

Language Enhancement Activities (LEA): A Strategy in Teaching Descriptive Writing and Self-Concept of Grade 7 Students

Hangdaan, Norlhyne Honnelore E., Mendoza, Jayne C., Martin, John Lester V. Reginalde, Richelle Dyan P., Ubbunan, Felizzee Yana P., and Asuncion, Zayda S., PhD

ABSTRACT

Writing is a fundamental language skill crucial for students to effectively communicate and express their ideas. Descriptive writing allows learners to fully explain what is on their minds in a creative and detailed manner. The more students can convey their message and feel that it is clearly understood, the more their self-concept builds up. However, writing also follows rules and mechanics, which prove to be somewhat difficult for students. Utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods, this study explored the effectiveness of Language Writing Enhancement Activities (LEA) as a strategy for teaching descriptive writing. Specifically, it investigated LEA's impact on the descriptive writing skills and self-concept development of Grade 7 junior high school students at Saint Mary's University, with 17 students in the academic curriculum as participants. It was conducted in six Saturday sessions, with two hours each. The researchers gathered data using two techniques: written tasks to assess students' descriptive writing ability, and written interviews to explore the improvement of their self-concept. Descriptive analysis and a two-tailed t-test were used for the quantitative data, while thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative data. Analysis of the results demonstrated that Grade 7 students exhibited a beginning level in their writing performance, with notable weaknesses across content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. However, LEA has helped develop the students' self-concept. In addition, a significant difference between the descriptive writing proficiency level of the students in the pre-task and post-task was observed.

Keywords: descriptive writing, proficiency level, self-concept, writing performance

INTRODUCTION

Language is the primary means of human communication, consisting of four major macro skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These skills are interconnected, and writing, in particular, is considered one of the most vital abilities for language learners (Perumal & Ajit, 2020; Tusyanah et al., 2019). Writing enables students to express their feelings, knowledge, and ideas effectively, making it essential to improve writing skills for academic and personal development (Asiah et al., 2020).

Writing is a complex and demanding skill involving multiple linguistic elements such as vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure (Din et al., 2021; Hikmar et al., 2019). It plays a crucial role in teacher education and academic success, as well as being a mental tool supporting other language skills like listening, speaking, and reading (Isma & Rasmin, 2022; Khazrouni, 2019). Effective writing requires mastery of microlinguistics—morphology, syntax, and semantics—as well as adherence to formal linguistic rules to ensure clarity and coherence in communication (Hasanova, 2024; Menggo et al., 2019). However, due to its complexity, writing is often viewed as a difficult task by many learners (Akbarallyevna & Burayma, 2022).

Among the different genres of writing—descriptive, narrative, persuasive, and expository—descriptive writing is particularly important because it enhances students' observational skills and linguistic creativity. It trains them to vividly express sensory experiences, thus fostering imagination and self-confidence (Gerot & Wignell, 1994 as cited in Jayanti, 2019; Martin, 1992 as cited in Mulyasin et al., 2023). In ESL classrooms, descriptive writing helps bridge language gaps by expanding vocabulary and building confidence in

expressive language use (Thohir, 2017 as cited in Mulyasin et al., 2019). Overall, descriptive writing contributes significantly to students' academic and personal growth.

Despite its importance, descriptive writing poses several challenges. Students often struggle due to limited vocabulary and grammatical weaknesses, which hinder their ability to create detailed and accurate descriptions (Alisha et al., 2019; Sitmurong & Manurung, 2020). Studies indicate that students frequently perform below average in grammar, syntax, and mechanics, leading to difficulties in sentence construction and coherence (Bernal, n. d.; Hikmah & Akmal, 2019). Common grammatical issues include misuse of pronouns, articles, adverbs, and prepositions (Ismayanti & Kholiq, 2020). Writing mechanics—such as proper title usage, punctuation, and structure—also present challenges, affecting the overall clarity and comprehension of students' compositions (Yani, 2021; Qian & Nair, 2021). Additionally, carelessness and low interest in descriptive writing further obstruct students' progress (Yani, 2021; Moybeka, 2023).

To address these difficulties, enhancement activities have been proposed as effective strategies. These activities supplement the standard curriculum by providing additional practice and support, helping students develop writing skills through structured learning experiences (Mendoca et al., 2022). Writing requires deliberate planning and practice unlike more natural skills like speaking or listening, and positive learning environments alongside confidence-building efforts are critical to improving writing performance (Jayanti, 2019; Faizah et al., 2024).

Several instructional strategies have shown promise in enhancing descriptive writing skills. Techniques such as clustering (Rahmawati et al., 2021), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Kaharuddin, 2022), magnet summary (Marzulina, 2019), guided writing (Megawati, 2020), collaborative writing (Harlena et al., 2020), and the PLEASE strategy (Siregar, 2020) have all been found to improve students' ability to compose descriptive texts effectively. These methods encourage creativity, collaboration, critical thinking, and systematic writing, all of which contribute to improved student outcomes. Interviews with local Grade 7 teachers reveal that multi-modal approaches—such as videos, graphic organizers, and real-life examples—are commonly used to support descriptive writing instruction.

Beyond writing proficiency, this study highlights the important connection between writing skills and self-concept—the perception and awareness individuals hold about themselves physically, emotionally, and behaviorally (Lirio et al., 2022). Self-concept develops through experiences and social interactions, and a positive self-concept is linked to better academic performance and emotional well-being (Vinney, 2024; Mcleod, 2023). Students with positive learning experiences tend to engage more actively and develop essential skills with higher satisfaction (Guo et al., 2021). Writing, as a form of self-expression, plays a vital role in shaping self-concept by allowing students to communicate their thoughts and feelings, thereby reinforcing their confidence and academic identity (Ofte & Solli, 2024; Huang & Zhang, 2020).

Despite these insights, there is a scarcity of research specifically exploring how descriptive writing influences students' self-concept. Most existing studies focus on how self-concept affects writing ability rather than the reverse. Furthermore, prior writing interventions have been limited in duration, with recommendations for longer, repeated sessions to yield significant improvements (Steiner et al., 2019). Preliminary interviews and student writing samples at Saint Mary's University Junior High School confirm persistent challenges in grammar and sentence construction in descriptive writing, underscoring the need for enhanced writing interventions.

To address these gaps, this study proposes a teaching strategy called Language Enhancement Activities (LEA), aimed at improving Grade 7 students' descriptive writing skills

and self-concept through focused, extended interventions. The findings could contribute to the existing literature and provide a formal program for developing writing proficiency and self-concept in students. If successful, the strategy may serve as a model for future research and practice in language education.

Generally, this study aims to explore whether LEA, as a teaching strategy can improve the student's proficiency level in descriptive writing after six weeks of providing the students Learning Enhancement Activities (LEA) and describe its contribution to the development of self-concept of grade 7 students. It specifically sought to determine the proficiency level of the Grade 7 students in descriptive writing in the pre-task and post-task, and the challenges they encountered in descriptive writing. It further sought to determine if LEA addresses these challenges and if it improves the students' self-concept. Finally, it tested a significant difference between the proficiency level of the students in descriptive writing in the pre-task and post-task.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a mixed-methods research design, integrating both qualitative and quantitative approaches within a descriptive-comparative framework. Initially, descriptive analysis assessed the baseline descriptive writing proficiency of Grade 7 students at Saint Mary's University Junior High School. The comparative element examined differences in students' descriptive writing performance before and after the implementation of Language Enhancement Activities (LEA). Qualitative methods explored how these activities influenced students' self-concept, while quantitative data measured proficiency levels and identified specific writing challenges.

The research took place at Saint Mary's University Junior High and Science High School in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, a private Catholic institution noted for academic excellence and diverse student enrollment. The participants included 17 Grade 7 students selected via stratified random sampling from one of three regular sections. Consent was carefully obtained from parents through formal meetings and informed consent forms, ensuring voluntary participation and confidentiality, with anonymity maintained by using pseudonyms.

Data collection involved a pre-writing task designed to evaluate students' strengths and weaknesses in descriptive writing, focusing on content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, evaluated through Heaton's analytic rubric. This pre-assessment guided the creation of targeted LEA sessions, aimed at addressing identified writing deficiencies. A structured written interview assessed students' self-concept before and after the intervention.

The LEA intervention comprised four face-to-face sessions over six weeks, each lasting two hours, where students engaged in tailored writing activities and games to improve their descriptive writing skills. A brief instructional session preceded activities when necessary to ensure understanding. Following each session, written interviews captured students' perceptions of their self-concept and writing abilities. Researchers actively observed and documented participant responses and progress throughout the intervention.

Data analysis combined qualitative thematic analysis of interview responses with quantitative statistical methods. Students' essays were independently scored by two raters using the rubric, with discrepancies resolved through discussion for reliability. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were computed to measure writing proficiency, categorized according to DepEd guidelines and a researcher-developed proficiency scale. The effectiveness of LEA was statistically tested via paired t-tests comparing pre- and post-intervention writing scores, determining if improvements were significant. Self-concept

data were analyzed by frequency counts and thematic coding of open-ended responses, revealing how the LEA impacted students' perceptions of themselves.

Overall, this rigorous mixed-methods design allowed the researchers to holistically evaluate the impact of LEA on both writing proficiency and self-concept among Grade 7 students, providing a robust basis for conclusions about the strategy's effectiveness in enhancing descriptive writing skills.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Section 1. Grade 7 Students' Proficiency Level in Descriptive Writing

Table 1

Overall Pre-Task and Post-Task Proficiency Levels of Grade 7 Students in Descriptive Writing

	Mean	SD	QD
Pre-Task	54.82	13.83	Beginning
Post-Task	58.41	15.31	Beginning
Overall	54.53	14.52	Beginning

Table 1 reveals the Grade 7 students' overall performance in descriptive writing. It can be seen that students remained at the *beginning* proficiency level both before and after the implementation of the Learning Enhancement Activities (LEA). The mean score increased slightly from 54.82 (pre-task) to 58.41 (post-task), showing a small improvement. However, this gain was insufficient to move the students to the next proficiency level. The standard deviation also increased slightly, which means the range of student performance widened a little. These results suggest that while the LEA had a small positive effect, the limited six-week duration—including the pre- and post-tasks—may have limited opportunities for more meaningful skill development.

The modest improvement in scores indicates that the LEA had a limited impact on the students' descriptive writing skills within a short period. The slight increase in the standard deviation may suggest that while some students made progress, others did not—highlighting the need for more personalized or differentiated instructional strategies. The short timeframe may not have been sufficient for students to fully develop essential skills, such as expressing ideas clearly and organizing their thoughts. This emphasizes the importance of allowing ample time for writing interventions to support lasting improvements in student performance.

Research shows that the duration and structure of writing interventions significantly affect their success. Sari (2019) investigated the use of Problem-Based Learning (PBL) to enhance students' writing ability. The study found that while PBL supported writing development, the short length of the intervention limited the extent of improvement observed. This supports the idea that short-term programs may not produce significant gains in writing proficiency.

Table 2

Pre-Task Proficiency Levels of Students by Writing Components

N=17	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean %	Interpretation	Extended Proficiency Level
Content	17.94	3.561	59.80392	Beginning	Beginning average
Organization	10.82	3.005	54.11765	Beginning	Beginning low
Vocabulary	12.29	2.953	61.47059	Beginning	Beginning average
Language Use	11.59	5.409	46.35294	Beginning	Beginning low
Mechanics	2.18	0.393	43.52941	Beginning	Beginning low
Scores	54.82	13.826	54.82	Beginning	Beginning average

Legend: 66-75- high beginning level; 55-66- average beginning level; 43-54- low beginning level

Table 2 reveals the students' descriptive writing proficiency level in terms of the different components. The expanded scale was used to determine the most critical component at the beginning level. It can be seen that before the intervention, students performed within the *beginning* proficiency level across all five writing components. Among these, content (17.94), and vocabulary (12.29) showed relatively better scores, categorized under *average beginning*. This indicates that students could generate and organize ideas with some degree of relevance and clarity. Despite having better scores on this content component, they remain to still be at the beginning level even after having a discussion with regard to descriptive writing. Looking at their papers, while some were able to follow the correct form of writing as instructed by the researchers, some still were not able to follow and proceeded to do narrative and expository-dominated essay writing. Moving on, language use (11.59), organization (10.82), and mechanics (2.18) were the lowest, falling under the *low beginning* level. These scores imply clear difficulties in sentence construction, grammar accuracy, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The scores suggest that while students can produce basic written content, their technical writing skills are underdeveloped.

The findings show that Grade 7 students require greater instructional support in grammar and mechanics to improve their overall writing quality. Although they demonstrate a foundational ability to generate ideas and structure simple paragraphs, their ability to express these ideas accurately is hindered by poor command of language conventions. This gap between idea development and technical execution could negatively affect the clarity and coherence of their writing outputs. It implies that writing instruction for these learners must go beyond brainstorming and outlining ideas—it should include explicit instruction in grammar, sentence construction, and mechanics.

Moreover, the results suggest that any writing improvement program should allocate specific time for reinforcing basic writing rules, especially for learners who are still developing foundational literacy skills. These findings are strongly supported by recent studies in writing pedagogy. A meta-analysis by Graham et al. (2023) concluded that explicit grammar instruction has a significant positive impact on students' writing quality in Grades 6–12. The study showed that grammar-focused instruction improves sentence construction and reduces errors in mechanics, which directly addresses the weaknesses seen in the learners' pre-task scores.

Table 3

Individual Pre-Task Descriptive Writing Scores of Grade 7 Students

NAME	C (30)	O (20)	V (20)	LU (25)	M (5)	TOTAL	Mean	SD	QD
Ron	17	7	13	11	2	50	10	5.74	Beginning
Axe	22	14	15	11	2	64	12.8	7.26	Beginning
Rie	17	10	15	14	2	58	11.6	5.94	Beginning
Noemi	13	9	13	5	2	42	8.4	4.88	Beginning
Ceejay	15	7	7	5	2	36	7.2	4.82	Beginning
Jhanna	17	10	10	10	2	49	9.8	5.31	Beginning
Ash	21	10	14	17	2	64	12.8	7.26	Beginning
Eddie	13	7	7	5	2	34	6.8	4.02	Beginning
Valerie	17	10	10	5	2	44	8.8	5.72	Beginning
Ashley	22	14	15	18	2	71	14.2	7.50	Beginning
Xia	22	17	15	20	3	77	15.4	7.44	Developing
Kara	20	12	13	10	2	57	11.4	6.47	Beginning
Mea	17	10	13	10	2	52	10.4	5.50	Beginning
Gabbi	25	14	15	19	3	76	15.2	8.07	Developing
JR	18	13	13	15	2	61	12.2	6.06	Beginning
Quin	13	7	7	5	2	34	6.8	4.02	Beginning
Kaycee	16	13	14	17	3	63	12.6	5.59	Beginning

Legend: C-Content; O-Organization; V-Vocabulary; LU-Language Use; M-Mechanics

Table 3 shows the descriptive writing scores of Grade 7 students in the pre-task, revealing that most of them are at the *beginning* level of proficiency. Most students scored low in mechanics and language use, which affected their overall performance. Only a few students, such as Xia and Gabbi, got scores in the *developing* category, implying that, while some students have better writing abilities, the overall trend suggests the need for improvement in fundamental writing skills. This highlights the presence of noticeable performance extremes among students in the classroom.

These findings imply that students have different learning profiles (e.g., skills, styles, etc.) and require a variety of instructional guidance. The wide range of scores suggests that a one-size-fits-all strategy to teaching writing may be ineffective. Some learners are prepared for more advanced writing activities, while others need more basic instruction, particularly in grammar, organization, and coherence. These differences highlight the need of employing strategies such as differentiated instruction, wherein teachers need to adapt to individual needs of learners, allowing them to grow at their own pace and level.

Recent studies support this approach by focusing on differentiated instruction's effectiveness for improving students' learning outcomes. For example, Mohamed et al., (2024) found that all of their respondents had a positive view on DI in improving their writing skills because they found the researcher's activities to be appropriately challenging and engaging with well-prepared materials that encouraged continuous development. Furthermore, the responses from their interview indicated multiple benefits of DI, such as increased participation, higher motivation, enhanced confidence, and opportunity for peer learning. Students favored the inclusive approach, which kept them interested and engaged regardless of their skill level.

Table 4

Post-Task Proficiency Levels of Students by Writing Components

N=17	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean%	Interpretation	Extended Proficiency Level
Content	18.94	4.145	63.13725	beginning	Average
Organization	12.29	3.016	61.47059	beginning	Average
Vocabulary	12.35	2.999	61.76471	beginning	Average
Language Use	12.41	5.832	49.64706	beginning	Low
Mechanics	2.41	0.507	48.23529	beginning	Low
Scores	58.41	15.305	58.41	beginning	Average

Legend: 66-75- high beginning level; 55-66- average beginning level; 43-54- low beginning level

Table 4 shows the proficiency levels of the students in the post-task by the different components, revealing that all five writing components—content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics—remained within the *beginning* proficiency level. However, slight improvements were observed across components, particularly in organization, which progressed to the average beginning level, indicating that students were able to improve in the areas of structuring ideas. Similarly, content and vocabulary also advanced to the average beginning level, showing better idea development and word choice. Meanwhile, language use and mechanics stayed in the low beginning range, despite showing minimal score increases. With an overall mean of 58.41%, students demonstrated early progress but still performed below the expected proficiency levels in academic writing.

The slight improvements suggest that intervention using the Language Enhancement Activities (LEA) had some positive impact, particularly in improving organization, content, and vocabulary, which implies that the students gained a better understanding of how to present ideas clearly and select more appropriate words. However, the persistent low performance in language use and mechanics signals continued struggles in applying grammar rules accurately and following basic writing conventions. These findings highlight the need for sustained,

targeted instruction that focuses on both the technical and expressive components of writing. Without such focused support, learners may continue to struggle with producing cohesive, accurate, and meaningful written texts.

These findings can be supported by Taye and Mengesha (2024), who identified and analyzed common English writing challenges among regular undergraduate students. The study found that students faced various difficulties in writing, including problems with grammar (29.41%), vocabulary (36.76%), punctuation (7.35%), spelling (8.67%), coherence (7.50%), and organization (10.29%). These results point to specific areas where students need more help. To improve students' writing skills, the researchers suggest that teachers should focus on these key aspects through clear and consistent instruction. By addressing these common challenges, writing lessons can help students express their thoughts more clearly, organize their ideas better, and produce more understandable and well-structured written work.

Table 5

Individual Post-Task Descriptive Writing Scores of Grade 7 Students

NAME	C (30)	O (20)	V (20)	LU (25)	M (5)	TOTAL	Mean	SD	QD
Ron	17	7	10	11	2	47	9.4	5.50	Beginning
Axe	24	15	15	15	3	72	14.4	7.47	Beginning
Rie	18	12	15	15	2	62	12.4	6.19	Beginning
Noemi	15	12	12	5	2	46	9.2	5.45	Beginning
Ceejay	14	10	7	5	2	38	7.6	4.62	Beginning
Jhanna	17	10	10	10	2	49	9.8	5.31	Beginning
Ash	22	14	14	19	3	72	14.4	7.23	Beginning
Eddie	13	7	7	5	2	34	6.8	4.02	Beginning
Valerie	17	10	10	5	2	44	8.8	5.72	Beginning
Ashley	24	15	15	19	3	76	15.2	7.76	Developing
Xia	26	17	17	20	3	83	16.6	8.44	Approaching Proficiency
Kara	21	13	13	10	2	59	11.8	6.83	Beginning
Mea	19	13	13	11	2	58	11.6	6.15	Beginning
Gabbi	26	15	15	20	3	79	15.8	8.47	Developing
JR	17	15	14	17	3	66	13.2	5.85	Beginning
Quin	15	9	9	6	2	41	8.2	4.76	Beginning
Kaycee	7	15	14	18	3	67	13.4	6.02	Beginning

Legend: C-Content; O-Organization; V-Vocabulary; LU-Language Use; M-Mechanics

Table 5 presents the individual post-task descriptive writing scores of Grade 7 students following the implementation of the Language Experience Approach (LEA). Among the learners, Xia, Gabbi, and Ashley achieved the highest scores, placing them at the *developing* and *approaching proficiency* levels. This indicates that these students exhibited better organization of ideas, more accurate grammar usage, and enhanced vocabulary. Conversely, several students, including Eddie, Ceejay, and Quin, remained at the *beginning* level, suggesting they struggle with sentence structure, grammar rules, and mechanics, showing minimal improvement despite the intervention.

The results imply that the LEA strategy positively impacted some students, particularly those with a stronger foundation in writing. However, the majority who remained at the *beginning* level may require more targeted instruction. Their performance underscores the necessity of reinforcing basic writing skills, especially grammar, punctuation, and sentence fluency, before expecting significant improvements from strategies like LEA. Additionally, time constraints during writing activities and the learners' limited prior exposure to descriptive writing may have hindered their ability to effectively apply the skills they learned.

This observation is supported by the study conducted by Lee (2020) where it was found that time pressure and limited writing proficiency adversely affect students' ability to produce coherent and grammatically accurate writing. Learners at lower proficiency levels often

concentrate more on sentence formation than on content, which slows their writing process and diminishes overall quality. Therefore, in classrooms with students who have weak foundations, it is essential to provide more time, scaffolding, and direct instruction on grammar rules to enhance writing outcomes.

Section 2. Challenges Faced by the Students Based on the Pre-Task

As a result of the process above, the different challenges faced by the students in terms of descriptive writing surfaced. Out of the 17 students, the majority falls under the *beginning* proficiency level in most criteria. This indicates a general struggle with descriptive writing skills, particularly in foundational aspects.

Based on the different components of Heaton's rubric, it was observed that the students have difficulty fully developing their ideas or providing rich, descriptive details in their writing when it comes to content. As for organization, there is a consistent issue with organizing ideas logically as the students struggle with introductions, transitions, and coherent paragraph structures. Focusing on their vocabulary, the result showed that the majority of the students are having difficulty in choosing and using the proper vocabulary for their sentences. They lack the vocabulary to exactly describe what they ought to say, which hinders them from expressing their ideas effectively. Some students opted to code-switch, a strategy that was observed to be frequently used by the student participants when they struggled to find the English term for what they wanted to say or when they could not find the right word for their statement. Some students, on the other hand, used some words improperly. Although the words are synonymous, they did not consider the context, thus making the words improper or unfit.

Section 3. Improvements Observed in the Post-Tasks

The writing development of three students—Gabbi, Ashley, and Xiela (not their real names)—demonstrates notable improvements after the LEA intervention, particularly in language use and mechanics. Gabbi's post-task writing shows significant growth in sentence construction and vocabulary. In her pre-task, she simply wrote, "I have a close friend that I admire," whereas in her post-task, she expanded her ideas with a more complex sentence: "She's a very simple girl who's not shy to show who she really is and that girl is one of my close friend[s]," indicating an increase in fluency and expression. Her mechanics also improved; frequent issues such as incorrect capitalization in words like "We" and "Kind" were corrected in the post-task. Additionally, her paragraphing became more appropriate, and she attempted a summary using the phrase "For short," showing her effort to conclude her essay, albeit with a slight misuse. Ashley also exhibited clear growth in language use and writing mechanics. Her pre-task writing was marked by short, basic sentences and grammatical errors, but her post-task displayed more complex sentence structures, better grammar, and the use of transitions like "because" and "even though," which enhanced coherence. Her mechanics improved significantly, and her writing became more organized and polished. Notably, she effectively concluded her essay with the word "Overall," signaling improved structure and reflection. Similarly, Xiela's post-task writing reflected greater clarity and organization. While her pre-task consisted mostly of loosely connected ideas, her post-task showed better flow, more varied sentence structures, and improved use of transitions. Although minor mechanical issues remained, her post-task writing was more refined, with fewer run-on sentences and more accurate punctuation. Altogether, these student samples illustrate substantial progress in expressive language, structure, and mechanics following the intervention.

Section 4. Attribution of LEA in the Self-Concept of the Grade 7 Students

This section explores the influence of Language Enhancement Activities (LEA) on the self-concept of Grade 7 students, particularly focusing on their confidence in expressing

thoughts and understanding themselves better through descriptive writing. The high frequency of “Yes” responses across both dimensions indicates that LEA contributes meaningfully to students’ developing self-concept.

Moreover, the students’ qualitative responses underscore how linguistic growth enables deeper emotional insight. This aligns with educational psychology theories, such as Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development and the importance of scaffolding, which suggest that guided learning experiences (like LEA) can elevate both academic skills and self-concept.

Aside from academic progress, a notable outcome during the implementation of the LEA strategy was the increasing comfort and rapport between the students and the researchers. As the sessions progressed, students became noticeably more at ease—sharing casual stories with the researchers during snack breaks, telling jokes while we were taking pictures for documentation after each session, and even suggesting snacks they would like for the next session. They developed an emotional connection with the researchers as some of the students cried during the last session. Additionally, in the group chat with the researchers, the students appeared comfortable and asked questions more openly, demonstrating trust and enthusiasm. This developing rapport seemed to contribute to their willingness to express themselves more honestly and emotionally.

Table 6

Grade 7 Students’ Confidence Expressing their Thoughts and Ideas After LEA

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	15	88.23%
No	2	11.76%
Total	17	100%

Table 6 shows the responses of the students to whether they felt more confident expressing their thoughts and ideas after engaging in LEA- Based activities. The data reveals that 15 out of 17 students or 88.23%, answered *yes*. This means that most of the students felt more confident in expressing themselves after participating in the writing activities. Meanwhile, 2 students or 11.76% responded *no*, indicating that a small number did not feel a significant improvement in their confidence. Overall, the results suggest that LEA has helped many of the students become more confident in sharing their thoughts through writing.

Table 7

Grade 7 Students’ Belief that LEA has Helped them Understand Themselves Better

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	17	100%
No	0	0%
Total	17	100%

Table 7 presents the students’ responses to whether LEA has helped them understand themselves better. All 17 students, or 100%, responded *yes*. This shows that every participant believed that the descriptive writing activities, as implemented through LEA, contributed to their self-understanding. It suggests that the activity encouraged personal reflection and allowed students to express their experiences more clearly.

Section 5. Difference in the Grade 7 Proficiency Level in the Pre- and Post- Tasks

Table 8

T-Test Paired Sample of Means for Individual Component and Overall Score

Pair 1	Content	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
		17.94	17	3.561	.864

		18.94	17	4.145	1.005
Pair 2	Organization	10.82	17	3.005	.729
		12.29	17	3.016	.731
Pair 3	Vocabulary	12.29	17	2.953	.716
		12.35	17	2.999	.727
Pair 4	Language Use	11.59	17	5.409	1.312
		12.41	17	5.832	1.414
Pair 5	Mechanics	2.18	17	.393	.095
		2.41	17	.507	.123
Pair 6	Overall Score	54.82	17	13.826	3.353
		58.41	17	15.305	3.712

Table 8 shows the individual mean score for each component, pre- and post-task, according to Heaton's rubric, including the overall mean score for the pre- and post-tasks. The components are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Table 9

T-Test Paired Sample of Means per Component and Overall

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	C	-1.000	1.275	.309	-1.655	-.345	-3.234	16	.005
Pair 2	O	-1.471	1.281	.311	-2.129	-.812	-4.735	16	.000
Pair 3	V	-.059	1.088	.264	-.618	.501	-.223	16	.826
Pair 4	LU	-.824	1.074	.261	-1.376	-.271	-3.160	16	.006
Pair 5	M	-.235	.437	.106	-.460	-.010	-2.219	16	.041
Pair 6	Overall Score	-3.588	3.104	.753	-5.184	-1.993	-4.777	16	.000

Legend: C-Content; O-Organization; V-Vocabulary; LU-Language Use; M-Mechanics

To evaluate whether there is a statistically significant difference between students' pre- and post-task performance in descriptive writing, a paired samples t-test was conducted. To lay it out more comprehensibly, a more detailed paired sample t-test is done. Each criterion or category of the utilized Heaton's rubric was run through the SPSS paired sample t-test.

The study assessed the impact of the LEA intervention on students' descriptive writing by comparing their pre-task and post-task scores across various writing criteria. Results show a notable improvement in most areas. The mean score for content increased from 17.94 to 18.94, with a t-statistic of -3.23 and a p-value of .005, indicating statistical significance. Similarly, the organization component improved from a mean of 10.82 to 12.29 ($t = -4.74$, $p = .000$), and language use rose from 11.59 to 12.41 ($t = -3.16$, $p = .006$). Mechanics also showed a significant increase, from 2.18 to 2.41 ($t = -2.22$, $p = .041$). In all these areas, the calculated t-values exceeded the critical value of ± 2.12 , and p-values were below the conventional alpha level of 0.05, confirming the effectiveness of the intervention. However, vocabulary did not show a significant change, with the mean slightly increasing from 12.29 to 12.35, a t-score of -0.223, and a p-value of .826—well above the threshold for statistical significance. This suggests that while the intervention improved most aspects of descriptive writing, it had little to no effect on vocabulary.

Although that is true, the total scores for the students' pre-task yielded a mean of 54.82, while the post-task scores showed an increased mean of 58.41, indicating a substantial change following the intervention. With the computed t-score of -4.77, df of 16, and a p-value of 0.00021, alongside the t-value of ± 2.12 , it can be stated that the overall result after the

intervention is statistically significant, as the computed t-score exceeds that of the critical t-value. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis, confirming a significant difference in descriptive writing scores before and after the intervention. Overall, the results provide strong evidence that the Language Enhancement Activities (LEA) effectively improved students' descriptive writing skills.

Conclusion

In general, the students' performance in descriptive writing in both pre-task and post-task is limited. The students were also found lacking in content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics in descriptive writing. However, LEA may help students overcome the challenges in descriptive writing as evident in the significant difference between the pre-task and post task. Lastly, LEA has helped the students improve their self-concept.

Recommendations

Learners should always practice the skills taught by teachers in their writing. The students should pay attention to grammatical rules and the technicalities of writing so they can communicate effectively through writing. Moreover, since the result showed that the students improved through LEA, teachers can adapt the LEA strategy in their teaching to continuously improve the writing skills of the students while focusing on their main topic. The LEA strategy contains various engaging activities that target the development of a certain skill, these could help them design their own enhancement activities or interventions to improve the writing skills of students. There should be a thorough discussion of this form of writing, descriptive writing, as it is seen to be an area that needs focus and improvements as evident in the pre-task conducted by the researchers regarding the mentioned form of writing. Adding to that, instructors or teachers may also undergo seminars and other professional development endeavors to enhance their genre knowledge instruction skills, especially with regard to descriptive writing. For school administrators, they may also expand LEA and implement it in other sections under Grade 7 as well, regardless of their academic sections. If it brings positive results, LEA can also be implemented in other grade levels. They may also conduct coaching and seminars to the teachers about the LEA strategy.

For future researchers, it is strongly recommended that they implement the Language Enhancement Activities (LEA) over a longer period- preferably a minimum of three months. Although the current study showed that LEA positively contributes to improving students' descriptive writing skills and enhancing their self-concept, the limited time frame posed a constraint in fully observing long-term retention and deeper skill development. A longer implementation period may yield more substantial and sustained outcomes. The students' written outputs revealed a need for further improvement in language use, organization, vocabulary, and especially mechanics. Due to the time constraint of the study, these areas were not given sufficient focus and intervention was only limited to the improvement of language use and mechanics. Future researchers are encouraged to investigate these two aspects more thoroughly. Additionally, it was observed that many students lack foundational knowledge in writing mechanics- not just in descriptive writing, but in writing as a whole. It is recommended that future researchers explore the underlying cause of this deficiency and identify targeted interventions to support struggling learners in developing these essential skills. Moreover, while existing research commonly focuses on how self-concept influences descriptive writing performance, it would be equally valuable to explore the reverse: how engaging in descriptive writing activities may impact a student's self-concept. Future studies might provide deeper insight into this relationship, potentially revealing how writing development can serve as a tool for personal and academic growth. Finally, they can explore other factors, external, which may have altered or have caused the students' way of writing in a descriptive manner i.e. background of the students, environment, economic status, and others.

REFERENCES

- Faizah, N. A., Cahyono, N. B. Y., & Ivone, N. F. M. (2024). A prototype of web-based supplementary writing instructional media for upper-secondary level learners. *Jurnal Onoma Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 10(1), 343–367. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i1.3049>
- Graham, S., Kim, Y.-S. G., Cao, Y., Lee, J., & Collins, P. (2023). Effective writing instruction for students in grades 6 to 12: A best evidence meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(7), 1004–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000819>
- Guo, J., Yang, L., Zhang, J., & Gan, Y. (2021). Academic self-concept, perceptions of the learning environment, engagement, and learning outcomes of university students: Relationships and causal ordering. *Higher Education*, 83(4), 809–828. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00705-8>
- Harlena, D., Mukhaiyar, N., & Hamzah, N. (2020). Collaborative writing strategy for teaching writing descriptive text. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 411, 411–417. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200306.045>
- Isma, A., Rasmin, L. O., & Samsudin, N. (2023). Decoding the challenges: A study of English writing errors among EFL students. *Glens Global English Insights Journal*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.61220/glens.v1i1.2023a1>
- Ismayanti, E., & Kholiq, A. (2020). An analysis of students' difficulties in writing descriptive text. *E-Link Journal*, 7(1), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.30736/ej.v7i1.260>
- Jayanti, A. D. (2019). Students writing ability on English descriptive text at Grade VIII in SMPN 33 Padang. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 3(1), 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v3i1.843>
- Kaharuddin, N., Mardiana, N., Ahmad, D., & Sari, A. A. I. (2022). Examining the skill in writing descriptive text among Indonesian learners of English: The effects of task-based language teaching (TBLT). *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1301.06>
- Khazrouni, M. (2019). Assessment for improving ESL learners' writing skills among undergraduate students: A case study of Skyline University College. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 30–44. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332409543>
- Lee, J. (2020). The effects of time constraints, genre, and proficiency on L2 writing fluency behaviors and linguistic outcomes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 47, 100714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100714>
- Marzulina, L., Zuhri, M., & Suparno. (2019, October 31). Magnet summary strategy in descriptive writing: The case of madrasah students in South Sumatera. *ELITE Journal - ELITE Association Indonesia*. <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE/article/view/13>
- McLeod, S. (2023). Self-concept in psychology: Definition & examples. *SimplyPsychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/self-concept.html>
- Megawati, N. (2020). Using guided writing strategy in teaching descriptive writing to the tenth grade students. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 7(1), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.19109/ejpp.v7i1.5590>
- Mohamed, F. T., Olamo, T. G., & Yemiru, M. A. (2024). Effect of differentiated instruction on primary EFL students' writing performance and perception: The case of Grade 7 students in Hawassa City, Ethiopia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101230>
- Menggo, S., Suastra, I. M., Budiarsa, M., & Padmadewi, N. N. (2019). Speaking for academic purposes course: An analysis of language functions. *e-Journal of Linguistics*, 13(2), 308–320. <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2019.v13.i02.p10>
- Mulyasin, M. A., Zamzam, A., Putera, L. J., Amin, M., & Arfah, H. (2023). The challenges and strategies in writing descriptive text on local places in the EFL essay writing course. *Jurnal Educatio*, 9(4), 2086–2092. <https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v9i4.6017>

- Ofte, I., & Solli, K. (2024). Exploring in-class writing activities in teacher education: A study of perspectives on writing in literacy events. *Nordic Journal of Literacy Research*. <https://nordicliteracy.net/index.php/njlr/article/view/5278/9635>
- Perumal, & Ajit, I. (2020). Enhancing writing skills: A review. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 57(9), 2229–2236. <https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v57i9.592>
- Rahmawati, W. T., Sihite, M. R., & Zulkarnain, I. (2021). Clustering technique in teaching writing descriptive text. *English Teaching and Linguistics Journal*, 2(2), 211–219. <https://doi.org/10.30596/etlij.v2i2.6984>
- Sari, I., Pulungan, A., & Husein, R. (2020). Students' cognition and attitude in writing descriptive text. *Britain International of Linguistics, Arts and Education (BIoLAE)*, 2(1), 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v2i1.210>
- Sari, N. P. (2019). The effectiveness of problem-based learning (PBL) method to improve students' writing ability. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 117–124. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v4i2.13531>
- Siregar, N. W. (2020). *The effect of Pick, List, Evaluate, Activate, Supply, End (PLEASE) strategy on writing descriptive text at Grade VIII students of Mts Al-Mukhlisin Sibuhuan Padang Lawas* [Master's thesis, UIN Syahada Padangsidempuan]. <http://etd.uinsyahada.ac.id/id/eprint/6239>
- Steiner, K. L., Pillemer, D. B., & Thomsen, D. K. (2019). Writing about life story chapters increases self-esteem: Three experimental studies. *Journal of Personality*, 87(5), 962–980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12449>
- Taye, T., & Mengesha, M. (2024). Identifying and analyzing common English writing challenges among regular undergraduate students. *Heliyon*, 10, e36876. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36876>
- Vinney, C. (2024). What is self-concept in psychology? *ThoughtCo*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/self-concept-psychology-4176368>