the Teaching of College English Writing. Unpub

پوختە

ئامانجی ئەم توێژینەوەیە بریتییە لە لێکۆڵینەوەی کاریگەریی ستراتیژی سکافۆڵدینگ لە سەر کارامەیی نووسین لە لایەن فێرخوازانی زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بێگانە. بۆ ئەم مەبەستە شەست و یەک قوتابیی قۆناغی دووەمی بەشی ئینگلیزیی زانکۆی سۆران لە ساڵی خوێندنی ئەکادیمی (٢٠٢٢-٢٠٢٣) هەڵبژێردراون. بە مەبەستی کۆکردنەوەی زانیاری؛ ڕێگای ئەزموونی بەکار هاتووە کە لە دوو گرووپ پێک دێن: ئەوانیش گرووپی کۆنترۆڵ کە بە شێوەی نەریتی باو دەخوێنن و گرووپی ئەزموونی کە بە شێوەی سکافۆڵدینگ دەخوێنن. ئەنجامەکانی لێکۆڵینەوە ئەوە دەردەخەن کە ئاستی گشتیی کارامەیی نووسین لە لای ئەو قوتابیانە کە بە ڕێگای سکافۆڵدینگ دەخوێنن؛ باشترە و بە شێوەیەکی بەرچاو توانای نووسینیان گەشەی کردووە بە بەراورد لەگەڵ گرووپی کۆنترۆڵ کە بە ڕێگای نەریتی دەخوێنن. بۆیە ئەم توێژینەوەیە تیشک دەخاتە سەر گرنگیی بەرجەستەکردنی ستراتیژییەکانی سکافۆڵدینگ لە پۆل و پێشنیاز دەکات وانەبێژان پشت بەو ڕێگا تازەیە ببەستن بۆ وانەوتنەوە و ئەزموونی فێربوونی زمان لە لای قوتابییەکانیان زیاد بکەن.

کلیلەوشەکان: سکافۆڵدینگ، کارامەیی نووسین، فێرخوازانی زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانی بێگانە

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة تأثير السقالات على مهارة الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية لدى المتعلمين. من أجل إجراء هذه الدراسة ، تم اختيار واحد وستين طالبًا من طلاب السنة الثانية في تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية من كلية الآداب بجامعة سوران في العام الدراسي ٢٠٢٢-٢٠٢٣. لغرض جمع البيانات ، تم استخدام طريقة كمية شبه تجريبية. تم إجراء كل من الاختبار القبلي والبعدي مع مجموعتين ؛ المجموعة الضابطة التي تلقت الطريقة التقليدية والمجموعة التجريبية التي نفذت تعليمات السقالات. بعد إجراء الاختبارات ، تم جمع درجات الطلاب وتحليل النتائج إحصائيًا. كشفت نتائج الدراسة أن الطلاب الذين تلقوا التعليمات من خلال استراتيجية السقالات كان أداؤهم أفضل من أولئك الذين درسوا الطريقة التقليدية. تسلط الدراسة الضوء على أهمية استخدام تقنيات السقالات في تعليم اللغة وتقترح أنه يجب على المعلمين دمج هذه الاستراتيجيات في ممارساتهم التعليمية لتعزيز تجربة تعلم اللغة لطلابهم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السقالات ، مهارة الكتابة ، متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.